

I pressed Dobrynin for possible indications of Brezhnev's desire to cooperate with the new Administration in SALT and other ways. He sent me o/a 20 December 76 four documents: Mr. Brezhnev's speech at the plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee delivered in late October with certain sections marked; Gromyko's Memorandum on disarmament delivered at the United Nations, also marked; quotes from Brezhnev's speech on relations with the United States at the 25th Congress of the Communist Party, February 24, 1976; and quotes from Brezhnev's speech on efforts to promote disarmament.

As I recall it, I sent the first two papers by hand to David Aaron with a penned note to the President-elect and asked him (Aaron) to mail them to the President-elect. I later heard that the President-elect had received them and noted the paragraphs of particular interest.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE USSR

SOVIET EMBASSY, INFORMATION DEPARTMENT

1706 18TH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009

TELEPHONE 232-6020

*See pp. 6-7*LEONID BREZHNEV'S SPEECH AT THE PLENARY MEETING OF THE
CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE

(Excerpts Relating to Some Aspects of the
Party's International Activities)

The Party's International Activities implement the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress. We have started to translate into life the program of further struggle for peace and international cooperation, for freedom and independence of the peoples adopted by the congress, at once, without any lengthy preliminaries.

As always, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee is giving priority attention to the development of fraternal relations with the socialist countries. We can say with satisfaction that the past months were marked by considerable successes in the further consolidation of the positions of world socialism.

The great community of socialist states is growing in strength and is developing successfully. The 25th Congress of the CPSU gave a high assessment of the fraternal cooperation of our countries and parties which I will not repeat. The congresses of a number of fraternal parties in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and Mongolia held after the 25th CPSU Congress, like the Congresses of the Communists of Hungary, Poland and Cuba held somewhat earlier, asserted once again the unbreakable ideological unity and political cohesion of our close-knit family. Recently we played host to a party and government delegation from Mongolia, headed by Comrade Tsedenbal. We held good talks, and signed a number of important agreements. In November we are expecting in the Soviet Union a Polish delegation led by Comrade Gierek. A visit to the Soviet Union by Comrade Ceausescu and our comradely conversations with him facilitated the development of our friendship with Rumania, with its Communist Party.

The economic cooperation of the socialist countries continues to move forward. The session this summer of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance adopted important decisions, in particular on developing long-term programs in raw materials, power engineering, food, etc. In a word, socialist economic integration is gaining strength.

The session was attended this time not only by representatives of Yugoslavia, but also of Vietnam, the Korean Democratic People's Republic, Laos and Angola. This points to the growing prestige of the CMEA, to its expanding ties.

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee constantly maintains close contacts with the leaders of the fraternal parties of socialist countries. Apart from useful meetings that took place in the course of the Berlin Conference of Communist Parties at the end of June, including meetings with comrade Tito, I had talks, as you know, in the Crimea with comrades Gierek, Husak, Zhivkov, Ceausescu, Tsedenbal, Honecker and Kadar. These were substantial, truly comradely, frank conversations on many topical questions of our cooperation and our joint actions.

On the whole this year's series of Crimean meetings turned out to be still another stage in developing our fraternal cooperation, in the further elaboration of our joint positions. The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee endorsed the work carried out during these meetings. A number of parties also adopted special decisions rating highly their importance.

In a work, comrades, our splendid community of socialist states is living a rich, full-blooded life. This factor is of tremendous importance and our Leninist Party will do everything in its power to continue this trend in the future.

Of very great significance is the fact that the reunification of Vietnam has been completed and it has been proclaimed a socialist republic. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam now has a population in excess of 50 million. For size of population it is the third biggest socialist state in the world.

Vietnam, with its great experience of heroic struggle against imperialist aggression, for freedom and independence, with its exalted revolutionary prestige, has become today an important factor of peace and progress in Southeast Asia, indeed in all Asia. We ardently welcome the historic victory of our Vietnamese friends and wish them new great successes!

The victory of the patriotic forces of Laos, and the leadership of that country passing to the Marxist-Leninist People's Revolutionary Party, was another important event. Having taken power into their hands, the working people of that country started the building of a new life. Last spring's visit to the USSR by a Laotian party and government delegation and the good comradely talk which Comrade Suslov and I recently had with the General Secretary of the fraternal Laotian party Comrade Kaysone Phomvihane, showed the good prospects of Soviet-Laotian friendship. I think, comrades, that we have every reason to say that in Laos the family of socialist states has another new member.

The road of independent development has opened up to democratic Kampuchea too.

As before, question of our relations with the People's Republic of China stands apart. Complicated political processes are taking place there. It is still difficult to say what will be the future political course of the PRC. However, it is already clear today that the foreign policy line Peking pursued

(more)

for one and a half decades has been greatly discredited throughout the world.

As for the Soviet Union, a desire to improve relations with China is our consistent course. As was stressed at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, in our relations with China, as with other countries, we adhere firmly to the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in each other's internal affairs and non-use of force. In short, we are prepared to normalize relations with China in line with the principles of peaceful co-existence. More than that, it was clearly indicated at our congress that we stand for the restoration of good relations between the USSR and the PRC in line with the principles of socialist internationalism. I want to emphasize that, in our opinion, there are no issues in relations between the USSR and the PRC that could not be resolved in the spirit of good-neighborliness. We will act in this direction further. The matter will depend on what stand will be taken by the other side.

As to our relations with Albania, we, as it is known, are prepared to restore them and do not consider that any objective factors divide us from that country.

Many events of major political significance have taken place in countries that have freed themselves from colonial dependence. Mention should be made first of all of the victory scored by the patriots of Angola over foreign imperialist interventionists and forces of internal reaction.

The heroic struggle of the Angolan people met with the sympathy and support of a number of progressive African countries as well as of socialist countries, including the Soviet Union and Cuba. We gave disinterested support to the just struggle of Angola's patriots, responded to the request of Angola's lawful government, and we are proud of this!

Angola's victory became an inspiring incentive for the forces of progress on the African continent. There has been an intensification of the struggle of the peoples against such bastions of racism and reaction, such stooges of world imperialism as South Africa and Rhodesia. The anti-imperialist forces in Africa feel more confident. We, too, could sense this when playing host in Moscow during the past several months to a number of high ranking delegations of independent African countries, of fighters for the freedom and progress of the peoples of that continent.

As to the recent visit to the Soviet Union by the President of people's Angola Comrade Neto, it laid a firm groundwork for a further development and strengthening of friendship between our countries. The conclusion of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Angola is a new step toward strengthening the great friendship between the world of socialism and the young emergent states, a considerable step at that, convincing step! Our ties with the young African republic of Mozambique are developing fruitfully. New evidence of this was the visit to the USSR this summer by the President of the republic, Frelimo Chairman Samora Machel.

I want also to particularly emphasize the great importance of the latest visit to the USSR this year by the head of government of friendly India

(more)

Madame Indira Gandhi. Our talks with her confirmed again that our friendship with that great and peace-loving Asian power is strengthening and deepening, that our cooperation is expanding to the great benefit of the peoples of both countries and universal peace.

Active steps are being taken on our part in support of the just demands of the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America for the restructuring of international economic relations on the basis of equality, for removing all forms of exploitation by capitalist states of weaker partners in the third world. The interests of socialist and developing countries coincide in this field, as well as in many other fields.

Of course, in the third world, just as on our planet in general, a stubborn struggle continues between the forces of progress and the forces of reaction. This was testified to by the Fifth Conference of Heads of State and Government of Non-aligned Countries that was held in Colombo in August. The non-alignment movement has become a noticeable factor of international life, an important link in the worldwide front of struggle by the peoples against imperialism, colonialism and aggression. The documents on political and economic problems adopted in Colombo as a result of lengthy and, as it has become known, sometimes difficult discussions confirmed that on the whole the non-alignment movement retains a progressive nature.

Comrades, the 25th Congress set the task of concentrating the efforts of peace-loving states on the liquidation of the remaining hotbeds of war and first of all on the attainment of a just and lasting settlement in the Middle East. This task has lately acquired a special burning topicality. The situation in that area has again worsened as a result of the bloody events in Lebanon.

If we look at the root of the events we will see that this is a new attempt by world imperialism, that is the United States and other NATO powers, to deal a blow at the forces of anti-imperialist revolution in the Middle East, to preserve and strengthen their positions there. Imperialism has now taken to provoking internecine conflicts of Arabs against Arabs. The possibilities for this lie in the increased class stratification inside Arab countries, in the growth of socio-political differences between them.

In Lebanon the forces of internal reaction, armed and encouraged by the Western powers, supported by Israel and Saudi Arabia, have launched an offensive against the local national patriotic forces. But first of all their blow is directed against the detachments of the Palestine resistance movement, that is against an anti-imperialist detachment of the Arab world. Unfortunately, Syria has found itself drawn into the orbit of military actions.

From the very outset the Soviet Union came out for the ending of the fratricidal war in Lebanon, for the protection of that country's progressive forces and Palestinian patriots from rout, for the preservation of the unity of the State of Lebanon and for frustrating the reactionary plan of splitting that country.

At the same time we hold the view that it is very important to settle in a spirit of mutual good will the relations between Palestinian and Lebanese patriots, on the one hand, and neighboring Syria, on the other. This is necessary for restoring the unity of anti-imperialist forces in the Arab East.

(more)

A conference between the heads of state of Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Syria, Kuwait and Lebanon and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization Apafat was held recently. An agreement on a ceasefire, on creating inter-Arab security forces and on normalizing the situation in Lebanon was achieved.

Judging by everything, this agreement, at least as far as the ceasefire is concerned, is being observed. We will see how matters develop further.

Our attitude toward an agreement on ending the war in Lebanon is, of course, positive. We would like to hope that the process of normalizing the situation there will proceed on a healthy basis, without detriment to the Lebanese patriotic forces and the Palestine resistance movement.

It seems that much time will yet be needed for a full normalization of the situation in that area. As to the USSR, we will do everything for the success of the peace settlement in Lebanon.

Comrades, we clearly see that the unsettled situation in the Middle East in general is the real basis of the events in Lebanon. Recently the Soviet Union came out with a new initiative aimed at the resumption of the Geneva Conference on the Middle East with the participation of all interested sides, including the Palestine resistance movement. We proposed a specific agenda for that conference. It encompasses all problems whose solution would really bring about the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Thereby we consistently keep to our course in respect to the conflict in the Middle East. Our policy is a principled, class, Marxist-Leninist one, and it is only such a policy that our country can pursue.

Comrades, the international policy of our party implies first of all struggle for lasting peace. We see one of the most important tasks in making full use, and not only in Europe, of the favorable possibilities created by the holding of the European Conference, by the document on peaceful coexistence and cooperation of states that was solemnly adopted in Helsinki. In full conformity with the program approved by the 25th Congress of the party, we are continuing the work to develop equal and mutually advantageous relations with capitalist states.

At every stage this work has its specific features. Five or 10 years ago the task was to create the basis for normal relations of peaceful coexistence with France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States, Canada, Italy, Britain and other capitalist countries, to cleanse these relations of the main burdens left by the cold war. When this had basically been accomplished, we advanced further, we began developing ever more extensive cooperation in the fields of politics, economics, science, technology and culture.

Many useful things in this respect were accomplished in recent months as well. For instance, agreements have been signed that fully accord with the spirit and letter of the Final Act adopted in Helsinki such as the ten-year

(more)

agreement with Canada on economic, industrial, scientific and technological cooperation; agreements on similar subjects with Cyprus and Portugal; the Soviet-Portuguese agreement on cultural cooperation; agreements with France on preventing accidental or unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons, on cooperation in the field of energy, civil aviation and aircraft manufacture, and with Finland in the field of public health and social security. As you see, things are moving ahead. The whole world sees that the USSR is advancing along the road of peace and peaceful cooperation. And the whole world should know that we will advance further along this road.

It must be admitted, however, the development of our relations with a number of states has slowed down lately, and through no fault of ours. This was caused to a considerable extent by the complex political situation in some countries, in particular by the election campaigns in the United States and the FRG.

Suffice it to say that matters are actually at a standstill in such an important question of Soviet-American relations as the drafting of a new long term agreement on the limitation of offensive strategic weapons, although the main content of this document was agreed upon at the summit level late in 1974.

Having received our latest proposals on the remaining question as long ago as March of this year, the American side has not yet answered them. It has been intimated to us that the reason for this lies in the complexities of the election situation. We can only regret such an approach to an issue on which the strengthening of peace and the security of two great nations depends, as does the general improvement of the situation in the world for years to come.

But on the whole the development of our relations with the United States so far retains its positive direction. The treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes was signed recently and mutually advantageous cooperation is underway in many fields of science and technology. Cultural exchanges are being conducted on an extensive scale. Economic ties, too, are expanding little by little, even with the existence of obstacles created by discriminatory trade legislation in the United States. Were it not for these obstacles, our economic ties would have certainly acquired an absolutely different scope.

In the course of the election campaign the rival candidates, President Ford and Mr. Carter, have repeatedly made statements on matters of foreign policy, on relations with the Soviet Union.

These statements, however, are for the most part of a rather general and, not infrequently, of a contradictory nature. On the whole, both contenders appear to be in favor of the further normalization of the international situation and of developing good relations with the USSR. But one often hears statements of a different sort from them as well: calls for a continued arms race, for pursuing a positions of strength policy, for a so-called tough line toward the Soviet Union, etc.

Nevertheless, whoever comes to power in Washington after the elections, it appears that the United States will have to take into consideration the actual alignment of forces in the world that prompted the American ruling circles, on making a sober analysis of the situation, to commence in recent years a search for accords with the socialist world. In any case, one thing must be absolutely

(more)

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

clear: Our policy of extensively developing relations with the United States, of lessening the danger of a new world war remains invariable. //

Now about relations with the Federal Republic of Germany. Regular elections to the Bundestag were held there recently. In the course of the election campaign there was a noticeable increase in the activity of the forces that attacked the government's "Estpolitik" from anti-Soviet, hardly concealed revanchist positions. In that situation we found it necessary to come out with a statement of our policy in respect of the FRG so that the Soviet Union's position would be clear to all.

To emphasize the readiness of both sides to develop good relations between the USSR and the FRG, we reached an agreement in principle with Chancellor Schmidt that I would pay another visit to the Federal Republic. A short announcement on this was published.

Although the government coalition lost some ground, its victory in the elections confirmed, as we see it, that the majority of the FRG's population seeks peace and the relaxation of tension, the further improvement of relations with socialist states. This apparently creates conditions for the normal development of mutually advantageous relations between the USSR and the FRG. Our position is clear: We stand for this.

Our relations with France, including questions of foreign policy, continue to develop with success, although, of course, by no means do we have common positions with the leadership of that country in all international matters.

It has not been ruled out that on the invitation of President Giscard d'Estaing and in accordance with the established practice of exchanging visits, I will visit France again in the near future. I think this will not only offer an opportunity to discuss questions of interest to both sides, but also generate an impulse for new initiatives in the traditionally friendly cooperation of the two great peoples.

We have attached and continue to attach serious importance to relations with Japan, our neighbor and one of the major Asian states. We have always considered as possible and desirable the development of broad and firm relations with Japan on the principles of mutual respect and reciprocal profit, relations permeated with the spirit of good-neighborliness. As you know, we have spoken of this repeatedly, even at the 25th Party Congress.

The last time I had an opportunity to voice some considerations about the actual prospects for long-term 10 to 15-year economic cooperation between our two countries was last August when I conversed in the Crimea with a prestigious delegation from Japanese business circles, led by the chairman of the federation of Japan's economic organizations Mr. Doko.

The reaction of the Japanese participants in the talks and subsequent comments in Japan itself were positive. This confirmed once again the existence of a solid foundation for developing broad and firm reciprocally advantageous relations between our two countries. As a matter of fact up to now this was also confirmed in practice.

(more)

However, we entertain no illusions and know that a complicated struggle for truly good Soviet-Japanese relations still lies ahead. The actions by the Japanese authorities during the recent incident with the Soviet plane which made a landing in Japan were a fresh reminder of this. The facts are known to all. We have already clearly stated our opinion about these Japanese actions in Soviet Government statements and in Andrei Gromyko's talk with the Foreign Minister of Japan. Here I only want to stress that the behavior of the Japanese authorities seriously clouded the general atmosphere of Soviet-Japanese relations. It sowed doubts among Soviet people as to the sincerity of the statements made in Tokyo about the desire for good relations with the USSR.

Comrades! We want the peaceful coexistence of states to be not only bilateral, but to assume an ever wider multilateral character, forming, as it were, a connecting tissue of lasting peace. It is precisely toward this, in particular, that the Soviet Union's proposals to hold European congresses on the problems of transport, energy, environmental protection are directed.

On the whole, the work to implement the Helsinki accords is taking the form of scores and even hundreds of practical deeds. They may not always be conspicuous, but this is party and state work of exceptional importance. And we Soviet people value the efforts of those who work in the same direction. For the cause of peace, so close to the heart of every Soviet person, is our common cause.

The so-called confidence-building measures--the practice of giving prior notification to other countries of forthcoming major military maneuvers and inviting foreign observers to them, approved on our initiative at the European conference--played a useful role in creating a calmer atmosphere in Europe.

We also consistently observe those provisions of the Final Act adopted in Helsinki which concern the expansion of cultural and other ties and contacts among peoples, the expansion of exchange of information. We proceed from the fact that in the conditions of relaxation of tension the development of such ties and contacts is quite natural--of course given the strict observance of the principles of mutual respect for the sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of each other. But to violate these principles in relations with the Soviet Union, to act counter to the interests of the Soviet people and our socialist system we--you will have to excuse us, gentlemen--will not allow anyone to do that.

In this connection one must say that in the conditions of relaxation of tension ever higher tasks are being set to our ideological work. Our propaganda, both inside the country and abroad, must sensitively respond to the changes taking place in the world, must be understandable and convincing. The Central Committee will continue to hold questions of ideological work in the center of its attention. We shall demand the same of all party bodies and organizations.

Comrades! There is no task of greater importance in the struggle for lasting peace today than ending the arms race, unleashed by imperialist powers, and the transition to disarmament. The fact is that the aggressive circles of

(more)

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

the capitalist world respond to their defeats in social battles, to the loss of colonial possessions, to more and more countries abandoning capitalism, to the successes of world socialism and the growing influence of Communist Parties in bourgeois states, by feverish military preparations. Military budgets are swelling, new types of armaments are being created, bases are being built, military demonstrations are undertaken. Leaning on this "position of strength" imperialism hopes to retain its capability of ordering other countries and peoples about, which is disappearing.

Striving to underpin their policy "ideologically," so to speak, the imperialist inspirers of the arms race stoop to any means and do not particularly care for elementary logic. When they need new allocations for armaments, they scare parliamentarians and the public with "superior Soviet power," but when they need to show the electorate their concern for defense, they assure them of the "absolute military superiority of the West."

So far as our defense is concerned, we spend on it exactly as much as is necessary to assure the Soviet Union's security and the defense, jointly with the fraternal countries, of the gains of socialism so that potential aggressors will not be tempted to try and solve in their favor the historical controversy between the two opposite social systems by force. To also maintain the country's armed forces at a high level in the future, so that Soviet soldiers always have the most up-to-date weaponry, which the imperialists could not ignore such is our duty to the people that we shall sacredly fulfill!

At the same time we have no greater desire than to switch the assets, of necessity diverted today from the national economy, toward raising the people's living standards, toward creative purposes. We are prepared even tomorrow to start disarmament measures--either big and radical, or, as a beginning only partial--on a truly fair, reciprocal basis. As far as we are concerned, we shall not be found wanting!

Many years ago V. I. Lenin spoke of disarmament as the "ideal of socialism." At that time no real prerequisites yet existed for stopping the growth of militarism, for averting the threat of a world war. Today the situation is different. The forces of socialism and peace exert such an influence that advance toward solving this problem, which is crucial to all humanity, even though gradually and in individual sectors, is entering the realm of the possible. Moreover, there is a slowly growing realization among the ruling quarters of capitalist states that in this nuclear age to stake on unleashing a new world holocaust is as futile as it is perilous and criminal.

In recent years the joint efforts of peace-loving forces, with the most active contribution of our country, succeeded in attaining substantial results in the matter of reducing the threat of a new nuclear war. Concrete, binding international treaties and agreements have been concluded on such questions as the ending of a considerable part of nuclear weapons tests; the taking of measures against further nuclear proliferation in the world; on the non-deployment of such weapons in space, on the sea and ocean floor; on the limiting of strategic armaments by the Soviet Union and the United States; on the prohibiting and eliminating of bacteriological weapons. These are not bad results at all. They refute the laments of the sceptics who renounce the struggle for disarmament as hopeless. But what has been achieved needs consolidation and further development in order to effectively put an end to the new

(more)

arms race.

You remember, Comrades, how sharply and as a matter of principle the question of disarmament was posed at our party's 25th Congress. Following the Congress, the Political Bureau repeatedly discussed ways of giving a new impetus to the struggle for this most important matter. It was decided, among other things, to come forth with a number of concrete proposals at the next session of the UN General Assembly.

The Soviet Union proposed the conclusion of a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. A substantial description of the document was given at the session of the UN General Assembly. Here I only wish to stress that the non-use of force in our draft covers interstate relations without infringing on the peoples' inalienable right to struggle for their social and national emancipation. We strictly distinguish between these two spheres.

The USSR also submitted for the deliberation of the UN an extensive complex document--a memorandum containing a broad, all-encompassing program of disarmament measures, most topical at this time.

In short, our country has again come out before the world with a concrete program for disarmament. In order to make this program as realistic as possible, substantial new elements have been included. The views of many states on a number of questions have been taken into account, certainly, without prejudicing the interests of our security. We are also taking a flexible position in the sense that we are prepared to tackle the implementation of either all the measures stipulated under the program, or, for a start, only some of them, moving from one step to another.

Disarmament must become the common cause of all states without exception. This purpose is served by our proposals to convene a world disarmament conference or, at first, as a step in this direction, to call a special session of the UN General Assembly.

The Soviet Union's new initiatives in the UN met with the understanding and support of many states and the broad peace-loving public. This gladdens us. It inspires us to make new efforts in the name of lasting peace on Earth!

I want to specially emphasize that the Soviet Union continues to consider the attainment of success at the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe one of the most important tasks. We are proposing concrete solutions there that would lead to a reduction of the military forces confronting each other in Europe, without damage to any of the sides. We are prepared to discuss counter-proposals based on the same principles. We are prepared for a further joint constructive search, but it must be constructive, honest, not aimed at unilateral advantages, for negotiations with our partners at any level, including the very highest.

Dear Comrades! If one were to mention the main thing that we succeeded in attaining in international affairs, one could say with a clear conscience: As a result of efforts undertaken together with the other socialist states and with the support of all peace-loving, realistically-minded forces,

(more)

it became possible to push further away the threat of nuclear war, to make peace more reliable, stronger.

We can all rejoice and take pride in such a result, Comrades! The winner is all humanity!

In conclusion allow me to briefly dwell on some questions of the World Communist Movement.

First of all it must be noted that in the course of stubborn class battles the Communist Parties in a number of capitalist countries achieved major successes recently. They expanded their mass base, strengthened their prestige, and their weight in the political life increased.

Active today in three out of the six major capitalist powers--France, Italy and Japan--are mass Communist Parties which were supported during elections by more than 20 million people. As a result of the latest elections, the Communist Party of Italy has won such a position that in fact not a single major question in the life of that state can be decided without its participation.

In France the alliance of the Communists with the socialists and other left forces has become a generally recognized weighty factor in that country's political life. After long decades of fascist terror the Communists of Portugal not only openly emerged on the political arena but became one of the most active and influential parties in the country. The Communist Party of Spain, too, is emerging from the underground and its prestige is growing. The Communist Parties of India, Finland, Denmark and some Latin American countries enjoy considerable political weight in their countries.

Thus, as the positions of socialism and the forces of national liberation strengthen in the world, the communist movement is scoring outstanding successes. Naturally we welcome this from the bottom of our hearts.

But the imperialists react differently. The increasing influence of Communist Parties in Western Europe caused them alarm. The leaders of the USA and the UK resorted to such gross pressure and threats against Italy in connection with the Communist Party's electoral success that it caused indignation in many countries, even among Italian bourgeois politicians. Nor did we in the USSR conceal our opinion on that score.

The Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers Parties of Europe, held last summer, was a significant event of recent times. Its preparation took a lot of time, the views of 29 parties on a number of important problems had to be compared in order to reach agreement on the draft of the concluding document.

However, the patient collective work was justified. The conference passed in the spirit of class solidarity and fraternal interaction of the Communists of Europe, of joint concern for strengthening peace, security, cooperation and social progress on the continent. It was attended by all European Communist Parties except the Albanian, and the concluding document was adopted unanimously.

(more)

The speeches of the participants in the Berlin Conference were permeated with the spirit of active struggle for peace and socialism. The document it adopted is a concrete program of further struggle for peace, security and relaxation in Europe. On the whole, as viewed both by friends and our class adversaries, the Berlin Conference furnished new testimony of the Communists' active role in European life. And we are feeling satisfaction that the CPSU was able to make its contribution to this great cause.

This, Comrades, is what I wanted to tell you about international affairs. As you see, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee carries out tireless work in this field, too, to implement the decisions of the 25th Congress. We shall continue this work with all our energy in the name of peace and the happiness of the Soviet people, in the name of peace and the progress of all humanity.

Comrades, in concluding my speech I would like to stress that the realization of the tasks posed by the 25th Congress should be facilitated by all party organizational and ideological-political work.

It is necessary to further ensure that all Communists, wherever they work, whatever position or post they occupy, would be examples of exactitude and discipline, creative attitude to the matter at hand, examples of the state approach to the solution of tasks, big and small.

The party's line toward all out development of creative initiative by the Communists of local party, Soviet and economic management bodies, of the broad masses of the people, is a correct line, and we tangibly feel the beneficial results it yields.

I. Lenin stressed that the plan as an assignment of the socialist state to workers is a tremendous mobilizing force. The documents which we are discussing accord with the cardinal interests of workers, collective farmers and our intelligentsia.

We must ensure that every labor collective, every working man and woman would know the perspective, have a clear idea of the frontiers that are to be reached and the tasks that have to be accomplished.

A tremendous, fascinatingly interesting project opens up before the country, before our party and people in the Tenth Five-Year Plan period. This project is extremely important. The might, prestige and flourishing of our motherland, the welfare of every family, the welfare and happiness of every Soviet person depend on how we will work, how we will fulfill the plans we have mapped out.

There is no doubt that this time again our people, guided by the party of Lenin, will prove worthy of the high responsibility placed on it by history.

The plans of the party, the tasks set forth by its 25th Congress will be translated into life!

###

TASS

SEE pp. 6-7

51

Unofficial translation

M E M O R A N D U M
OF THE SOVIET UNION ON QUESTIONS OF *Achieving*
ENDING THE ARMS RACE AND DISARMAMENT

In new historic conditions where international detente is making itself felt to an ever greater degree and people everywhere entertain increasing hopes for the establishment of lasting peace, the Soviet Union, being guided by the foreign policy programme of the 25th Congress of the CPSU, renews its appeal to all member states of the United Nations, to all states of the world to redouble their efforts in solving the problem which is the greatest in scope and significance in contemporary interstate relations--the problem of ending the arms race and disarmament. *achieving*

No task confronting mankind today is more urgent. "Today, this objective is more vital than ever", --declared L.I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU. "Mankind is tired of sitting upon mountains of arms, yet the arms race spurred on by aggressive imperialist circles is becoming more intensive".

A race in arms in the nuclear age is fraught with a far more serious threat to the life of the peoples than at any time in the past. Modern weapons are thousands of times more powerful than any of those used in wars of earlier periods. The destruction of Hiroshima--the first victim of the use of the nuclear weapons-- lives in the memory of the peoples as a horrible tragedy. But nowadays states possess such types of these weapons and in such quantities that could destroy hundreds, even thousands of cities like Hiroshima. One modern nuclear warhead has the destructive power exceeding that of all explosives used by states in the Second World War. Yet weapons of mass destruction continue to develop, absorbing the latest achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, and they are ever growing in quantity.

It is an utterly false concept which justifies the arms race by alleging that the "balance of fear" is indeed a safeguard for peace. An official report of UN experts, world famous scholars, admits with every reason that each new step in the development of weapons of mass destruction entails a new and still more ominous degree of uncertainty and increased danger. The arms race provides security for no one.

- 2 -

Another thing is also obvious. If the arms race is not stopped, it will inevitably set a barrier to the deepening of political detente in relations between states. This is why an increasing number of states recognize the need for supplementing political detente with efforts towards reducing military confrontation and facilitating disarmament. The states that participated in the ~~All-European~~ Conference on Security and Co-operation unanimously pronounced themselves in favour of such a policy.

in Europe The arms race is inconsistent with the interests and the will of the peoples. Only militarists and military-industrial complexes stand to gain from it. The arms race consumes vital resources of the countries and deprives the peoples of a considerable and ever growing proportion of wealth created by their labor. According to the UN data the whole world spends today about 300 billion dollars a year on armaments, i.e. a million dollars every two minutes. This considerably exceeds the entire national income of the developing countries of Asia and Africa. In a modern world it costs on the average sixty times less to educate a child for creative endeavour than to teach a soldier the ABC of destruction. And more and more states are being involved in the arms race.

The continued arms race hampers the resolution of urgent problems common to all mankind--the development of essentially new sources of energy, extensive exploration and use of the oceans and outer space, prevention of disastrous changes in the environment, eradication of diseases, hunger and cultural backwardness. For all this enormous investments are needed and it is impossible to mobilize sufficient resources without putting an end to the competition in armaments.

Thus, the problem confronting mankind today is this: either the arms race is stopped and states proceed to disarmament, reducing step by step the threat of military conflict and releasing more and more material and intellectual resources for the purposes of economic and social development, or the gigantic war preparation machine will consume an ever greater amount of resources vital for people, while the shadow of war catastrophe will loom larger and larger over the peoples.

disarmament For any state desirous of safeguarding the security of its people and of creating the most favourable opportunities for their advancement along the path of progress, for any politician conscious of his responsibility for world developments, for any sensible person there can only be one alternative: everything must be done to bring about the cessation of the arms race and ~~the~~ disarmament. This is not a simple task: in working out any measure in the field of disarmament the states have to take decisions on matters directly bearing on their national security, to weigh carefully diverse political, strategic and military-technological factors. But it is well known that failure to put an end to the arms race is not due to these difficulties.

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The main obstacle is the resistance of imperialist forces. The obstacle is raised, above all, by monopolistic quarters for which the arms race provides profits worth ~~thousands of millions~~. The obstacle is raised by political parties and groups committed to the cold war policy which would not abandon their foolhardy designs to resolve by force the historical confrontation of the two social systems. Also desirous of impeding the resolution of disarmament problems are those who assert cynically that mankind's future can most easily be built on radioactive ruins, those who, in pursuit of the narrow objectives of their great-power policy, which are alien to the interests of the peoples, are ready to doom even their own people to mass annihilation in another world war.

These forces would not stop at any means of deception in attempting to complicate the question of the cessation of the arms race and to hamper the peoples' struggle for disarmament. These include shameless slander as regards the policies of states advocating disarmament and false expatiations about the lust for power inherent in man and about human rights and fundamental freedoms, expatiations designed to cover up the most inhuman and misanthropic thing--the manufacturing of weapons for annihilating people.

There is no doubt and there cannot be any doubt that it is feasible to overcome the opposition raised by disarmament opponents. The correlation of forces in international politics does not at all develop in their favour. The socialist states, whose socio-political nature rules out any kind of interest in war and armaments, are working resolutely and persistently to bring about the cessation of the arms race. The non-aligned movement also comes out in favour of disarmament. Statesmen and politicians of various countries of the world are becoming more keenly aware of the fact that in the nuclear age a military conflict is fraught with exceedingly grave consequences and that the interests of security demand the curbing of the arms race and not its further intensification. Public opinion in favour of an early adoption of ^{practical} effective measures to this effect is becoming more and more pronounced and determined.

The possibility ^{to solve} the disarmament problem has been convincingly proved by the fact that in recent years certain steps of this kind have, indeed, been taken. Though these steps are but initial and limited, their importance is great.

^{They include}
These are the Soviet-U.S. agreements aimed at preventing nuclear war and reducing the risk of its accidental outbreak, at the limitation of strategic arms, as well as the agreement between the Soviet Union and France on the prevention of an accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons.

^{These include}
These are the measures limiting the nuclear arms race, ^{including} the treaties on the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, on the limitation of underground nuclear

weapon tests, the treaties on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, on the non-emplacement of nuclear weapons in outer space, on celestial bodies, on the sea-bed and the ocean floor. Talks are under way concerning a long-term Soviet-U.S. agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive arms, and their successful completion would be a new major contribution to the consolidation of international peace and security. ✓

They include
These are the international convention on the prohibition of the development and production and the destruction of stockpiles of bacteriological (biological) and toxin weapons, which is already in force, and the convention on the prohibition of military and any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques ~~the talks on which~~ are nearing completion.

they include
And finally, these are the efforts made to ease military confrontation in different parts of the world. In this connection of special importance are, of course, the negotiations that are now going on regarding the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe--the area where the most powerful groups of the armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty are concentrated. Having recently advanced new proposals aimed at moving these negotiations forward, the participating socialist countries are now expecting reciprocal steps from their counterparts. ✓

The Soviet Union's proposal to sign a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations is now getting broad support. The purpose of this initiative is to make, through joint effort of states, the principle of the non-use of force established in the UN Charter an integral part of the practical policies of states and an effective law of international life. The use of both nuclear and conventional weapons should be completely excluded from relations between states.

Thus, new political and material prerequisites are now taking shape for more resolute progress towards ending the arms race and towards disarmament. Such prerequisites did not exist in the past, including the years preceding World War II and the first postwar decades. They do exist now. The duty of all states is to make the utmost use of them in the interests of international peace and security, in the interests of peoples.

The Soviet Union, as before, is prepared to negotiate the most radical disarmament measures, including general and complete disarmament. Together with its Warsaw Treaty allies, the Soviet Union is prepared to proceed to mutual dissolution of the opposing political and military groupings of states or, to begin with, of their military organizations. If not all are prepared to get down to the realization of these objectives at once, they should be reached gradually, step by step. The most essential thing is to move on from discussions on ending the arms race to practical steps.

The analysis of the state of the political and strategic situation in the world, of the trends and prospects of its development, and of material and technological factors which determine the nature and form of the race leads to the conclusion that under current conditions the main directions for coordinated action by states in the field of disarmament are as follows:

1. Cessation of the nuclear arms race, reduction and subsequent elimination of nuclear weapons

In the situation where nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind, complete nuclear disarmament becomes the most important measure.

The Soviet Union has always favored banning nuclear weapons and their withdrawal from the arsenals of states. It worked for this when nuclear weapons had just appeared. At that time their stocks were not large and it was relatively easier to agree on their prohibition and elimination. Now that nuclear weapons have grown into a huge complex of types and systems of means of destruction, diverse in purpose, capacity and ways of delivering nuclear charges to the target, the problem of eliminating them has become much more difficult. But it can be solved in the present situation as well.

The first thing to be done for this purpose is to stop the arms race, that is, to stop manufacturing nuclear weapons, equipping armed forces of states with them, the development and construction of new models and types of such weapons. At the same time or immediately after that, reductions in the stocks of nuclear weapons should commence, with the transfer of nuclear materials thus released to peaceful sectors of the economy. The ultimate goal of the reduction should be the complete elimination of all types of nuclear weapons-- strategic and tactical, offensive and defensive. The reduction of the stocks of nuclear charges, warheads and bombs should be carried out along with the reduction of their means of delivery.

Naturally, simultaneously with nuclear disarmament, measures should be taken for the limitation and reduction of armed forces of states and armaments of conventional types, which also pose no small threat to the peoples.

It is evident that nuclear disarmament could be achieved only if all states possessing nuclear weapons take part in it. It is inconceivable that some nuclear powers should be moving ahead toward eliminating their nuclear weapons while others should be stockpiling and perfecting them. That is why nuclear powers should participate in nuclear disarmament negotiations. As for the Soviet Union, it is prepared, as has been already stated by the Soviet side, to sit down at any time at the negotiating table together with all the other nuclear powers for a comprehensive discussion of the nuclear disarmament problem in all its scope and for a joint elaboration of concrete ways of

- 6 -

its practical solution. The Soviet Union has no objections to non-nuclear powers also taking part in such negotiations since all the countries and all the peoples of the world are interested in nuclear disarmament.

2. Prohibition of nuclear weapon tests

An important issue on the solution of which largely depends the cessation of the arms race is the prohibition of all nuclear weapon tests. This problem should be tackled without waiting for the outcome of negotiations on complete nuclear disarmament.

The prohibition of all nuclear weapon tests will put an end to their qualitative perfection and prevent the emergence of new types of these weapons. The Moscow treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water as well as the treaty between the USSR and the USA on the limitation of underground tests have only partially solved this problem. Besides, two nuclear powers out of five have not acceded to the Moscow treaty and one of them, China, still continues to carry out nuclear test explosions in the atmosphere.

Now time has come to bring the task of stopping nuclear weapon tests to a conclusion. Conditions are quite ripe for that, in particular as a result of the signing between the USSR and the USA of the treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, establishing such a procedure for carrying out peaceful explosions as will preclude their use for perfecting nuclear weapons.

As is known, in 1975 the Soviet Union proposed the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, i.e. on the prohibition of conducting nuclear test explosions in all environments and by all states. The draft of such a treaty was at the time submitted by the Soviet Union to the United Nations, and a year has already passed since the General Assembly pronounced itself in favour of holding concrete negotiations to reach agreement on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. However, due to the negative stand taken by some nuclear powers such negotiations have not started. It is necessary to begin them promptly.

It is a known fact that the question of stopping underground nuclear tests was complicated by certain states which artificially exaggerated the problem of control. It was persistently alleged, in particular, that it was impossible without on-site inspections to tell natural seismic phenomena (earthquakes) from similar phenomena caused by underground nuclear explosions, hence it was impossible to verify compliance by states with their obligations with regard to the prohibition of underground nuclear weapon tests. Most experts never accepted this view, believing that national technical means and international exchange of seismic data were sufficient to verify compliance

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

- 7 -

with a treaty banning underground nuclear weapon tests. With the development of technology for detecting and identifying seismic phenomena, this view now enjoys practically unanimous support among scientists. However, even now some states suggest the possibility of on-site inspection of actual circumstances if there is doubt as to compliance with the obligations to stop underground nuclear tests.

The Soviet Union is convinced that no particular difficulties should arise in elaborating such a compromise basis for an agreement ^{as} would ensure a voluntary framework for making decisions relating to on-site ascertaining of relevant circumstances and, at the same time, impart confidence to all parties to the treaty that the obligations are complied with. The Soviet Union stands ready to participate in a search for a universally acceptable understanding on this basis.

3. Consolidation of the regime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons

It is absolutely clear that the threat of nuclear war would immeasurably increase if other states which at present do not possess nuclear weapons were involved in the process of developing and stockpiling such weapons. It is not difficult to imagine the consequences brought about by such a turn of events when the arsenals of parties in conflict in one region or another would include nuclear weapons as well.

Hence the need to prevent effectively a further spread of nuclear weapons. In this sense the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to which about one hundred states have become parties, has achieved a great deal. The obligation to renounce proliferation of nuclear weapons is now a rule of international law.

It should be however taken into account, that for the time being not all nuclear powers are parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Refusing to become parties to it are also some non-nuclear states which are capable, in view of their industrial and technological level, of developing nuclear weapons of their own. Therefore, it is important to strive for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to become genuinely universal. The Soviet Union supports all the decisions of the United Nations adopted in this respect.

In the interests of consolidating the regime of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons it is also necessary to take actions of another kind. It is well known that in the process of their operation nuclear power plants produce and accumulate as a "by-product" a fissionable material--plutonium--which can be used for manufacturing nuclear weapons. With the development of international commercial exchange of nuclear materials, equipment and technology,

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

- 8 -

possibilities of this kind will increase, including those of the states which have not assumed obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It is obvious that the states which supply nuclear materials, equipment and technology bear in this connection special responsibility. Strict safeguards are needed to prevent international co-operation in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy from becoming a channel of spreading nuclear weapons. This is not a question of commerce but a question of policy, a question of international security.

The Soviet Union is also resolutely advocating the need for perfecting in every possible way the system of control over nuclear installations and materials exercised by the International Atomic Energy Agency. To this end, the Soviet Union is ready to co-operate with all interested states.

4. Prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons

Following the conclusion of the convention banning bacteriological weapons, especially pressing has become the task of completely prohibiting and eliminating another dangerous category of weapons of mass destruction--chemical weapons. The use of such weapons as far back as the years of World War I caused grave sufferings and mass deaths. Since that time military and chemical technology has made great strides. New types of chemical weapons threatening people with still more agonizing death have been developed. Radical improvements have also been made in the means of delivery of chemical weapons, which can now be used not only in combat areas, i.e. against the armed forces of the other side, but also against the civilian population in vital centres of states.

agreed The Soviet Union, together with many other countries, has long proposed to agree on the prohibition and elimination of all chemical means of warfare. This problem should be solved radically and by single action, as was the case with bacteriological weapons. However, the negotiations on this subject, which have been going on already for several years, still fail to offer prospects for such a comprehensive solution. In this connection the question arises as to a possibility of starting with ^{the} agreement on the prohibition and elimination of the most dangerous, lethal types of chemical weapons. The Soviet Union is ready to seek such a solution as well. A substantial contribution to this end could be the implementation of the Soviet-U.S. accord on joint initiative to conclude a convention on the most dangerous, lethal chemical means of warfare.

As regards control over observance of the prohibition of chemical weapons, it should be based on national means. In this respect there exists a positive precedent in the convention banning bacteriological weapons. At the same time the Soviet Union is ready to examine a possibility of using additional control procedures and, in particular, to discuss methods of verifying the destruction of stocks of chemical weapons which are to be excluded from the arsenals of states.

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPTS DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

There is no reason, and there cannot be any, for delay as regards the question of banning chemical weapons. What is needed is to show political will and desire to reach generally acceptable agreement.

5. Prohibition of the development of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction

Scientific and technological progress poses the pressing problem of preventing the emergence of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. New types of weapons ^{could} appear already in the foreseeable future and may become commensurate in their destructive capabilities with nuclear, chemical or bacteriological weapons or even surpass them.

At present there are no limitations whatsoever on the use of science for such purposes. It means that most unexpected developments may occur at any time, the consequences of which cannot be foreseen. The danger is great. It is necessary to find means to avert it.

It was precisely these considerations that the Soviet Union was guided by when proposing in 1975 to conclude an international agreement which would prevent the development and manufacture of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. As is known negotiations to this effect are already under way, which is a positive factor. In the course of the negotiations it has become desirable to specify the object of the prohibition, i.e. to define new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction.

The Soviet Union is ready to propose such an approach which would include among new types of weapons of mass destruction any types of weapons based on qualitatively new principles of action--according to the method of use and the targets to be attacked or the nature of their impact. Take, for example, ray weapons capable of affecting blood and intracellular plasma; infrasound weapons designed to damage internal organs and affect human behavior; genetic weapons the use of which would affect the mechanism of heredity. If we take into account the fact that science never stops in its advance, it is not difficult to realize that in the future possibilities may emerge for the development of even more dangerous types of weapons.

As for new systems of weapons of mass destruction, they should not be developed either for new types of such weapons or for those types of weapons which are based on the scientific principles already in use but whose dangerous characteristics can be further increased as a result of introducing new technical elements of combat or support means. In this context, aerospace systems of nuclear weapons on the basis of transport space ships may serve as an example. The question of the prohibition of the development of new types and new systems of weapons of mass destruction is an important and timely one;

it embraces an essential aspect of the whole problem of disarmament and prevention of war. Negotiations on this question should be given top priority. ✓

6. Reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments

Nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction pose, undoubtedly, the greatest threat to mankind. But can anyone forget the many millions of human lives lost by mankind as a result of the use of the so-called conventional armaments? Even since World War II the destructive power of these armaments has increased many-fold. A modern tank is many times ~~a~~ more deadly ~~weapon~~ than a tank of the 1940s. The same is true of artillery, small arms and, of course, aircraft.

The armed conflicts which have taken place in various parts of the world in recent years have shown how tragic for people are the consequences of the use of new models of conventional arms and how great is the destruction of material values caused by them.

Thus, ^{life itself} sets before states the task of taking feasible measures to reduce ^{the number of} aircraft, artillery, tanks and other modern types of conventional armaments as well as ^{the number of} armed forces ^{that are} equipped with these weapons. Since the Second World War, the Soviet Union has repeatedly come out with concrete proposals on this score. The Soviet side has proposed specific figures for ceilings on the strength of armed forces of major states and has expressed its readiness to conduct negotiations on this matter both within the framework of the programme of general and complete disarmament and as a separate measure covering major states. These proposals have not been accepted. And even now the Soviet Union is prepared to conduct negotiations on reduction of armed forces and armaments. Given the desire for this on the part of all states which possess powerful armed forces, such negotiations could lead to positive results and to constructive agreements.

Similarly the Soviet Union believes it desirable that new efforts be made at an international level to bring about the elimination of all military bases in foreign territories and the withdrawal of foreign troops from such territories. In many of its forums the United Nations expressed itself quite definitely in favour of the solution of this problem both on a global scale and on the scale of individual continents. However, no progress has been made in this respect, which cannot but cause concern. The Soviet Union, as before, is prepared to ^{co}operate actively and constructively in solving this problem.

7. Zones of peace in the Indian Ocean and other regions

In recent years states in various regions of the world have been ever more insistent in raising the question of putting into effect regional measures of military detente with particular emphasis on the point that powers which do

- 11 -

not belong to corresponding regions should not build up their armed forces or establish their military bases there.

Thus, the littoral states of the Indian Ocean express their concern over the fact that some states which are geographically very remote from the region are deploying there military bases and increasing their military presence. In regarding such actions as a threat to their independence and security, these countries advance ^{the} an idea of turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. The Soviet Union regards this proposal with understanding.

Obviously, the key question here is to assure that there must be no foreign military bases in the region of the Indian Ocean, that the bases which were established there must be dismantled, and the establishment of new bases must be precluded. As to the Soviet Union, it did not and does not intend to build military bases in the Indian Ocean. ✓

In solving the question of foreign military bases along these lines, the Soviet Union would be prepared together with other powers to seek ways for reducing on a reciprocal basis military activities of non-littoral states in the Indian Ocean and in the regions directly adjacent to it. Naturally, measures of this kind must fully take into account generally recognized rules of international law regarding freedom of navigation on high seas and the need for associated business calls at ports of littoral states as well as for research. This question is of great importance for the Soviet Union since practically the only sea route navigable all the year round which connects the European part of the USSR with the Soviet Far East passes through the Indian Ocean.

The littoral states of the Indian Ocean are in favour² of holding an international conference to discuss practical measures to turn the region into a zone of peace. The Soviet Union would be prepared to consider the question of its attitude towards³ the convocation of such a conference in the light of the above considerations.

The Mediterranean is another region where military tensions, especially in connection with the Middle East conflict, reached from time to time, dangerous proportions. With a view to reducing the tensions, the Soviet Union proposed some time ago to the United States to agree on the withdrawal from the Mediterranean of Soviet and U.S. ships and submarines carrying nuclear weapons. This proposal is still valid, and it is in the interest of all states whose security in one way or another depends on the situation in the Mediterranean to work for its implementation. 7

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

- 12 -

The problem of military detente is very relevant for the Middle East. The Soviet Union has repeatedly expressed itself in favour of stopping the arms race in the Middle East within the framework of a comprehensive political settlement of the Middle East conflict.

In various regions of the world the states concerned put forward proposals on the establishment of nuclear-free zones. That reflects their desire for effective limitation of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and for reduction of the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet Union supports such proposals. It is prepared to cooperate in their implementation, taking into account, naturally, the possibilities of a particular region where it is proposed to establish a nuclear-free zone. It is important that such zones should actually be free from nuclear weapons and that appropriate agreements contained no loopholes and were fully consistent with the generally recognized rules of international law.

3. Reduction of military budgets

One of the promising approaches to stopping the arms race and to disarmament is the reduction of military budgets of states. The resources thus released could be channeled for the purposes of economic and social progress of peoples, for accelerating the rates of economic growth, ensuring employment, developing new sources of energy, solving the food problem, combatting diseases and building new schools and higher educational establishments.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly put forward proposals for the reduction of military budgets and has taken steps which could serve as an example in this respect. Several years ago the Soviet side proposed to agree on the reduction by 10 per cent of the military budgets of states- permanent members of the UN Security Council and the use of a part of the funds thus saved to provide assistance to developing countries. This proposal was approved by the UN General Assembly, but so far it has not been implemented due to the opposition by those states which have been stubbornly pursuing the policy of building up military expenditures.

The Soviet Union is prepared to take a flexible position regarding the specific figure to start the reduction of military budgets. A figure greater or smaller than 10 per cent could be agreed upon as a first step for 1977. What is important, however, is that this question should be made as soon as possible, a subject of businesslike negotiations between the states concerned. The current continuous growth of military expenditures of many states can and must be replaced by the practice of their systematic reduction.

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

9. Negotiations on questions of stopping the arms race and of disarmament have been conducted in various forms: on a bilateral basis, especially where this concerns states possessing the greatest military and war industrial potential; within a particular group of states directly concerned, including those on a regional level; within specialized bodies set up for discussion of the disarmament problem as a whole or of its individual aspects and made up of states representing major political groupings and geographical regions of the world today. Each year the questions of disarmament are given a prominent place in the work of the UN General Assembly.

On the whole these forms of negotiations and discussions have proved their usefulness. They will undoubtedly be used in the future as well. At the same time, the achievement of cardinal changes in the solution of the disarmament problem, which affects the interests of all states without exception, requires discussions in an international forum as broad and authoritative as possible.

Such a forum should first of all be truly global and should represent all states; secondly, it must provide an opportunity for expert examination, with due regard for all circumstances and in necessary detail, of the totality of disarmament questions; thirdly, it must be given the power to ~~take~~ *make* effective decisions.

These requirements would be met by the convocation of a World Disarmament Conference, and the Soviet Union continues to believe that it must be held.

A special session of the UN General Assembly could become an appropriate forum for discussing disarmament questions in their full scope, for determining through joint effort the ways and means of their solution and for working out a long-term programme of practical steps. To prevent a situation where its results would be reduced to decisions containing provisions of a general nature in favour of disarmament, which already abound in the UN archives, such a special session of the General Assembly and its organization must not be of routine nature. This should be a particular session. It must be prepared, organized and held in such a way as to ensure a breakthrough in the solution of disarmament problems. Its entire work should fully reflect the high responsibility of all states of the world and especially of major powers possessing the most powerful armaments and armed forces.

Naturally, the convocation of a special session of the UN General Assembly should not eliminate the question of a World Disarmament Conference.

- 14 -

The Soviet Union considers the convocation of such a session to be an interim stage, which should by its decisions prepare a broad and radical review of the disarmament problem at the world conference. Such a session should not be restrained by strict time limits or the procedure normally followed at the General Assembly sessions, including special sessions.

x

x

x

Such are the views which the Soviet Union believes necessary to bring to the attention of all member states of the United Nations and all states of the world. The Soviet Union expresses the hope that these views, motivated by concern for peace and the security of nations, by the desire to contribute to mankind's advance along the road of stopping the arms race and disarmament, will be carefully considered by all states and will help achieve practical results in the solution of this historic task facing mankind.

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE USSR

SOVIET EMBASSY, INFORMATION DEPARTMENT

1706 18TH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009

TELEPHONE 232-6020

*For Navy Secretary's Office
1/24/76*

THE TWENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION:
LEONID BREZHNEV ON RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES

Moscow, February 24, 1976. The turn for the better in our relations with the United States of America, the largest power of the capitalist world, has of course, been decisive in reducing the danger of another world war and in consolidating peace. This has, without question, contributed to the improvement of the international climate in general, and that of Europe in particular. Acting in complete accord with the Guidelines set by the Twenty-fourth Congress, we have devoted very great attention to the objective of improving relations with the United States.

As a result of the negotiations with U.S. President Nixon in Moscow and Washington, and later, of the meetings with President Ford in Vladivostok and Helsinki, an important and fundamental mutual understanding has been reached between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States on the necessity of developing peaceful equal relations between the two countries. This is reflected in a whole system of Soviet-U.S. treaties, agreements and other documents. Cumulatively, they have laid a solid political and juridical foundation for greater mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and USA in line with the principles of peaceful coexistence. To a certain extent they have lessened the danger of nuclear war. Precisely in this we see the main result of the development of Soviet-U.S. relations in the past five years.

There are good prospects for our relations with the United States in the future as well--to the extent that they will continue to develop on this jointly created realistic basis when, given the obvious difference between the class nature of the two states and between their ideology, there is the firm intention to settle differences and disputes not by force, not by threats or sabre-rattling, but by peaceful political means.

In recent years our relations with the United States have been developing in many areas. There is a lively exchange of delegations, including parliamentary; and cultural exchanges have become more active. Many Soviet-U.S.

(more)

agreements have been concluded envisaging expansion of mutually beneficial cooperation in a variety of economic, scientific, technical and cultural areas. Most of them have already come into force and are being put into practice with obvious benefits for both sides, and, more important still, for the mutual understanding of the Soviet and U.S. peoples.

The essentially positive development of Soviet-U.S. relations in recent years is, however, complicated by a number of serious factors. Influential forces in the United States that have no stake either in improving relations with the Soviet Union or in the relaxation of international tensions as a whole are trying to impair it. They portray the policy of the Soviet Union in a false light and refer to an imaginary "Soviet threat" to urge a new intensification of the arms race in the USA and in NATO. We may recall that there have also been attempts to interfere in our internal affairs in connection with the adoption by the U.S. of discriminatory measures in the field of trade. Naturally, we could not, and will not, suffer that sort of action. That is not the kind of language one can use with the Soviet Union. By now, I think, this is clear to all.

It is no secret that some of the difficulties stem from those aspects of Washington policy which jeopardize the freedom and independence of peoples and constitute gross interference in their internal affairs on the side of the forces of oppression and reaction. We have opposed, and will continue to oppose, such actions. At the same time, I want to emphasize once more that the Soviet Union is firmly determined to follow the line of further improving Soviet-U.S. relations in strict accordance with the letter and spirit of the agreements reached and commitments taken in the interests of both peoples and peace on earth.

Let me refer specifically to the current Soviet-U.S. negotiations on further strategic arms limitations. We are holding them in an effort to effectuate the 1974 Vladivostok understanding and to prevent the opening of a new channel for the arms race, which would nullify everything achieved thus far. An agreement on this issue would obviously be of very great benefit for the further development of Soviet-U.S. relations, for greater mutual confidence, and for the consolidation of world peace.

Since we attach the utmost importance to the whole of this problem, we have persistently and repeatedly offered to the United States that we not stop at just limiting the existing types of strategic weapons. We thought it possible to go farther. Specifically, we suggested coming to terms on banning the development of new, still more destructive weapons systems, and in particular, the new Trident submarines carrying ballistic missiles and the new strategic B-1 bombers in the United States and similar systems in the USSR. Deplorably, these proposals were not accepted by the U.S. side.

But we have not withdrawn them; and need we say how beneficial their implementation would be for mutual confidence. Furthermore, both sides would be able to save considerable resources and use them for productive purposes to improve the lives of the people.

(more)

- 3 -

Let me add one more thing. Of late, pronouncements have been proliferating in many countries against any of the powers setting up military bases in the region of the Indian Ocean. We are in sympathy with these pronouncements. The Soviet Union has never had, nor has now, any intention whatever of building military bases in the Indian Ocean. And we call on the United States to take the same stand.

###

Novosti Press Agency

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

NEWS AND VIEWS FROM THE USSR

SOVIET EMBASSY, INFORMATION DEPARTMENT

706 18TH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009

TELEPHONE

232-6020

THE TWENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION:
LEONID BREZHNEV ON EFFORTS TO PROMOTE DISARMAMENT

Moscow, February 24, 1976. In the report to the Twenty-fifth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev emphasized that, "Efforts to end the arms race and to promote disarmament are, and remain--as the Peace Program requires--one of the main trends in the foreign political activity of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet government."

Brezhnev said: "Today, this objective is more vital than ever. . . Mankind is tired of sitting upon mountains of arms; yet, the arms race, spurred on by aggressive imperialist groups, is becoming more intensive."

"The main motive for the arms race given by its advocates is a so-called Soviet threat. They invoke this motive when they want to drag through a larger military budget by reducing allocations for social needs, and when new types of deadly weapons are being developed, and also when they try to justify NATO's military activity. In fact, of course, there is no Soviet threat either in the West or in the East. It is all a monstrous lie from beginning to end. The Soviet Union does not have the slightest intention of attacking anyone. The Soviet Union does not need war. The Soviet Union does not increase its military budget, and, far from reducing, is steadily augmenting allocations for improving the people's well-being. Our country is consistently and staunchly fighting for peace, and making one concrete proposal after another aimed at Arms reductions and disarmament."

"The Soviet Communists are proud of having undertaken the difficult but noble mission of standing in the front ranks of the fighters striving to deliver the peoples from the danger of the continuing arms race. Our party calls on all the peoples, all countries, to unite their efforts and end this perilous process. General and complete disarmament was, and remains, our ultimate goal in this field. At the same time, the Soviet Union is doing all it can to achieve progress along separate sections of the road leading to this goal."

(more)

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

- 2 -

"An international convention on banning and destroying bacteriological weapons, based on a project submitted by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, was drawn up, signed and has entered into force. In effect, it is the first real disarmament measure in the history of international relations. It envisages removal of a whole category of highly dangerous mass annihilation weapons from the military arsenals of states.

"The sphere of operation of the Treaty on the non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons has expanded. Recently, additional large states, including the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy, have become party to it. Yet further effective measures to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons are still a most important objective. The USSR is prepared to cooperate with other states on this score.

"Let me refer, specifically, to the current Soviet-U.S. negotiations on further strategic arms limitation. We are holding them in an effort to effectuate the 1974 Vladivostok understanding and to prevent the opening of a new channel for the arms race, which would nullify everything achieved so far. An agreement on this issue would obviously be of very great benefit for the further development of Soviet-U.S. relations, for greater mutual confidence, and for the consolidation of world peace.

"Since we attach the utmost importance to the whole of this problem, we have persistently and repeatedly offered to the United States that we not stop at just limiting the existing types of strategic weapons. We thought it possible to go farther. Specifically, we suggested coming to terms on banning the development of new, still more destructive weapons systems, in particular, the new Trident submarines carrying ballistic missiles and the new strategic B-1 bombers in the United States and similar systems in the USSR. Deploably, these proposals were not accepted by the U.S. side.

"But we have not withdrawn them; and need we say how beneficial their implementation would be for mutual confidence. Furthermore, both sides would be able to save considerable resources and use them for productive purposes for improving the people's lives.

"Let me add one more thing. Of late, pronouncements have been proliferating in many countries against any of the powers setting up military bases in the region of the Indian Ocean. We are in sympathy with these pronouncements. The Soviet Union has never had, nor now has, any intentions whatever of building military bases in the Indian Ocean. And we call on the United States to take the same stand.

"Certainly, the time will come when the inevitable association of other nuclear powers with the process of strategic arms limitation will arise on the agenda. And those which refuse would assume a grave responsibility before the peoples.

"On our country's initiative, the U.N. General Assembly has, in recent years, adopted a number of important resolutions on the questions of restraining the arms race and banning the development and manufacture of new types of mass

(more)

REPRODUCED FROM THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

annihilation weapons and such weapons systems.

"The task is to have these resolutions implemented. Frankly, this is not easy to achieve, because a number of major states are still obviously reluctant to end the arms race. The opponents of the relaxation of international tensions and disarmament still dispose of considerable resources. They are highly active in different forms and from different angles. Though imperialism's possibilities for aggressive action are now considerably reduced, its nature has remained the same. This is why the peace-loving forces must be highly vigilant. Energetic action and unity of all the forces of peace and goodwill are essential.

"Therefore, special importance is attached to the proposal supported by the vast majority of U.N. member-countries to convene a world disarmament conference.

"Political relaxation of tensions needs to be backed up by military relaxation. The Peace Program advanced a clear aim to reduce armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. The Vienna negotiations on this score have already been going on for more than two years. However, there has been no visible progress, for only one reason: The NATO countries refuse to give up trying to use the negotiations to secure unilateral military advantages. For some reason, the West wants--even demands--concessions prejudicial against the security of the socialist countries. Yet, we have not noticed any inclination on the part of the NATO bloc to make similar concessions to the other side.

"Recently, the socialist states submitted new proposals in Vienna in an effort to get matters off the ground. For a start, we are prepared to accept a reduction of only Soviet and U.S. troops in the course of this year, while the strength of the armed forces of the other participants in the negotiations remains frozen and not subject to reduction until the second stage in 1977-1978. We have also made perfectly concrete proposals concerning reduction, by both sides, of the number of tanks, nuclear missile-carrying planes and missile launchers, along with a definite quantity of nuclear warheads for them.

"Our proposals are based on the only realistic approach to preserving the existing relations of strength in the center of Europe, in substance, one of equal balance. Their implementation will not prejudice the security of either side. And it is to be hoped that all this will win the due response of the Western countries and that it will at last be possible to go from discussion to actual measures reducing armed forces and armaments.

"The Twenty-Fourth Congress set this objective: Renunciation of the use and threat of force in settling questions in dispute must become the rule in international relations. Later, this principle was reflected in a number of treaties concluded by the USSR with other countries. It is contained in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. To make the danger of war recede still farther and to create favorable conditions for progress towards disarmament, we now offer to conclude a world treaty on the non-use of force in international relations. Its participants, naturally including the nuclear powers, would undertake to refrain from using all types of weapons, including nuclear, in settling disputes that may arise between them. The Soviet Union is prepared to join other states in examining practical steps leading to the implementation of this proposal."