



General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/41/505
7 August 1986
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

Forty-first session
Items 39, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67 and 70
of the provisional agenda*

QUESTION OF PEACE, STABILITY AND CO-OPERATION IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

**REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUDING DOCUMENT OF THE
TWELFTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND DECISIONS
ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS TENTH SPECIAL SESSION**

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION OF THE INDIAN OCEAN
AS A ZONE OF PEACE**

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

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

Letter dated 5 August 1986 from the **Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the**
Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to
the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the **text of the foreign-policy** part of the speech given by M. S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the **Central** Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on 28 July 1986 in Vladivostok.

* A/41/150.

A/41/505
English
Page 2

I request you to have this text distributed as an official document of the General Assembly under items 39, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67 and 70 of the provisional agenda.

(Signed) V. S. SAFRONCHUK
Chargé d'affaires a. i. of the
Permanent Mission of the USSR
to the United Nations

ANNEX

**THE FOREIGN-POLICY PART OF THE SPEECH GIVEN BY M. S. GORBACHEV,
GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL, COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST
PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION, ON 28 JULY 1986 IN VLADIVOSTOK**

Events of enormous significance are taking **place** before Our eyes. An understanding **of the need for peace for all.** is being forcefully brought home to the peoples **of the world,** even in places where Governments continue to believe **that weapons and war are tools of politics.** I **say** peace for all, precisely because a nuclear war would not simply be **a clash between two blocs, two opposing forces;** it **would lead to a global disaster in which human civilization would be threatened with destruction.**

The reaction to **our** initiatives on nuclear disarmament, major **cuts** in conventional weapons and armed **forces,** verification and the **creation of a healthier international atmosphere** have taken various **Forms.**

Friendly countries have expressed support for them. The countries **of the socialist community** view them with good reason **as** an inherent **part of the general policy of socialism in the world arena -** and not only because **these** initiatives have been co-ordinated with them, not only because of **internationalist considerations of principle, but also because** both we and they are **engaged** in the **same** purely peaceful **effort,** that **of improving our societies.** On **that basis, the salutary process of developing closer bonds is being intensified, economic integration is being given a new shape, practical steps are being taken to set up joint plants and combines, and active human contacts are being broadened.** In **a word, a progressive, mutually beneficial process of intensifying co-operation and fraternity among the peoples of the community is under way.**

The developing world shows **a keen interest** in **our** plans and intentions, **both internal and international.** We note that many developing **countries** wish to **expand and intensify further their economic, scientific and cultural co-operation with the Soviet Union.** We **are** prepared for that.

It would **be fair to say that the public at large and those representatives of the business world in the West** who have a realistic view **of things, do not suffer** from anti-Communist paranoia and have nothing **to do with profits from the arms race** view **our** plans seriously and with interest. They also **are** in favour of **peace** and co-operation and the development of healthy **economic, scientific and cultural ties with the Soviet Union.** We welcome **such** an approach.

Yet **in many** capitalist countries the pace is **set, as before, by forces** whose view of **the past and the future is blinded by animosity towards socialism or by imperialist ambitions, or by forces closely geared to the arms trade.** But **the latter are known to be extremely voracious and ruthless. yesterday they needed millions, today they need billions, and tomorrow they will need trillions.** They will never start manufacturing, **of their own free will, children's toys instead of missiles. Such** is their nature.

The ruling circles of the United States and of **some of its allies** try to represent **our** peace initiatives as sheer propaganda, or **as benefiting** the Soviet Union alone. Yes, we do stand **'to** gain from disarmament - **if** we are going to **use** that verb - just **as** all peoples and the Government which now spend billions on **the** arms race stand **to** gain from disarmament. Yet that is only part of the truth. I would even say **it** is a minor part of the truth. The major truth is that our initiatives **stem** from a profound concern about mankind's destiny.

It is absurd and criminal to act in the face of a nuclear threat according to an old and discredited **axiom** - what is good for the socialist countries must **be** rejected. That clearly reveals a class-conscious narrow-mindedness, **a** primitive and mechanistic ideological approach and the growing political influence of **militarism**. Yet I am not inclined to believe that the military-industrial complex is **all-powerful**. We see that the world public ever more clearly **realizes** the **dangers of** militarism. **We** see that, even in the United States, despite **unrelenting efforts** to inculcate chauvinistic sentiments, there are growing realistic **feelings** and a deepening awareness that the military threat: **to** the United States **stems** not from the Soviet people, not from the socialist countries, not from Nicaraguan peasants **or** the **far-away** Vietnamese **or** Libyans, but **from its** own arms manufacturers and the **irresponsible** politicians serving them, the adventurist warmongers.

We **certainly** understand that the spiralling **arms race serves not only to boost** super-profits and **preparations for** war, but **also - last** but not least - other immoral aims **whose essence** is to exhaust the Soviet Union economically, frustrate the Party's policy for a further improvement in **people's living standards**, and hamper implementation of the social programme. **We know** exactly **who continues to cherish** the hope for **a** planned, **methodical** destruction of the **USSR** and the socialist countries, using to that end **economic, moral, psychological, propaganda, political and military** methods. **But** that was **a** futile effort, and still is. The time has come to reckon with realities, rather than to **make policy on the basis of** illusions and misconceptions. In the absence of **agreements**, there will be no relief or tranquillity in the world) fear will not **be dissipated** until **some** Western rulers give up the dangerous attempts - which are, perhaps, **consoling** for them, but, the main thing **is**, fruitless - to bring the Soviet Union to its knees, divide the socialist community **and** hamper our forward **march**.

The times persistently demand a new understanding of the present stage in the evolution **of civilization** and international **relations** in the world - a world that is complex and contradictory but in fact **united** by the **bonds of** mutual dependence and **international** relations that have evolved to the point where, **given the many** divergent and clashing interests, one can no longer **preserve millenia-old** traditions governed by the "law of the jungle". It is **a civilization** that demonstrates the unprecedented power **of** the human **mind and of** human labour but also, simultaneously, a fragility, a vulnerability at the **hands of** those forces released by human **genius** but placed in the service of **destruction**.

All that dictates the urgent need for a radical departure **from many customary** attitudes to foreign policy, a **break** from the **traditions** of political thinking, from views on the problems of **war** and peace, defence, security of individual states and **international security**. In that connection it is clear that our radical - and, in the full sense of **the** word, **global - proposals** such as the programme for the elimination before the end of this century of **nuclear and other weapons of mass**

destruction, proposals for a total **ban on nuclear-weapons tests, a ban on chemical weapons, co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space and a whole range of others** concern the whole world, all countries.

The main problem which confronts **the human race today** - that of survival - is equally acute and urgent for Europe, Africa, America and Asia. Yet, in each part of the world it **looks** different. Therefore, while here in **Vladivostok**, it is natural to **look at global policy** issues from the Asian and Pacific **viewpoint**.

Such an approach is justified for many **reasons**. In the first place, east of the Urals, in Asia - in Siberia, in the **Far East** - lies the **greater part of Our** country's territory. It is here that many national tasks **put forward by the Party Congress** will be **resolved**. **Hence**, the situation in the **Far East as a whole**, in **Asia** and the **ocean** expanses washing its **shores, where** we have **long lived** and navigated its waters, is to **us a national, a State interest**.

In this vast region, spreading over almost half the globe, lie many major States, including the USSR, the **United States, India, China, Japan, Viet Nam, Mexico and Indonesia**. **Here** lie States which are considered to be of medium size, but are rather big by European standards - Canada, the **Philippines, Australia and New Zealand** - and along with them there are **dozens of** relatively small and quite tiny **countries**. Some of them have a history covering **millenia or many centuries**, others have been founded in **modern times**, and still others were **formed** quite recently.

Asia, which woke up to a new life in the twentieth century, has enriched world progress with its diversified and unique experience of the struggle for freedom and **independence**. And this **is** not only history. **It** is a living **legacy** that constitutes one of the fundamentals of current political realities in this part of the world.

Every country has its own social and political system with all the nuances imaginable, its own traditions, achievements **and** difficulties, its own mode of life and its **beliefs**, convictions and prejudices, its **own** understanding of spiritual **and** material **values**. Each of them **has** something to be proud of and something to uphold in the treasure house of human **civilization**.

This impressive diversity, this colossal human **and** socio-political edifice, calls for close attention, study and respect. We know well from our own Soviet experience what an immense creative force the revived **sense** of national dignity becomes, what a constructive role **is** played by the national identity of a people in its vital links with other equal and free peoples. **This** process is now on the rise in Asia and the Pacific: everything is in motion here, much has not **settled**. The new **is** mixing with the old, **the way of life** which **only yesterday seemed** unshakable **is** giving **way** to a whirlwind of change - social, scientific and technical, and **ideological**. This is, I would **say**, yet **another** period of renaissance in world history, a period embodying **a huge** potential for progress. And this is true not only with regard to Asia and Oceania.

Which path will socio-economic and political development **take**? **What** processes will prevail in inter-State relations? These issues will largely determine the destinies of the whole world.

Socialism is an inalienable factor in the large-scale and complex changes in **this region**. It **gained** a firm foothold in Asia **as a result of the Great October Revolution and the victory over facism and Japanese militarism, following the Great Chinese Revolution) after the new social system was consolidated in Mongolia) in Korea, whose people displayed outstanding determination in the struggle for the socialist future of their country) and then in Viet Nam and Laos. But it is also here where it was confronted with the most brutal and cynical counteraction. The most graphic example of this is Viet Nam. Its heroic experience, the lessons of its victory over imperialism highlighted again the irresistible strength of the ideas of freedom and socialism.**

This **region, Asia, saw the formation of the concept of non--alignment, the movement which now includes more than a hundred nations. This movement is Striving to come up with its own response to the challenge of the times) it is actively working to overcome the division of the world into military blocs and is looking for ways to diminish the nuclear threat. In rejecting and condemning exploitation, the policy of aggression and neo-colonialism, the Non-Aligned Movement is urging mankind to unite, to co-operate in combating hunger and the grinding poverty of hundreds of millions of people.**

Its **recognized leader is the great country of India, with its moral authority and traditional wisdom, with its specific political experience and huge economic potentialities. We greatly value India's contribution to establishing standards of equitable coexistence and justice in the international community. Friendly relations between the USSR and India have become a stabilizing factor on a world-wide scale,**

Japan has turned into a Power of front-rank importance. The country which became the first victim of American nuclear weapons made enormous headway within a brief period, demonstrated striking accomplishments in industry, trade, education, science and technology. These successes are due not only to the self-control, discipline and energy of the Japanese people, but also to the "three non-nuclear principles" which officially underline its international policy, although lately - and this cannot be ignored - they, as well as the peaceful provisions of Japan's Constitution, are being circumvented ever more openly.

But we also see many other things in **Asia and Oceania. The peoples' dignity - insulted by colonialism, the legacy of poverty, illiteracy and backwardness - together with deep prejudices, are a fertile soil for mistrust and hostility between peoples, including those living within the boundaries of one State. Imperialism speculates on the difficulties and prejudices, and this fans local conflicts and ethnic and religious strife and engenders political instability.**

Wherever independence becomes a tangible **international quantity and imperialism finds its exploitive interests threatened, it resorts to its favourite methods: economic blackmail, intrigues and plots against the leadership of the country in question) it interferes in internal problems, supports separatists, finances and even arms counter-revolutionary forces and terrorists. Punjab, the Tamil problem - with attempts being made to turn this one against India, too - the undeclared wars against Kampuchea and Afghanistan, the annexation of Micronesia, interference in the Philippines, and pressure on New Zealand offer enough examples to see how the contemporary mechanism of imperialist intervention and diktat operates.**

The experience of history, the law of growing interdependence and the integration requirement of the economy spur on the **search** for unity, and the establishment of open ties among nations within the region and **beyond it**. These nations have **tens**, hundreds of intractable problems, inherited from the colonial past or emerging from the contradictions of present-day development. They are being **dragged** into blocs, and the freedom to **dispose** of their own resources **is** being curtailed. They are being forced to inflate military **budgets**, and are being swept into the **arms** race, drawn into the **militarization** of the economy and of social life.

All this distorts the processes of internal development, generates tension and, naturally, stands in the way of normalising relations between nationalities and **between** States.

The Soviet Union is **also** an **Asian** and Pacific **country**. It understands the **complex** problems of this **vast** region. They are at its **very** borders. **This** is what determines its **balanced**, overall view of this giant part of the world, characterised **by a mass of diverse States** and peoples. And **our** approach to it **is based** on a recognition and understanding of existing realities.

At the **same** time our **interest is** not a claim to enjoy certain privileges and a special position, **not an** egoistic attempt to strengthen our security at **someone else's** expense, not a search for gain to the detriment of others. **Our** interest lies in the pooling of efforts and in co-operation, with **full** respect for each people's right to live as they choose and **resolve** their **problems** on their own in conditions of peace.

We are in favour of the building together of new, equitable relations in **Asia** and the Pacific.

Recently I had many meetings with leaders of European nations, with various political figures of European countries. One cannot help comparing the situation in Asia with that in Europe.

The Pacific region has not as yet **been militarized** to the **same extent** as in Europe. **But** the **potentialities** for its militarization are truly immense and the **consequences** are extremely dangerous. A glance at the map will **convince** one of **that**. Major nuclear Powers are situated here. **Powerful** land armies, mighty navies and **air** forces have been established. The scientific, technological and industrial potential of **many** countries - from the western to the eastern **shores** of the ocean - **makes** it possible to **spur on any arms race**. The situation is being exacerbated by **the** preservation of conflict situations. Let **us** not **forget**: it is in **Asia** that American imperialism waged the two biggest wars **since** 1945 - in Korea and **Indo-China**. Hardly a few years went by during the past four **decades** without flames of war blazing in **one** or **other** part of the Asian and Pacific region.

In Europe, there operate - perhaps badly, perhaps well - the Helsinki process of dialogue, talks and agreements. **This** brings a certain stability and reduces **the** probability of armed conflict. **But in the** region that we are **discussing**, this **is absent**, or nearly absent. And if something has been changing recently, it **has not been** for the better. Since the second half of the **1970s** the United States has undertaken large-scale measures to build up **armed forces in the Pacific Ocean**. The

militarized Washington-Tokyo-Seoul "triangle" is **being set up under** its pressure. And although two of **the** three nuclear Powers in **the region - the** People's Republic of China and the USSR - have pledged not to be the first to **use nuclear weapons,** **the** United States has deployed nuclear-weapons delivery vehicles and nuclear **warheads** in one of the zones of crisis - the Korean peninsula - and **nuclear-weapons** delivery vehicles **on** Japanese soil.

One cannot help **noticing** that **militarization** and the **escalation** of the **threat** of war in this part of the world are picking up dangerous speed. The Pacific Ocean is being turned into an arena of military and political confrontation. This is **what** gives rise to growing concern **among** the people living here. This is alarming also for us from all viewpoints, and that **includes** considerations of security in the Asiatic part of our **country**.

The Asian and Pacific orientation of **the** Soviet Union's **foreign** policy is an integral part of **the** overall programme of international activities of **the** Communist Party of **the** Soviet Union that was worked **out by** the April **plenary** meeting and **the** **Twenty-seventh Party Congress**. **But** the **programme is** not a blueprint that **can be** applied to **any situation;** it is, rather, a set of principles and a method **relying** on experience.

Proceeding from that fact, how do we view the process of **shaping** international security and peaceful co-operation in **this vast region?**

First of all, in keeping with its fundamental policy adopted at **the** Twenty-seventh Congress, the Soviet Union will **seek to make** its bilateral relations **with all other countries** situated **here, without** exception, more **dynamic**. **We shall** do our utmost to strengthen friendship and invigorate our manifold ties **with the** Mongolian People's Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, **the** Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, **the** Lao People's Democratic Republic and the People's Republic of Kampuchea. We regard relations with our friends, **built on the** principles of equality and solidarity, as an integral part of overall Asian and Pacific security.

At present, for instance, the question of withdrawing a **substantial** part of Soviet troops from Mongolia is being examined jointly with the Mongolian leadership.

We are prepared to expand ties with **Indonesia,** Australia, **New Zealand,** the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, **Burma,** Sri Lanka, **Nepal,** Brunei and the Republic of Maldives, as well as with **the youngest** independent participants in the region's political life. With some of these - Papua New Guinea, **Western Samoa,** **the** Kingdom of **Tonga,** Fiji, the Republic of Kitibati, **the** Republic of Nauru, Tuvalu and the Republic of **Vanuatu** - we already maintain diplomatic relations.

Speaking in a city which is, **as** it were, a mere step from **the** People's Republic of China, I would like to dwell **on the most** important issues in our relations. The relations are extremely important for several **reasons,** starting from the fact that we are neighbours, **that** we share **the world's longest** land border and that we, our children and **grandchildren** are destined to live **near each other,** **as** it were, "for ever and ever".

But the question is not, of course, **reduced to** that. History entrusted the Soviet and the Chinese peoples with an **extremely** responsible mission. **Many** aspects of international development depend on these two major socialist nations.

A noticeable improvement has occurred in our relations in recent years. I would like to reaffirm: the Soviet Union is prepared, at any time and at any level, to discuss with China questions of additional measures for creating an atmosphere of good-neighbourliness. We hope that in the near future the border dividing us - I would prefer to say linking us - will become a line of peace and friendship.

The Soviet people view with understanding and respect the goal set **by** the Communist Party of China - that of modernizing the country and building in the future a socialist society worthy of a great people.

We and China, as far as one **may** judge, have similar priorities - those of accelerating social and economic development. **And** why should we not support each other, why should we not co-operate in implementing our plans wherever this will clearly benefit both sides? The better the relations, the more we shall be able to exchange our experience.

We note with satisfaction that a positive shift can be discerned in economic ties. We are convinced that the historically established **complementarity between** the Soviet and the Chinese economies provides great opportunities for expanding these ties, **including** in the border regions. Some of the major problems of co-operation are "knocking at the door". For instance, we do not want the River **Amur**, which forms the border, to be viewed as a water barrier. Let the basin of this mighty river unite the efforts of the Chinese and the Soviet peoples in using for mutual benefit the rich resources available there and in building water-management projects. An intergovernmental agreement on this issue is being jointly worked **out** **the** official border **may** pass along the main shipping channel.

The Soviet Government is preparing a positive reply concerning the issue of assistance in building a railway to connect the Xinjiang-Uygur Autonomous Region with Kazakhstan.

We proposed co-operation with China in space exploration, which could include the training of Chinese cosmonauts. There are great opportunities for mutually beneficial exchanges in the **sphere of culture and education. We are ready for, and** sincerely wish, all that to take place.

About relations with Japan. Were as well there are emerging signs of a turn for the better. It would be good if the turn **did** take place. The actual position **of our two countries in the world demands close co-operation on a sound, realistic basis**, in a calm atmosphere free from problems of the past. A beginning was made this year. There was an exchange of visits by Ministers for Foreign Affairs. On the agenda is an exchange of visits at the highest level.

Economic co-operation is **of** mutual interest, This especially concerns our coastal regions, which already maintain business contacts with Japanese firms. We **may** discuss the question of establishing joint enterprises in contiguous and nearby regions of the USSR and Japan. Why not also establish long-term co-operation in

the investigation and all-round exploitation of **ocean** resources? **Why** not link together the programmes for the peaceful study and use of **outer space**? The Japanese, it seems, have a method of making relations *more dynamic*: it is called "**economic diplomacy**". This time let it serve Soviet-Japanese **co-operation**.

In the Pacific region the Soviet Union **also** shares a border with the United States. It is **our** next-door neighbour in the literal meaning of the **word**, and we **are** separated by only seven kilometres - the exact distance between the Soviet island of Big Diomede and the American island of Little Diomede.

We clearly **realize** that the United States is a great pacific power - primarily **because** a considerable part of the population of the United States **lives** on the shores of this ocean and the western part of America, which gravitates towards this region, is playing a growing role in the country's life and has a dynamic outlook. Besides, **the United States**, undoubtedly, **has** important economic and political **interests in the region**.

There is no doubt that, without the United States, without its **participation**, it is impossible to resolve the problem of security and **co-operation** in the Pacific Ocean in a way that would satisfy all. **So far**, regrettably, Washington has not shown interest in this, and is not **even** contemplating a serious talk on the subject of **the Pacific**. *And* if this subject is taken up, it takes the well-worn path of **the 'Soviet threat'** and of **drumming** in order to corroborate this myth.

Our approach to **relations** with the United States **is** well known. We are in favour of peaceful, good-neighbourly relations and mutually beneficial co-operation - **for which, incidentally**, there are also considerable opportunities **in** the Far East, in the Pacific.

Since we are talking **about** the United States, here are a few **words** about the **most important** aspect of our relations at the present time - concerning termination of the arms **race**. Since the Geneva meeting, the Soviet Union has put forward many major proposals on the entire range of problems connected with **reducing and eliminating arms** and verifying this process. We have not seen any movement to meet us half way. We were treated, in **fact**, to the **same** old stuff as **prior** to the Geneva meeting .

with a view to putting an end to marking **time**, we **went** further towards meeting the united States **position**: in my June letter to the President of the United States, new, important **compromise proposals** were put forward. During my visit here in the Far East, I received a reply from President Reagan. It sets one thinking. **We** have begun to study it. We shall deal with it in a responsible and attentive manner. To us the **most** important thing is, **first of all**, the extent to which the **proposals contained** in the letter meet the principle of equal security and whether they make it possible to reach effective joint solutions to ending the arms race **and preventing it** from spreading into outer space. We shall determine **our** further steps accordingly. As regards a new Soviet-American summit meeting, I can **repeat**: we favour such a meeting. But we resolutely oppose the interpretation of the accords reached at the previous meeting in Geneva that reduces them to the promise to **have** more meetings. *No*, the main thing, on which we agreed last time with President Reagan and which we signed, is the consent to strive for the

normalization of relations between the USSR and the United States and for the improvement of the international situation, and to speed up the pace of talks on arms reduction. A new summit meeting, too, should serve that purpose.

We frequently hear from abroad all kinds of information to the effect that the Soviet Union is building up its military power in the east of the country. Let me state with all responsibility: we are not doing anything and shall not do anything over and above the level that corresponds to the minimal requirements of our defence, and the defence of our friends and allies, especially in the light of the American military activity not far from our and their frontiers.

This fully applies to medium-range missiles. Those who do not want to see the lessening of world tensions continue to argue that we allegedly will be able to move our SS-20 missiles from west to east and from east to west. This is why I emphasize once more: we suggest that both American and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe be eliminated. And I mean, eliminated, and not moved somewhere. It is quite clear that this promotes the interests of Asian countries as well,

I would also like to state that the Soviet Union is a convinced advocate of disbanding military groupings, renouncing the possession of foreign bases in Asia and the Pacific Ocean and withdrawing troops from the territories of foreign countries. The USSR is a party to the Warsaw Treaty, but this is a European defensive alliance and operates strictly within the geographical framework laid down by the Treaty. On the other hand, we strongly oppose United States attempts to extend NATO's "competence" to the entire world, including Asia and the Pacific Ocean.

Our views about security in the Asian and Pacific region have not come out of thin air. They take account of the experience of the past and of present times. The principles of "Pancha Sila" and of Bandung have not sunk into oblivion. The positive examples of the truce in Korea, the 1954 Geneva meeting on Indo-China and the Indo-Pakistan Agreement in Tashkent live on in the diplomatic experience. Nowadays, too, we see in practice the efforts of a number of States to solve common economic problems and their attempts to settle conflict situations in one way or another. There are substantial favourable elements in the activities of ASEAN and in bilateral ties. After the concept of a "Pacific community" had been rejected, discussion of the idea of "Pacific economic co-operation" began. We approached it without bias, and are ready to join in the deliberations on the possible foundations of such co-operation - provided, of course, it is conceived not in accordance with a bloc-oriented, anti-socialist pattern imposed from outside, but as a result of a free discussion without any kind of discrimination. The fairly wide range of scientific and political ideas on the issue of establishing a new international economic order and the experience of integration in the West and the East could become a solid foundation for such discussions.

As an objective, even if a rather remote one, we would propose a conference, in the mould of the Helsinki Conference, to be attended by all the countries that gravitate towards the Ocean. If and when an agreement on convening such a conference is reached, it will be possible to come to terms on the venue for it. One of the options is Hiroshima. Why should not that city, the first victim of the nuclear evil, become the "Helsinki" of sorts for Asia and the Pacific Ocean?

Summing up, I would like to emphasize that we favour integrating the Asian-Pacific region into the **general** process of establishing a comprehensive **system** of international security as **proposed** at the Twenty-seventh **Congress** of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

How do we see this in concrete **terms**?

First of all, the issues of **regional** settlement **suggest themselves**. I'll **speak** of Afghanistan separately. Let **me** speak now about South-East Asia and **Kampuchea**.

The Khmer people sustained terrible losses. Kampuchea's towns and villages repeatedly **came** under American **bombing** raids. With its suffering it has **gained** the **right** to choose its own friends and allies. It is not permissible to try and draw **it back** into the **trafic** past, or to decide the future of that State in distant capitals or even in the United Nations.

Here, as in other problems of South-East Asia, **much** depends on the **normalization** of Sino-Vietnamese relations. It is a sovereign matter of the Governments and leadership of the two countries. We can only express our interest in **seeing** the border **between** these socialist States again **becoming a border** of peace and good-neighbourly relations, and in **seeing** comradely **dialogue** resumed and fruitless suspicion and mistrust removed. **It seems** that the time is ripe, and the whole of Asia needs this.

In our opinion, there are no insurmountable obstacles to establishing mutually acceptable relations between the countries of **Indo-China** and **ASEAN**. Provided there is good will and non-intervention, they could solve their problems, to the benefit also of the cause of security in Asia as a whole.

There is a possibility not only **of** lessening dangerous tensions in the Korean peninsula **but** also of starting to move **along** the road of solving the national problem of the entire Korean people. If truly Korean interests are to **be** preserved, there are no sensible reasons for evading a serious **dialogue**, as proposed **by the** Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Second. **We** favour **putting** up a barrier to prevent **the** proliferation and build-up of nuclear weapons in Asia and the Pacific Ocean. **It is** common knowledge that the USSR has pledged itself not to increase the number of medium-range nuclear missiles in the Asiatic part of the country.

The USSR **supports proclaiming** the southern part of the Pacific Ocean a nuclear-free zone and **urges** all nuclear powers, whether on a unilateral or a multilateral basis, to guarantee its status.

Implementation of the **proposal put** forward **by** the Democratic People's **Republic** of Korea for the creation of a nuclear-free zone **in** the Korean **peninsula** would **make** a serious contribution. Well-deserved attention was aroused **by the** idea of **creating** such a zone in South-East Asia.

Third. **We propose** that talks be started **on** the reduction of the activity of **naval** fleets in **the** Pacific, especially nuclear-armed ships. The restriction of

rivalry in the sphere of anti-submarine weapons, specifically the arrangement to refrain from anti-submarine activity in certain zones of the Pacific Ocean, would help to strengthen stability. This could become a substantial confidence-building measure.

In general I would like to say that, if the United States gave up its military presence, say, in the Philippines, we would not leave that step unanswered.

We remain strongly in favour of resuming the talks on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

Fourth. The Soviet Union attaches much importance to radically reducing armed forces and conventional weapons in Asia, bringing them down to the limits of reasonable sufficiency. We realize that this problem should be tackled gradually, stage by stage, starting with one region, say, the Far East. In this context, the USSR is prepared to discuss with China practical steps aimed at a proportional lowering of the level of land forces.

Fifth. The Soviet Union considers that the time has long come to raise to a practical level the discussion of confidence-building measures and the non-use of force in the region. A start could be made on the simpler measures, for instance measures for the security of sea lanes in the Pacific Ocean, and for the prevention of international terrorism.

A conference to discuss and work out such measures could be held in one of the Soviet maritime cities. Incidentally, it would be possible in time to solve the question of the opening of Vladivostok to visits by foreigners. If a change for the better in the situation in the Pacific is really achieved, Vladivostok could become one of the major international centres, a commercial and cultural centre, a city of festivals, sports events, congresses and scientific symposia. We would like it to be a wide-open window to the East. And then the words of our great Pushkin, "The ships of every flag and nation will hail our shores" will then apply also to Vladivostok.

In conclusion, about Afghanistan. It was declared from the rostrum of the Twenty-seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union that we are ready to bring home Soviet troops stationed in Afghanistan at the request of its Government. As you know, the Party now firmly adheres to the principle that words should be followed up by deeds.

Having thoroughly assessed the situation that is taking shape and having held consultations with the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the Soviet leadership has adopted the decision which I officially announce today: before the end of 1986, six regiments will be brought home. These are: one tank regiment, two motorized rifle regiments and three anti-aircraft artillery regiments, with their equipment and weapons. These units will be returned to the areas of their permanent deployment in the Soviet Union, and in such a way that this may be easily ascertained by all those interested.

In taking so serious a step, about which we informed in advance the states concerned, including Pakistan, the Soviet Union is striving to speed up a political settlement, to give it further impetus. The Soviet Union also proceeds from the

view that those who organise and carry out the armed intervention against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan will correctly understand and duly appreciate this unilateral step of ours. It must be answered by a curtailment of outside interference in the affairs of Democratic Afghanistan.

In the Afghan-Pakistan talks being held through the mediation of a representative of the United Nations Secretary-General, some progress has been achieved of late. As soon as a political settlement is finally worked out, the return of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan can be speeded up. Schedules for their phased return have **been agreed** upon with the **Afghan** leadership.

But all those who **encourage** and finance the undeclared war against Afghanistan and from whose territory it is waged should know that, if the intervention against Afghanistan continues, the Soviet Union will **not** leave its neighbour in the lurch. Both our internationalist solidarity with the Afghan people and the interests of Soviet security absolutely preclude this.

We support the course taken by the present **Afghan** leadership towards national reconciliation, a widening of the social base of the April national-democratic revolution, including the setting up of a government with the participation in it of those political forces which found themselves outside the country's borders but which are ready to play a sincere role in the nation-wide process of constructing a **new** Afghanistan.

Comrades, the present generation has inherited **many** difficult and painful problems. In order to move towards their solution we must rid ourselves of the burden of the past and seek new approaches, guided by a sense of responsibility for the present and the future.

The Soviet Union calls on all Asian and Pacific nations to co-operate for the sake of peace and security. Everyone who is striving for **these goals** and who hopes for a better future for their peoples will find us to be benevolent interlocutors and honest partners.

Mankind is passing through a difficult and tense period. But it has a reserve of strength which allows it not simply to survive but also to learn to live in a new, civil **ized** world, in other words, to live without the threat of **war, in** conditions of freedom, **when** the highest criterion will be the well-being of mankind and the maximum development of the capacities of the human personality. But this requires an unrelenting **struggle** against **the** common enemy - the threat of universal destruction.

Today, more than ever before, it is important to **mobilize** the potential of common sense existing in the world, the partnership of **reason**, in order to arrest the slide towards catastrophe. Our resolve to do our utmost for this remains unchanged. Peoples of all countries and States can be sure of this. That, in brief, is the state of affairs at the present day, such are the **general** features of the international situation, in the development of which the role of the Asian and Pacific part of the **globe** will continue to **grow**. We must draw practical conclusions from all this in order to act with yet **greater energy** for **reshaping** our lives in a better way.