

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**Collection: Matlock, Jack F.: Files**  
**Folder Title: Shultz-Shevardnadze Meeting**  
**in New York 09/25/1985 (3)**  
**Box: 45**

---

To see more digitized collections visit:  
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:  
<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: [reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

# WITHDRAWAL SHEET

## Ronald Reagan Library

**Collection:** MATLOCK, JACK: Files

**Archivist:** dlb

**File Folder:** Shultz-Shevardnadze Mtg in New York September 25,  
1985 (3 of 3) Box ~~92479~~ 45

**Date:** 12/27/00  
Skinner/F00-008/1

| DOCUMENT<br>NO. AND TYPE | SUBJECT/TITLE                                | DATE | RESTRICTION |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------|------|-------------|
| 1. Talking Pts           | re: Geneva NST Talks, (page 1 missing), 8 p. | n.d. | B1          |
| 2. Talking Pts           | Structure for Followup, 1 p.                 | n.d. | B1          |

### RESTRICTION CODES

**Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA].
- B-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA].
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA].

- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA].
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA].

~~SECRET~~

*MATLOCK*  
System II  
90940  
add-on *File*

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

ACTION

September 22, 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT C. McFARLANE

FROM:

*Bill* BILL WRIGHT / *SK* SVEN KRAEMER

SUBJECT:

Arms Control Points for Shultz-Shevardnadze Meeting

Following the SACG gameplan which you outlined, attached at Tab I is a memorandum to SACG Principals asking their urgent review of the arms control talking points for the Shultz-Shevardnadze meeting on September 25. Given the short deadlines, the memo asks that the Principals be prepared to discuss at the SACG meeting on Tuesday, September 24, any major problems they have with the points so that we can reach interagency agreement either at or promptly following the meeting.

To ensure that the SACG discussion is narrowed down to the fewest possible outstanding issues, we need your authorization to provide the memo to the members of the Arms Control Support Group at our meeting on Monday, September 23. We would ask those members to deliver it immediately and personally to the SACG Principals and to ensure, as the memo to Principals requests, that this is treated on an extremely close-hold basis. Support Group members would be asked to be ready at our meeting Tuesday morning to indicate what, if any, major problems their Principals have with the points. We would then alert you to these problem areas in order to focus the SACG discussion Tuesday afternoon.

Recommendation

That you approve the above plan to ensure a focused SACG discussion and sign the memo at Tab I to SACG Principals.

Agree \_\_\_\_\_ Disagree \_\_\_\_\_

Concurrence: *Bob* Bob Linhard, *Ron* Ron Lehman, *Bill* Steve Steiner.

Attachment

Tab I Memorandum to SACG Principals, with arms control talking points

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines, August 26, 1997  
By *dlr* NARA, Date *12/27/00*





~~SECRET~~

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

System II  
90940  
Add-on

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

MEMORANDUM FOR SACG PRINCIPALS

SUBJECT: Talking Points for Shultz-Shevardnadze (S)

Attached for your timely review are the arms control talking points which have been prepared for Secretary Shultz's September 25 meeting in New York with Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. Please review these points as soon as possible and be prepared to discuss major substantive concerns at the SACG meeting on September 24. Given the deadline, we need to reach agreement at that meeting on the language and on any changes which may be required. (S)

In view of the sensitivity of these issues, it is important that you treat this package on an extremely close-hold basis. Your cooperation in this regard is appreciated. (S)

Attachment

Arms Control Talking Points

DECLASSIFIED

White House Guidelines, August 28, 1997

By dlb NARA, Date 12/27/00

~~SECRET/SENSITIVE~~

Declassify on: OADR

~~SECRET~~

## RONALD W. REAGAN LIBRARY

THIS FORM MARKS THE FILE LOCATION OF ITEM NUMBER 1-2 LISTED ON THE  
WITHDRAWAL SHEET AT THE FRONT OF THIS FOLDER.



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

September 24, 1985

NOTE TO: JACK MATLOCK  
STEVE STEINER  
DON FORTIER  
STEVE SESTANOVICH  
RON LEHMAN

FROM: KARNA

Here is a copy of the Shevardnadze  
speech -- I thought you would want  
to have it -- could you please  
distribute it within your own  
staffs. Many thanks.



JIP/K

② # 295

PRESS RELEASE

# UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

136 EAST 67th STREET, NEW YORK, NY 10021

No. 123

September 24, 1985

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

Unofficial translation

## S T A T E M E N T

BY EDUARD A. SHEVARDNADZE, MEMBER OF THE POLITBUREAU  
OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN  
AFFAIRS OF THE USSR, AT THE FORTIETH SESSION OF  
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

24 September 1985

Mr. President,

Distinguished delegates,

Four decades separate us from the victory of the freedom-loving peoples over German fascism and Japanese militarism, from the end of the Second World War. The United Nations, whose birth was a natural result of that great victory and on whose activities the peoples have largely pinned their hopes for preventing new wars, has now been in existence for forty years.

Today it can be stated with great satisfaction that there have been forty years without world wars. Truly gigantic changes have taken place in the world over that period.

They include the establishment and development of the world socialist system--a system of States whose socio-political nature rules out any interest in wars. All practical activities by the countries of the socialist community on the international arena are based on the policy of peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems. The role of socialism in world affairs has been steadily increasing.



Over an extremely short historical span of time the hurricane of the peoples' liberation struggle has destroyed and eliminated from the face of the earth the colonial system of imperialism. Over one hundred new States have emerged from its ruins. Today they are full-fledged members of the United Nations.

The forces that work to strengthen peace and prevent war are constantly growing. At present, their struggle involves people on all continents, of all generations and occupations, and with most diverse political beliefs.

The past forty years have been a period of rapid progress of the scientific and technological revolution, which is not only drastically changing our concepts of the structure of the Universe and of the matter but is also creating ever broader opportunities to meet the spiritual and material needs of every individual and of all mankind. Already today, scientific achievements, if they are used for constructive purposes, permit to resolve just about any economic problem. Yet, they also generate unprecedented risks whenever they are used for developing means of annihilation and destruction.

- In the complex and rapidly changing world, which witnesses a continued struggle between the forces of progress and those of reaction, between the forces of the future and those of the past, the development of relations among States, including the major powers possessing the greatest military potential, has followed a variable and at times zigzag path.

Aggravations of international tension alternated with periods of its abatement; international crises sprang up and were overcome, with some of them being so acute as to bring mankind to the verge of catastrophe. It would be fair to say that many a time when the international barometer forecast a storm, the United Nations raised its voice in warning and was also able to take practical steps to reduce the threat.

The greatest hopes for a stable peace emerged in the 1970s, which went down in history as the years of detente. The latter was based on the general recognition that it was inadmissible in the nuclear age to seek to attain political and ideological goals by means of war and that the policy aimed at achieving military superiority of some States over others, of one social system over the other, was illegitimate and dangerous.

The countries of the socialist community and many other States have every right to take pride in being the architects and engineers of detente.



Yet, in the late 1970s and early 1980s the world once again saw a higher pitch of activity of the forces which never supported the policy of detente and are now seeking to undo its most important accomplishments. As a result, much in the system of international relations has come out of joint and the risk of war has sharply increased. (426)

Our delegation intends to set forth the considerations of the Soviet Union regarding the reasons for the current unfavourable development of the situation in the world and the ways to remedy the existing state of affairs. It can be remedied only if there is an understanding, as has been pointed out by Mikhail S. Gorbachev, of the "realities and those dangers which we will inevitably face tomorrow if today those who can and must take the only correct decision evade the responsibility incumbent on them."

We perceive the greatest peril in the fact that the nuclear arms race has taken, so to say, a fresh start and is forging ahead. Added to this is the threat of the arms race spreading to outer space. The possibility of the arms race acquiring an uncontrollable and irreversible character is becoming real. In the final analysis, this is a road leading to a nuclear catastrophe.

It is also alarming that of late it has not been possible to settle a single regional conflict or to extinguish a single hotbed of military tension. In the meantime, the flames of "local" wars, more often than not undeclared, have been killing dozens and hundreds of thousands of people.

Mankind is suffering because of being denied the opportunity to tackle urgent problems such as food, ecology, energy, population, and the constantly widening gap between the developed and developing countries in terms of their economic level. It has been denied that opportunity because the intellectual and material resources needed to find a radical solution to these problems common to all mankind are being squandered on the arms race.

Not a single twist in the arms race spiral was initiated by the Soviet Union. It is only in response to actions of the other side and out of legitimate concern for our own security and that of our allies and friends, concern for international security as a whole, that we have developed or are developing this or that weapon system.

Moreover, as early as 1946 the USSR proposed that nuclear weapons should be banned for all time. We have been advocating this ever since, and this remains our position now. We have been proposing that agreement should be reached on renouncing all weapons of mass destruction, reducing and totally eliminating their existing stockpiles, and cutting down armed forces and conventional armaments. Our country has come out with a proposal on the general and complete disarmament under strict international control.



These radical proposals have yet to be implemented, and it is the United States and some other NATO countries, rather than the Soviet Union, that are to blame for this fact. (5) 7264

It is precisely because of their refusal to follow the example of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, which has also unilaterally pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, that the threat of nuclear war continues to hang over the world.

Nonetheless, due to the vigorous efforts of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving States a number of treaties and agreements limiting the arms race in major areas have been concluded. These are the 1963 Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the SALT I Agreement, signed in 1972, and the 1979 SALT II Treaty. All these treaties, which have served in large measure to reinforce strategic stability, became possible because political realism was also displayed by the then leaders of the United States and other Western countries.

It is not the fault of the Soviet Union that local conflicts break out and are raging in various regions of the world. The only thing that we could be "guilty" of is that we have invariably been and remain on the side of the peoples threatened by imperialism and of the States upon whose sovereignty and generally recognized rights imperialism is encroaching.

As regards the increasingly acute economic problems common to all mankind, the Soviet Union has consistently been in favour of uniting the efforts of all States and peoples with a view to finding a rational solution to those problems. This is the thrust of the proposals made by our country, by all Warsaw Treaty member countries, for a drastic reduction in the military expenditures of States, and above all of the major Powers.

These are all facts which cannot be disputed.

The responsibility for the current critical state of international relations rests with another group of countries, namely the United States and some of its closest allies.

It was they who, in the early 1980s, wrecked the structure of negotiations which had taken such an effort to build, the negotiations which had shown signs of progress toward agreements in many areas ranging from complete and general prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests to the limitation of sales and supplies of conventional armaments,



from banning the development of nuclear weapons. It was the United States that refused to ratify the SALT II Treaty designed to pave the way to further, even more substantial cuts in strategic arms. It was the United States that in 1983 torpedoed the Soviet-US talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe by starting the deployment of its new nuclear missiles on the European continent. (473)

And the new military programmes which now cover not only the land, oceans and atmosphere of our planet but also outer space are US programmes too.

No particular perspicacity is needed to see clearly that precisely those States that are obstructing disarmament efforts are also set on fomenting local conflicts.

They bear responsibility for the failure thus far to come to grips with problems common to all mankind.

All of this is being said not for the sake of polemics but in order that the United Nations could, on the basis of real facts and through concerted efforts, devise effective ways of radically improving international relations and strengthening universal security.

What are these ways as we see them?

It is said at times that all that is needed is that the "two superpowers" should stop competing with each other for influence in the world. This proposition stems either from ignorance or from malicious intent. First, the Soviet Union has no intention of placing itself above other States and peoples, nor is it seeking opportunities to order them about or dictate its will to them. Secondly, the Soviet Union is not involved in any competition whatsoever, whether for markets, natural resources, control over sea or air routes, or the possession of outer space.

On the other hand, it is of course true that the Soviet Union is one of the world's two most powerful nations. But the whole point is what political aims are served by that power. Those who invoke the concept of the "two superpowers" would be well advised to ponder once in a while what would happen to their independence and what turn world developments would generally take if the USSR were weaker than it is and if the Soviet people were not investing so much of their effort, material resources and scientific endeavour in maintaining its economic and military potential at an adequate level.

In discussions about the ways of improving the situation frequent mention is also made of the need to restore, above all, confidence among States. This, it is said, would make it possible to resolve all major



problems, including those of halting the arms race and settling regional conflicts. Indeed, confidence is an important factor in overcoming the current difficulties. We feel, however, that it is impossible to achieve a necessary and reliable degree of trust in relations among States unless the causes and the material roots of distrust are removed.

But work to restore confidence must be pursued, and this is what we are doing. In particular, at the Stockholm Conference of the States participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Soviet Union is working for the adoption of a complex of large-scale political and effective military-technical confidence-building measures. At Stockholm, we are prepared to proceed immediately, together with our negotiating partners, to the actual drafting of agreements to that effect. Our country attaches major importance to the CSCE process as a whole.

The Soviet Union is building and developing its relations with all States in strict compliance with the Final Act and on the basis of the ten principles proclaimed therein, attaching special importance to the factor of confidence in those relations. And it is gratified when it sees this factor present in its relations with this or that country in Europe, America, Asia, Africa, or Oceania.

In our relations with other States, we have invariably given priority to the search for ways of easing international tensions and preventing the danger of war. Of major importance in this context is Mikhail S. Gorbachev's coming visit to France.

We also want to build normal, stable relations with the United States. We have never been the initiators of confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States. Today, we do not think that tensions in Soviet-American relations result from a fated clash of national interests. We believe, therefore, that both sides should be interested in a successful outcome of the forthcoming meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States. This is precisely how the Soviet Union approaches the meeting. It remains to be seen what will be the attitude of the other side in this matter.

We are convinced that the Soviet-American summit meeting should focus on the most important problem of today--the problem whose solution would indeed make it possible to reduce decisively the danger of war, restore international trust and create pre-requisites for resolving many other pressing issues in relations among States.



What I have in mind is the problem of preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on Earth, limiting and reducing nuclear arms and enhancing strategic stability. Let me address this question in greater detail.

To begin with, it appears indisputable that as long as States possess nuclear arms the risk of outbreak of nuclear war cannot be completely ruled out. It is equally true, however, that in conditions of strategic equilibrium that risk is comparatively lower. For, essentially, strategic equilibrium means that each side, even if it becomes victim of a nuclear aggression committed by the other side, would still retain sufficient strategic capability to deliver a no less devastating blow against the aggressor. Consequently, in conditions of strategic equilibrium there can be no winner in a nuclear war, and starting it would be tantamount to committing suicide.

Yet the situation may change if one side should try to acquire such a nuclear potential as would enable it to hope in one strike to deprive the other side of adequate retaliatory capability against aggression and even more so if the potential aggressor should develop a space-based anti-missile shield, hoping to protect itself with it from a retaliatory strike. It is obvious that in such case the aggressor may be tempted to deliver or threaten to deliver a first "disarming" nuclear strike, counting on impunity. This is what makes the desire to gain military superiority in the nuclear age extremely dangerous. Yet, this is precisely the thrust of the new US military programmes, already under way or about to be launched.

It could be argued that this is a purely hypothetical danger since the Soviet Union itself has repeatedly stated that it would not allow the other side to obtain superiority and would take appropriate countermeasures to restore the balance. But does that mean that the problem of removing the danger of nuclear war will no longer be on the agenda?

True, our country will not permit military superiority over itself. The State and party leadership of the Soviet Union has instructed me to reaffirm this once again from the high rostrum of the United Nations. Profoundly mistaken are those who may expect that the Soviet economy will fail to withstand the strain of a qualitatively new stage in the arms race which is currently being forced upon us. Our country and the Soviet economy have had to stand up to even greater pressures. Today, the economic might of the Soviet State and its scientific and technological potential are such as to leave no doubt whatsoever in anyone's mind concerning the ability and determination of our people to deal with the new challenge.



But it should be remembered that the higher the level of military confrontation in this nuclear-and-space age, the more shaky and less secure--even if strategic equilibrium is maintained--become the foundations of world peace. Nuclear war in these conditions may result not only from a deliberate decision but also from attempts at blackmail or from miscalculation by one side as to the intentions or actions of the other; it may also break out as a consequence of someone's reckless behaviour prompted by a sudden aggravation of the situation or be caused by malfunctions in computers which are increasingly relied upon in the operation of modern sophisticated weapon systems.

Such is our understanding of the current strategic and political realities. It is based on grim facts that cannot be ignored.

It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Union has been so persistent in seeking not merely the maintenance, but a lowering of the existing level of strategic equilibrium, the early adoption of effective measures to stop and reverse the arms race. We know--and many other States now realize this as well--that there is no more time to waste, for it may become too late.

We have gathered in New York in the final days of the first month of autumn. This season is regarded as a time to harvest the crop, when farmers look to the coming winter with a feeling of work well done.

When one thinks about this, another metaphor comes to mind which, regrettably, has already taken root in the vocabulary of mankind--the metaphor of "nuclear winter". We want the word "winter" to retain in all languages of the world the one and only meaning--its original one-- and be identified solely with the season of the year which is beautiful and joyful in its own way.

Seeking to establish a favourable climate for the resumption of the process of arms limitation and reduction and ultimately for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere, the Soviet Union has recently taken substantial steps on a unilateral basis.

They include the decision not to place anti-satellite weapons in outer space so long as the United States does not take such a step. Unfortunately, however, the United States, in disregard of the interests of political and military stability, has recently tested an anti-satellite weapon against a target in space.

Among our steps is also the suspension of further implementation of our countermeasures in Europe caused by the deployment of US medium-range nuclear systems on the territories of some West European countries.



And finally, there is our moratorium on any nuclear explosions.

It is clear that by their very nature such unilateral steps could not be taken as measures of unlimited duration. But they could become of unlimited duration if the United States followed our good example. And that would constitute significant progress towards a relaxation of military tensions in the world. If, however, the United States fails to heed the voice of reason, let no one blame us when the unilateral moratoria we have declared are ended as they expire. It is not for us but for the United States to make the choice.

Notwithstanding the importance of such steps as moratoria designed to put a brake on the arms race, the peoples of the world have every right to demand that radical measures be taken to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear--and not only nuclear--weapons.

From the very beginning of the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space arms, our country has been determined to achieve a radical solution to these interrelated problems and has taken a constructive stand. The Soviet delegation has brought to the current round of the negotiations substantial, large-scale and far-reaching proposals.

We believe that agreement to ban space strike weapons and to effect truly radical reductions in nuclear arms would today have the most positive effect. Such an agreement can bring about a turn for the better in the entire course of world events, avert the threat of nuclear catastrophe and open up for the peoples the prospect of a world free from fear for tomorrow. Mankind would march towards the new millennium, which is already knocking at our doors, confident that civilization would continue to progress.

The Soviet Union has been putting forward proposals on the whole range of issues regarding the cessation of the arms race.

I am not going to name each of those proposals, for all of them will in one way or another become the subject of an exchange of views at the General Assembly. Let me just say that they cover the nuclear field, including the cessation of nuclear tests, as well as chemical weapons, conventional weapons, and the numerical strength of armed forces. In some cases it is a question of a freeze; in others, of a reduction. As before, the Soviet Union resolutely supports the proposals to establish nuclear-free zones, zones free from chemical weapons, and zones of peace in various regions. It favours a limitation of naval activities and naval armaments and resolutely opposes the development of any new weapons of mass destruction.



In the context of the proposed arms limitation and reduction measures the Soviet Union believes it necessary to provide for adequate measures of verification, national in some cases, or national in combination with international, whenever there is an objective necessity for this. We have as great an interest as anyone else in effective verification of compliance by all States with their obligations regarding measures of disarmament.

We call upon the States represented at the United Nations General Assembly, members of politico-military alliances as well as non-aligned and neutral countries, to support this approach which, we are convinced, is constructive and also realistic.

Now I would like to offer some ideas as to what could be done to eliminate, through collective efforts, local wars and conflicts which result in untold suffering and innumerable casualties.

Viewed in a purely UN context, the solution to this problem may seem to be simple--what is needed is to obligate all States to comply in their actions fully and scrupulously with their commitments assumed under the United Nations Charter and equally firmly to deny support to those who violate those commitments.

For instance, it is hard to imagine that any delegation would venture to assert here that the monstrous crimes of Israeli aggressors on the long-suffering Lebanese soil, on the West Bank and in the Gaza strip are consistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter or that the financing, arming, training and infiltrating into Nicaragua of thousands upon thousands of counter-revolutionaries--"contras", as they are called--are consistent with those principles.

Only chauvinistic arrogance would make one deny the Palestinian people their right to independent statehood while recognizing that right for the people of Israel. All peoples and nations have equal rights.

Who is unaware of the brutal record of the South African apartheid regime, which is executing hundreds of the country's indigenous inhabitants and jailing thousands of others? Who is unaware of the acts of aggression it is constantly committing against Angola--which we are witnessing today--as well as against Mozambique, Botswana, and Lesotho. It would, indeed, be outrageous even to think that this inhuman regime acts in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. But it is a fact that Pretoria's racists receive support, and this support comes from a major power that forty years ago was among the founding members of the United Nations.



Of course, expressing indignation over the crimes of the racists and condemning the aggressor does not in itself mean that those crimes will be eradicated. Peaceful settlement of a conflict with full and just regard for the legitimate interests of all sides requires a political basis for a settlement which would not prejudice those interests and a negotiating mechanism suitable for each specific conflict situation.

Such political platforms for a just settlement of all or nearly all existing regional conflicts have already been or are being formulated. Suitable negotiating mechanisms either already exist or can be established.

Let us turn to the situation in the Middle East. The main parameters for solving the Middle East problem--in a manner that would take into account the legitimate interests of all the parties--have long been defined. They include the return to the Arab States of all their territories occupied by Israel since 1967, the exercise of the right of the Arab people of Palestine to establish an independent State of their own, and ensuring the right of all States in the Middle East, including Israel, to live in peace and security. A negotiating mechanism for such a settlement has long been proposed as well, namely, an international conference on the Middle East under United Nations auspices with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, and several other countries including the Soviet Union and the United States.

There may, however, be some people who think that the Middle East knot can be untied through separate deals. But the experience has already shown that such deals can only result in aggravating the conflict instead of settling it. We believe that this year the General Assembly will take an even firmer stand in favour of an early and just political settlement in the Middle East, and will demand that those who continue to resist such a settlement should stop their sabotage.

It is to be recalled in this connection that Israel owes its existence to a decision of this Organization, the decision which also called for the establishment in Palestine of an Arab State. It was a dual decision. The Soviet Union actively supported precisely that decision and, incidentally, it was among the first to recognize the State of Israel.

In principle, there also exists a negotiating mechanism for settling the situation in Central America, which was conceived by Latin American countries themselves. I have in mind the Contadora group, with which several more South American States have recently expressed solidarity. There is also a draft Act of Peace in Central America drawn up by the Contadora members. It is widely supported by the



States and peoples of the region, including the government and people of Nicaragua--the country against which the spearhead of the imperialist aggression is directed. It is important that the United Nations support the efforts of the Contadora group and contribute to overcoming the resistance of those who, instead of peace, seek to restore their domination in Central America.

It is also possible to break the deadlock in the Cyprus problem provided that an end is put to interference by the imperialist forces and that the recognition of the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus is taken as a firm basis.

Let me make some specific comments about Afghanistan. A political settlement of the situation that has arisen around that country is also possible. What is required for this is that all should recognize the Afghan people's right to build their life as they desire and that armed and other forms of outside interference in the internal affairs of the DRA should be stopped. When such interference is ended and if its non-resumption is guaranteed, it will become possible to withdraw the Soviet military contingent from Afghanistan by agreement with the Afghan government. The sooner a political settlement is achieved, the better it will be for everyone.

The proposals of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea provide a good political framework for building good-neighbourly relations between all the States of Southeast Asia, particularly between the ASEAN countries and the States of Indochina. The basis for such relations is gradually taking shape, and the countries concerned are perfectly capable of establishing a negotiating mechanism. What is important is that no one should stand in the way of their desire to reach agreement with each other.

We support the efforts of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea aimed at a peaceful reunification of Korea and the demand for the withdrawal from South Korea of all foreign troops as well as the proposal to make the Korean Peninsula a nuclear-free zone.

The question of the situation in southern Africa is quite urgent today. What needs to be done here is that the Security Council should finally exercise fully its authority as regards the racist South African regime, which in violation of the relevant United Nations decisions refuses to transfer power to the Namibian people and represents a threat to the security of African States and to global security.



A quarter of a century has passed since the United Nations adopted, at the initiative of the Soviet Union, a decision which substantially contributed to changing the face of today's world--the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. What was started then has now been almost completed. Almost, but not entirely. There should be no place on our planet for the remaining fragments and hotbeds of colonialism. In this matter, too, the United Nations should speak out in an unequivocal and definitive manner. It is important that the newly-free countries and peoples should be given assistance in ensuring their genuine political and economic independence.

The United Nations rightfully can and must raise its voice against the exploitation of developing countries by imperialist monopolies, against the plundering of their natural resources and the strangling of their economies with the noose of indebtedness. Cuba and some other member States of the United Nations propose ways of solving the problem of financial indebtedness.

We support the demands of newly-free States for the establishment of a new international economic order on an equitable and democratic basis in accordance with previously adopted United Nations decisions, as well as their opposition to "cultural" and "information" neocolonialism and its other forms.

It is inadmissible that the States of Asia, Africa and Latin America should be regarded as a sphere of someone's "vital" interests, as an arena for confrontation with socialism. Those States form the influential non-aligned movement and actively support disarmament, detente and peaceful settlement of conflicts, which has been once again convincingly demonstrated at the recent Conference of the foreign ministers of non-aligned countries held in Luanda.

The rights and freedoms of the individual are inextricably linked with the rights of the peoples. The unique experience of our country eloquently bears witness to this. Socialism not only has ensured to each and every citizen equal rights to work, housing, rest and pensions, not only has made it possible to get all types of education and all medical services free of charge, but also has provided comprehensive guarantees of those rights. The standards of social justice were established in close association with the realization of the principles of self-determination of all nations and nationalities, including the preservation of their identity and the development of such national phenomena as language, writing, literature, and the arts.

Due to the advantages of the socialist system, the peoples of the Soviet Union--in the past oppressed, backward and divided and now standing together, united and therefore strong--have in a historically short span of time reached



the most advanced frontiers of economic development, created a flourishing spiritual culture and attained the heights of human civilization.

We believe that this path not only leads to economic and spiritual advancement but also contributes to building trust between the peoples and, on this basis, to their drawing closer together and joining efforts in order to attain goals common to all mankind.

This is how we understand the essence of the question regarding the rights and freedoms of the individual and of the peoples.

The United Nations by virtue of its Charter must play an important role in encouraging and promoting respect for human rights throughout the world. This provision, which laid the groundwork for international cooperation in the field of human rights, was incorporated in the United Nations Charter at the initiative of the Soviet Union. Forty years have passed since that but, regrettably, flagrant massive violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms are taking place to this day. This is an inherent characteristic of the society where the power and wealth of a minority exist at the expense of a majority of the population. Such violations have become a "norm" of life in those States whose leaders are trying so hard to portray themselves as champions of human rights.

I wish once again to draw your attention to a problem whose solution will to a large extent shape the world of our children, grandchildren and great grandchildren. I am referring to the problem of the peaceful exploration of outer space.

Space, until recently the realm of science fiction writers, has now become an area of man's practical activity. Peaceful exploration of space holds out for mankind truly limitless prospects of utilizing scientific and technological achievements to promote the economic and social progress of the peoples and to solve the vast problems that face mankind on Earth.

However, these truly cosmic dimensions--and I am not speaking figuratively--also present new requirements to the inhabitants of the Earth and above all to the leaders of States.

There should be no repetition of the mistake made four decades ago when the States and peoples of the world were unable to prevent the great intellectual achievement of the mid-twentieth century--the release of the energy of the atom--from becoming a means for the mass annihilation of human beings. This folly should not happen again at the end of this century when, having filled the first pages of its space history, mankind is facing a choice--either space will help to improve the living conditions on our planet or it will become the source of a new mortal danger.

Wishing to contribute to mankind's progress towards new heights of civilization, our country has taken a new major initiative by proposing the inclusion in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly of an item "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in Conditions of Its Non-Militarization."



The Soviet Union has also submitted to the General Assembly specific proposals concerning the main directions and principles of broad international cooperation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes. Outer space is indivisible and all States should be able to take part in its peaceful exploration.

This implies that progress should be made by joint efforts in both basic and applied areas of space exploration and that all the peoples should be able to benefit from space research. It is our view that such cooperation could best be carried out within the framework of a world space organization. But this could become a reality provided that all channels for militarizing the boundless reaches of outer space are closed off.

To counter the sinister plans of "Star Wars", the USSR is putting before the international community a concept of "Star Peace".

The Soviet Union hopes that its proposals will be examined carefully by the General Assembly.

Mr. President, distinguished colleagues, the Soviet delegation has set forth the views and proposals of the Soviet Union which we have found necessary and timely to submit for the consideration of the United Nations. It is to be hoped that they will be regarded with understanding by all States represented in this hall and by all peoples who constitute mankind as a whole.

A great deal of useful work for the benefit of peace and international cooperation has been done by the United Nations in the past forty years. However, the United Nations has still a lot more to accomplish, since it appears that we are entering upon a most crucial period in the history of mankind when it will have to take a decision on the question of paramount importance to it: whether to live in peace or perish in a nuclear war.

In this regard I would like to quote the following policy statement of Mikhail S. Gorbachev: "Our goal, as we see it, is to resolve together—for no one is able to do it alone—the major problems which are essentially common to us: how to prevent war, how to settle the existing conflicts and crises and to prevent potential ones, how to create a world climate that would allow every country to focus attention and concentrate resources on finding solutions to its own problems (show me a country which has no problems), and how to join efforts in resolving global problems."

Thank you, Mr. President.