UNITED NATIONS





General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/41/425 23 June 1986 ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/FRENCH/

RUSSIAN/SPANISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-first session
Items 21, 62, 70 and 76 of the preliminary list*
INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF PEACE
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT
REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL JECURITY
QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION

Letter dated 23 June 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Bulgaria to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

At the request of my Government I have the honour to transmit to you the text of the speech made on 22 May 1986 by His Excellency Mr. Todor **Zhivkov**, Chairman of the Council of state of the People's Republic of **Bulgaria**, at the International **Meeting** of Agrarian and Other Democratic Parties and Organisations.

I should be grateful if you would arrange to have the text of this speech circulated as an official document of the General Assembly under items 21, 62, 70 and 76 of the preliminary list.

(<u>Signed</u>) Boris **TSVETKOV**First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs
Permanent Representative of Bulgaria
to the United Nations

^{*} A/41/50/Rev.1.

ANNEX

FOR THE TRIUMPH OF PEACE AND SECURITY IN THE WORLD

Speech at the International Meeting of Agrarian and Other Democratic Parties and Organizations

Dear guests, Distinguished friends,Dear **comrades.**

We live in complicated, tense and troubled times. As you know, nowadays mankind has no other more important task than that of safeguarding peace, and this means life on Earth.

This is the Number One problem. It is a vital problem fot governments, for political parties and movements, for the peoples. It concerns each and every man.

- As is well known, the present-day world is a mosaic of countries of different social and political systems, at a different level of development, with different cul-

tural traditions, It is so motley a mosaic that it can hardly be confined to any pattern.

- The problems facing mankind also form a motley mosaic. All of them are important and pressing and not a single one should be underrated,

Yet I believe you will agree with me -today the problem of peace and security stands above everything else. **One should** simply **be a realist** in order to become aware of this.

That is why the first question I would like to dwell on, concerns *the realities of the present-day world.*

Undoubtedly, the main, determining thing today is the existence of two socio—economic systems — the socialist and the capitalist one,

- Their existence is a historical fact, a law-governed phenomenon in mankind's development.
- And the opposition between these two systems is just as law-governed,' because of the differences and contradictions between them,

Experi: nce has shown that these contradictions cannot be solved from the position of strength, by military means. This is even less possible to achieve in our times.

Why?

- Because the striving to defeat, to liquidate the other party by military force will only result in the liquidation of the two' systems, in annihilating **civilization** and life on the planet.
- In our times, the two systems could either live together, or die together, which means survival or destruction of the whole of mankind. History has willed it so.

This is the first basic reality.

The second reality is that the world startds in dialectic unity.

The world we are living in is characterized by the exis-

tence of different social systems, by contradictions which divide them, and in certain cases, oppose them to one another. Such is one of the realities of our times.

The other one is **the** growing mutual dependence between states, irrespective of their differences.

What is this mutual dependence determined by?

- 1. The main unifying factor is the joint responsibility and concern fur the survival of life on **Earth, for** its safeguarding,
- 2. The world economy is functioning, economic life is being **internationalized**, international division of labour is growing more intensive. To one degree or another, these processes influence favourably the development of the world economy and of the different countries.
- 3. In this connection, the question of the international economic security of all states, of, eliminating everything which hampers the development of world economic relations, becomes ever more urgent.

All this presupposes:

- democratization of economic relations;
- doing away with discrimination and all artificial restrictions in economic interrelations;
- expansion of trade and scientific and technological cooperation;
- using up the means released by disarmament for development, for wiping out backwardness, hunger, disease, poverty and the like.
- 4. The present-day world is characterized by an unprecedented growth of the importance of universal, global problems:
- such are the problems of protecting the environment, the air space, of utilizing the resources of the world ocean, etc.;
- they cannot be solved through the efforts of one

state **or** a group of states. What is necessary is cooperation on a world scale.

The revolution in science and technology and its nuclear aspect constitutes, in my opinion, the third basic reality of the contemporary world.

The scientific and technological revolution is often likened **to Janus** the double-faced. And with good reason.

Because, on the one hand:

- Being a universal law-governed regularity, the scientific and technological revolution has already brought about colossal achievements for man and for humankind. It is the core of present-day progress.
- We cannot imagine the future of the world without it. That is why every country concerned about its advancement promotes and will continue to promote it.

In brief: the scierztific and technological revolution leads to a qualitative leap in mankind's productive forces, to a mammoth, unparalleled growth of man's material and intellectual potential, creates all-round conditions for the further upsurge of civilization.

On the other hand:

- The scientific and technological revolution has also led to a qualitative leap in the means of destruction, in warfare.
- For the first time in history it has supplied man with the means of destroying life on Earth, himself included; man has in **fact** become a hostage of the means of warfare and destruction he himself created.
- In these circumstances war becomes an absurdity. Irrespective of this the arms race continues. Here are some facts and figures.
 - The First Special Session on Disarmament of the UN General Assembly held in 1978 noted that *military expenditures on a world* scale amounted to some

400 billion dollars a year. Today, eight years later, they have doubled. Again according to UN data, these expenditures are likely to top the 1,000 billion–dollar mark by the end of the 1980s.

- In 1980 the military spending in the US budget amounted to 142.5 billion dollars. Today, the Pentagon demands that the US Congress approve military spending to the tune of 313.5 billion dollars for the 198611987 fiscal year.

Nowadays there are stockpiles of weapons, especially nuclear ones, in the world which could destroy **several times** life on the planet.

Therefore, in the nuclear-missile age: he security of no state can be guaranteed by military-technical hardware. Security constitutes an exclusively political problem,

That is why the new aspect is that now there is no alternative other than a political one. Only by political means, by a dialogue can a way out be found. I repeat, the key problems of our times cannot be solved by military force. Otherwise we are bound to destroy ourselves. **Every-**body must understand that we live in a crucial time when the fate of the planet is at stake.

I consider myself to be a realist, distinguished guests, and do not entertain any illusions, and I believe you do not have any illusions either, that the opposition between the two systems will be eliminated. This is not what we are talking about. The two systems -the capitalist and the socialist one -will continue to compete. This competitionhowever is possible:

- only in the conditions of peace, without war and the threat of war;
- only as a competition in science, in technological progress, in the economy, in all wdlks of life.

What we mean is *peaceful competition* which will:

- guarantee life on our planet;

- see to the preservation of its wealth and, above all, its most precious wealth - man.

We firmly uphold the stand of competing in the conditions of peace and security for creating worthwhile, genuinely humane material and cultural conditions of life for all nations.

This is possible only when strictly observing *the principle of peaceful coexistence*.

What is the meaning of this principle which is invariably observed by the socialist countries?

It means:

- renunciation of war, of the use of force or threat of force;
- settling controversial issues through negotiations, through dialogue, through political means;
- conscientious fulfilment of obligations ensuing from the universally adopted principles and norms of international law, from the international treaties signed;
- the nations' right to determine their destinies themselves;
- strict respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity of states and the inviolability of their borders;
- non-interference in internal affairs and mutual respect for legitimate interests.

As is known the principle of peaceful coexistence was formulated by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. However, this principle, its content are in direct relation to the concrete historical conditions. In Lenin's time this principle had one connotation,, in the wake of the Second World War it had a somewhat different connotation. At present in the qualitatively new conditions it acquires new traits and characteristics.

I should like to lay a particular emphasis on this. Why? Because a situation has evolved in the present-day conditions which has no parallel in any of the preceding

stages, that saw the application of the principle of peaceful coexistence. As I have already underscored this is a situation in which mankind has to make a fateful choice.

Which are the new traits and characteristics of the principle of peaceful coexistence'!

First, excluding war from the life of mankind for good.

Second, not simply good neighbourliness and cooperation but a new approach in international relations, aimed at halting the disastrous arms race, at the radical improvement of the political climate in the world. If good neighbourliness had been good enough in the past today we are talking about something qualitatively new- about pooling the efforts of all states, irrespective of their social system, in the name of peace and for the salvation of mankind.

Third, not only maintaining military-strategic parity but gradual reduction of its level to the final liquidation of nuclear and conventional weapons.

Fourth, promoting international scientific and technological cooperation exclusively in the interest of peace, for solving humanitarian tasks, wide exchange of cultural values etc.

Fifth, not an information war but active cooperation in the field of information, in the name of peace, mutual familiarization, friendship, amity and confidence between peoples.

A1 1 this necessitates a new political thinking, a new political consciousness, a new political approach.

We have amassed useful historical experience thanks to observing the principle of peaceful coexistence.

All of us are contemporaries of this development of the international situation in the conditions of abiding by this principle. I myself am one of those who for several decades now have been the living history of that development; I have taken part in the overcoming of many contradictions, I would even say, clashes on the international

arena. We all know how much wisdom, restraint and political tact were needed to prevent certain armed conflicts, to develop interstate. relations in a positive aspect.

The path traversed to the Helsinki Final Act which will remain in history as an example of political farsightedness, of re-affirming the principle of peaceful coexistence, was full of hardships.

The Helsinki Final Act yieided positive results because it corresponded to the interests of the peoples, to their will, to their aspirations and it was not accidental that notwithstanding the dangerous course international development has taken in recent years, the 'spirit of Helsinki' could not be buried. The experience amassed during this period indicated what should be done, what path should be followed in the current tense international setup.

Such are, dear friends, the realities turning Lenin's idea of peaceful coexistence into the only reasonable and acceptable alternative.

In the conditions of the impending nuclear war it is not confrontation but peaceful coexistence that should become a law, a universally acknowledged and universally observed norm of interstate relations.

I would like to emphasize that this norm is the guiding princip; in the approach of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to the issue of saving the world from war. This is a realistic and constructive approach.

The great energy, restraint and persistence of the Soviet leadership, the reasonable compromises it is making in the name of checking the dangerous course of international developments and attaining a turn for the better in Soviet-American relations and in world affairs are well known to the world community.

- It is this energy, persistence and readiness for reaching understanding that made possible **the Geneva summit** and the resumption of the East-West summit **dialogue**.

- The large-scale comprehensive initiatives and proposals of the Soviet leadership put forth by **Mikhail Gorbachov** for a step-by-step reduction and abolition of nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of the century, for cutting down arms and troops levels in Europe, for establishing a **reliable** system of disarmament control, etc., are well known.
- The Soviet leadership has undertaken a bold and responsible step, **declaring** a *unilateral moratorium* on nuclear tests which has been extended on several **occasions** already.
- The latest manifestation of a genuine concern over the future of mankind is **the extension of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until August** 6, i.e. until the day when the first atomic bomb was dropped over Hiroshima more than 40 years ago.
- Mikhail Gorbachov has reiterated his proposal to meet with President Reagan without delay with a view of reaching agreement on a nuclear 'est ban.

As you know, the 27th CPSU Congress proposed a comprehensive system of international security:

- approaches and solutions have been elaborated which would not only reduce international tensions and the danger of war but would also relieve mankind of the fear for its future.

And something more:

- The Soviet proposals make it possible to guarantee comprehensively nnd effectively human rights, starting from the fundamental right the right to live.
- The CPSU peace programme contains a **proposal** for changing the image of the present-day world, for establishing* an international order that would be marked not by the domination of military force but by cooperation and a broad exchange of scientific, technological and cultural achievements. **This would**

provide favourable opportunities for solving mankind's global **problems** through the joint efforts of all states.

In other words, this is a programme for peaceful coexistence in action.

I believe that we all are well aware of the fact that the Soviet initiatives and proposals are not a sign of weakness, even less so of fear. They are a manifestation of a high sense of responsibility for the future of the whole of mankind.

- This is an honest and clear-cut stand, a stand without any 'reefs', a stand prompted by universal considerations.
- This is an example of humanism in action.

The Soviet proposals are laid on the table. The Soviet Union is ready to take the risk, to do its utmost.

The nations of the world have the right to demand that the other side should also face these proposals, sit at the negotiating table and conduct a dialogue. There is no other alternative,

- The view that the US could annihilate us in a surprise attack from the earth, oceans and outer space is **absolutely illusory. What it can do,** *however, **is liquidatecivilization!**
- It is high time for the US to shed the illusions that in a pre-emptive strike it would suffer minimal losses. This is so because such an action would inevitably provoke a retaliatory strike. Probably such a retaliatory strike would not be necessary at all. As scientists claim, the first nuclear strike would be enough to destroy civilization.

Militaristic reaction in the United States has recently been opposing the so-called *neoglobalism* to the realistic and constructive approach of the USSR and the other socialist countries, the Warsaw Treaty member **states**, the **Non-Aligned** Movement, the sober-minded politicians and statesmen in the capitalist countries.

What is its content?

- It is above all the proclamation of the whole planet and outer space a sphere of US interests, of US security. There is not a single region on earth where US military bases have not been established.
- Preparations for 'Star Wars', for the implementation of the so-called strategic defence initiative.
- Militarisation of politics and thinking, an aggressive behaviour on the international scene, placing its interests above the interests of the other participants in international affairs, most flagrant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states.
- Rejection of good neighbourliness **and** cooperation as principles of world development, as a philosophy of international relations.
- Infringement upon interstate relations and cooperation.
- Undermining of international institutions including the UN and its agencies.
- Replacing peaceful competition with military confrontation.
- Evasion of scrious political dialogue.

In fact the policy of neoglobalism is also directed against the very allies of the US, and not only against *he people in those countries, but against the interests of the capitalists in them.

This is a policy to the detriment of the whole of man-kind.

One of the gods of neoglobalism is to preserve and perpetuate the system of neocolonial exploitation of the developing countries in the interest of the transnational monopolies, to check the process of progressive political and socio-economic changes in those countries.

Without exhausting the question, with respect to the developing countries neoglobalism means:

- intensifying the inequitable trade;
- increasing the 'export' of inflation to those countries;
- drastically raising their foreign debts **which** makes their repayment practically impossible.

Through the policy of neoglobalism which boils down to political manoeuvring, threats, blackmail and military intervention, imperialism is aspiring to hold the developing countries in economic and political dependence. Imperialism is manually to blame for the economic backwardness, poverty and acute social problems existing in most of those countries.

Consequently, neoglobalism is:

- a policy opposed to peaceful coexistence;
- a policy of inequality, of diktat and subordination;
- a policy conducive to an exacerbation of international tensions, to the creation of acute conflict situations and international crises, to the accumulation of complicated and unresolved problems, to increasing the threat of a nuclear catastrophe.

That is why such a course, such ta policy does not and cannot have anything in common with the interests of mankind, with its survival and progress,

In the present troubled time we should make a serious analysis and draw lessons from the use of space and nuclear technology.

More specifically, what I have in mind are the accidents with the *Challenger* space shuttle, in the nuclear **power** plant in the USA, in Chernobyl and others.

The disaster in Chernobyl has shown:

First, what a sinister power the atom is when it slips out of human control.

Second, the consequences of similar cases do not concern an individual country; the struggle for controlling the atom and for eliminating the nuclear threat requires joint efforts.

Third, some imperialist circles including also 'the seven' in Tokyo, used that misfortune for mean slanderous goals, for escalating nuclear militarism.

From the Chernobyl case too the Soviet Union drew *responsible and realistic* conclusions and made the respective proposals:

- Since the future of mankind is unthinkable without nuclear power, an international order should be established for its safe development and its **use** for the welfare of man.
- The necessity is ripe of solving the problems of the 'military atom', Nuclear weapons of an incredible **destructive** capacity have been stockpiled. The question of their abolition is a fateful one.

The nuclear catastrophe poses a threat to all. Its prevention requires joint efforts by all governments, states, parliaments, peoples, political parties and mass peace and antimissile movements, by scientists and all people on the earth, irrespective of class, national, ideological und religious differences.

- All of us, all peaceloving people throughout the world value highly the contribution of the **Non**-Aligned Movement, its efforts for healing the international political climate.
- We also hail the efforts of the parties and movements which you represent at this international meeting,

It is our common duty to wage an energetic and purposeful struggle for a complete ban on nuclear tests, for abolishing all kinds of nuclear weapons.

This is the supreme objectire in the name of which we should unite, work and fight. **This is the imperative of the time we five in.**

Dear friends,

It is a fact that communication is an age-long necessity for the human race. Specialists say that thanks to that communication man has been able to evolve and develop as a social being:

- to exist, people have communicated and continue to communicate as settlements and classes, as races, nations and states;
- to exist and make progress, people exchange values, technologies, discoveries and cultural achievements.

What is more:

- there is a general law of extending the boundaries of communication from its local, regional forms to'the contemporary *communication within the boundaries'* of the whole of mankind;
- this law is acting today with a particularly great force; all nations,, people throughout the world are subordinate to it in the conditions of the **techno-sci**entific revolution.

It is no secret that the modern means of information have acquired unprecedented power:

- today, there is no politician, political party or movement which do not reckon with this power;
- today it is very **difficult** to enforce one idea or another, one political. will or another, if the modern information systems do not work in its favour.

Each one of you will confirm that inference.

Each one of you will also confirm that the mass media in the world of today often contribute to the exacerbation of tensions, that the **mass** information media are often turned into disinformation media, that sometimes they are conducive to misunderstanding between countries and peoples rather than to communication.

In what cases and why?

- When and because, in certain cases, these media are backed up by reactionary political forces developing what can be called *information 'terrorism'* against the world of socialism, against the peoples fighting for freedom, for consolidating their national independence, against the forces of progress und peace.
- When and because these media are subordinate to the militaristic schemes of **imperialism**, to the policy spearheaded against dialogue and detente.

It is evident that a new approach is **necessary** in that sphere too, that information should go beyond the **narrow** understanding of class and national interests, of ideological and other differences.

We the present generations are called uponto elevate to a new historical height the communication between people as the foremost factor for boosting man's energies and abilities.

Naturally, we shall argue **from** an ideological point of view, the mass media are and will remain means fur a struggle of ideas, of political views, of ideologies. Hut here too. I would like you to understind me well, there are problems which unite us.

- Those are the so-called global problems the threat of an ecological catastrophe, famine, illiteracy, etc.
- Those are the problems related to the change of scientific and technological achievements, of cultural values, etc.

Joint efforts are needed for the solution of these and many other problems, and they will be even more fruitful if backed up by the tremendous might of the present and of the future information systems.

Information in the struggle for peace has particularly great possibilities.

- The press, radio and television - those are and can

be invaluable weapons of mankind in its struggle for peaceful coexistence.

- The press, radio and television - these are invaluable weapons for establishing a new political thinking, a new economic order, a new order in interstate and international relations.

In general, the broad and all-embracing peace front needs a new information strategy and tactics, a new order in the sphere of information.

This strategy and tactics, this new **information** order should be imbued to the **utmost** extent with humanism, with faith in the future of man anti mankind.

- The mass media should proclaim widely and freely and defend all practical actions in the name of peace and peaceful coexistence.
- They are called upon to **stigmatize** any manifestation of militarism, to create an atmosphere of moral and political intolerance to the belligerent policy of imperialism.

Our country is in favour of such information, of such an information order.

Distinguished guests and friends,

The foreign-policy activities of the People's Republic of Bulgaria are imbued with the ideals of peace and international security.

Our policy is aimed at affirming peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

Bulgaria maintains diplomatic relations with 120 countries. It:

- develops broad and fruitful cooperation with the socialist countries in all spheres of public life;
- expands and deepens its cooperation with the developing countries;

- supports the struggle for doing away with the vestiges of colonialism, against neocolonialism, racism and apartheid, against dictatorial and anti-popular regimes;
- strives for a political dialogue, mutually advantageous and equitable economic, **techno-scientific** and cultural cooperation with the advanced capitalist states:
- takes an active part in the work of the UN, UNESCO and other international **organizations**, contributes to enhancing their role in the consolidation of peace and security, in settling regional conflicts and solving global problems.

Understandably, we devote considerable attention to our relations with *the Balkan states*.

The situation in our region is relatively stable and calm, We do not close our eyes to the attempts at changing it, at undermining confidence and creating tension between individual Balkan countries.

Here too a realistic approach and joint efforts are needed.

What are we doing, more specifically'?

- we contribute actively to the development of bilateral relations with the Balkan states;
- we work towards turning the Balkans into a zone free of nuclear and chemical weapons;
- we reiterate our proposal to sign bilateral agreements with all Balkan countries, agreements that should also include a code of goodneighbourly relations;
- we have advanced the initiative for all Balkan states to work out and sign a treaty for protection of the ecology on our peninsula and to issue a call on this matter to all countries and peoples of Europe;
- we uphold the further development of multilateral

cooperation in specific areas of common interest such as transport, power generation, science, culture sports, etc.

All this is a concrete expression and a contribution by our country to preserving peace, strengthening confidence and security and maintaining and promoting goodneighbourly relations and cooperation in the Balkans.

Distinguished guests, Comrades.

I took the liberty of sharing with you, as with friends, some considerations on the most topical problems of our modern world, on the tasks facing mankind.

In conclusion, I would like to express our confidence that:

- all peace-loving people ever more clearly see the watershed: on the one side stands the handful of the military and political top crust of the militaristic forces, and on the other the millions of people who are aware of the need to prevent a nuclear catastrophe;
- that all and each one of us are responsible for the cause of peace and must contribue to it;
- we must rally ever more strongly round the banner of peace.

Allow me to wind up with the call which brought us toget her at this international meeting:

- May peace and security triumph in the world! Thank you for your attention.