



General Assembly Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/42/715 J
S/39252
5 November 1987
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-second session

Agenda **items** 41, 56, 62, 66, 69, 73 and 82

REVIEW OF THE EFFICIENCY OF **THE**
ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL
FUNCTIONING OF THE
UNITED NATIONS

PREVENTION OF AN ARMS RACE IN **OUTER** SPACE
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

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

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISARMAMENT
AND DEVELOPMENT

COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL
PEACE AND SECURITY

DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL
ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION

SECURITY **COUNCIL** L
Forty-second year

Letter dated 5 November 1987 from the Permanent **Representative** of
the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the united **Nations**
addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to **transmit** to you herewith the text of the foreign-policy **section** of the address given by the General Secretary of the Central **Committee** of the **Communist** Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. **Mikhail** Gorbachev, at the ceremonial meeting dedicated to **the** seventieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, held in Moscow on 2 November 1987.

I **request** You to arrange for this text to be circulated **as** a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 41, 56, 62, 66, 69, 73 and 82, and also of the Security Council,

(Signed) A. BELONOGOV

ANNEX

The foreign-policy section of the address given on 2 November 1987
by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union at the ceremonial meeting
dedicated to the seventieth anniversary of the Great October
Socialist Revolution

The world would not be as we know it today without the great revolution in Russia. Before that turning point in world history the "right" of the strong and the rich, as well as expansionist wars, were the customary norm of international relations. Soviet rule, whose first legislative act was to promulgate the famous decree on peace, led the struggle against that state of affairs. The land of the Soviets introduced into international practice something that was beyond the realm of big-Power politics - the people's common sense and the interests of the working masses.

During those brief years when Lenin guided Soviet foreign policy, he not only elaborated its underlying principles, but also showed how to apply them in a most unusual and abruptly changing situation. Indeed, contrary to initial expectations, the rupture of the weakest link in the capitalist system was not the "last, decisive battle", but the beginning of a long and complex process.

The major achievement of the founder of the Soviet State was that he eventually perceived the real prospects opening up before the new Russia as a result of the victory in the civil war. He realized that the country had gained not only a breathing-space, but something much greater - "a new period in which our fundamental international existence among the capitalist States has been secured". And Lenin resolutely proposed a policy of learning the art of long-term "cohabitation" with them. As a counterbalance to leftist extremism, he argued that States with different social systems could peacefully coexist.

It took only a year and a half to two years after the civil war to end the international political isolation of the workers' and peasants' State. Treaties were concluded with neighbouring countries and then, at Rapallo, with Germany. Britain, France, Italy, Sweden and other capitalist States accorded diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Republic.

The first steps were taken to bring about equitable relations with the States in the East - China, Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan.

All this was not simply the initial triumphs of Lenin's foreign policy and diplomacy. It was a breakthrough in international affairs. We established the basic thrust of our international policy, which we rightfully call the Leninist policy of peace, mutually advantageous co-operation among States and friendship among peoples.

Of course, not all our subsequent **foreign-policy** efforts were *an* unalloyed **success**. There were miscalculations **as** well, **Both** before and after the Second World War, we did not always succeed in making full **use** of the **opportunities** which had arisen. We were unable to harness the enormous moral authority with which the Soviet Union had emerged from the war in order to consolidate the peace-loving **and** democratic forces and stop those who were fomenting the cold war. **We** did not always respond adequately to imperialist provocations.

Yes, some things could have **been** done **better** and more effectively. Nevertheless, on this solemn occasion **we can** state that the main thrust of **our policy** was always in keeping with the basic course worked out and charted by Lenin, that is, in accordance with the nature of socialism **and its fundamental** commitment to peace.

This was the decisive factor **in** averting the **outbreak** of a nuclear war and preventing the forces of imperialism from winning the cold war. Together with **our** allies we defeated the imperialist strategy of "**rolling back socialism**". The imperialists had to moderate their claims to world domination. At that new **stage**, we were able to draw precisely on the results of our peace-loving policy, devising fresh approaches in the spirit of the new thinking.

Lenin's concept of peaceful coexistence, naturally, underwent change. Initially it was based primarily on the need to create the minimal external conditions for building a new society in the land of the socialist revolution. **But, as** a continuation of the class-oriented policy of the victorious proletariat, peaceful coexistence **eubeequantly**, **and** particularly in the nuclear age, became a **p-erequisite** for the survival of the entire human race.

The April 1985 plenary meeting of the Central **Committee** of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) was a landmark in the development of Leninist thought in this area as well. The Twenty-seventh Congress presented in detail a new concept of foreign policy. The following idea, as we know, serves as its basis in spite of the profoundly contradictory nature of the contemporary world and the **radical** differences among the States comprising it, the world **is** interrelated and interdependent and constitutes an integral whole.

This was brought about by the **internationalization** of world economic ties, the comprehensive nature of the scientific and technological revolution, the fundamentally **new** role played by communications and **the mass media, the state** of the earth's resources, the **common** ecological danger and the glaring social problems of the developing world, which affect everyone. **But** mainly it arose from the problem of human survival: the development of nuclear weapons **and** the threatening prospect of their use have called into question the very survival of the human race.

Thus, Lenin's idea of giving priority to the interests of social development acquired new meaning and **importance**.

Since the April plenary meeting, we have made our **vision** of progress towards a safe and stable world sufficiently clear to all. Our intentions and our determination have been embodied in the decisions taken by the highest political

/...

forum of the party and the people - the Twenty-seventh Congress - and also in the new version of the **CPSU Programme**, the programme for nuclear disarmament set forth in the statement of 15 January 1986, the Delhi Declaration and other **documents** and official **statements** by the leaders of the Soviet Union.

Together with the **other** countries of the socialist **community**, we have undertaken a number of important initiatives in the United Nations, including a proposal for establishing a **comprehensive** system of international peace and **security**. The States parties to the Warsaw Treaty have made a proposal to NATO and all the European countries on reducing armed forces and armaments to a level of reasonable sufficiency and have suggested a comparison of the military doctrines of the two alliances with a view to **making** them exclusively defensive. We have put forward a concrete plan and are actively working to prohibit and eliminate chemical **weapons**. We **have** shown initiative in **devising** effective methods for verifying weapons reduction, including on-site inspection.

We have resolutely advocated strengthening **the authority of the United Nations** and the full and effective use of the powers vested in it and its bodies by the **international community**. We are doing everything in our power to ensure that the United Nations - this universal mechanism of **ours** - can competently discuss and undertake a collective search for ways to balance the interests of all States and effectively carry **out its** peace-making functions.

The **most important thing is that** our conception and **our firm** dedication to peace are reflected in **our** actions, throughout our conduct in international affairs and in the very style of **our foreign policy and diplomacy, which are imbued with a commitment to** dialogue, a frank and honest dialogue conducted with due regard for **mutual** concerns and the advances of world science, without **attempting to** outmanoeuvre or deceive anyone. And so, now that **more than two** years have elapsed, we can state with confidence that **the new political thinking** is not just another declaration or appeal, but a **philosophy** of action - if you will, a philosophy of life. It continues to evolve, keeping pace with the objective **processes under** way in the world. And it is already working.

The October 1986 meeting in Reykjavik **ranks among the events which** have occurred since the new stage in international affairs began, events which deserve to **be mentioned on this occasion and which will go down in history**. It gave a practical **boost to** the new thinking, enabling it to gain ground in the **most** diverse social and political quarters, and made international political contacts more fruitful.

The new way of thinking, with its regard for universal human values and its emphasis on **common** sense and openness, has begun to forge ahead in world affairs, sweeping away the stereotypes of anti-Sovietism and **dispelling** the distrust of **our** initiatives and actions.

Naturally, **gauged** against the scope of the tasks that humanity will have to tackle in order to ensure its survival, very, very little has **so far** been accomplished. **But** a start has **been** made, and the first signs of change have

appeared. A convincing proof of that is the understanding reached with the United States of America to conclude in the very near future an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles.

The conclusion of this agreement is of great importance in itself: it will eliminate for the first time a whole class of nuclear weapons, it will represent the first practical step towards destroying nuclear arsenals, and it will show that it is possible in fact to move in this direction without harm to anyone.

This is unquestionably a major success of the new thinking, the results of our readiness to seek mutually acceptable breakthroughs while strictly preserving the principle of equal security.

Yet the question concerning this agreement was largely settled back in Heykjavik, at our second meeting with the President of the United States.

At such a critical period, the world expects the third and fourth meetings between the leaders of the USSR and the United States to produce more than just a formal acknowledgment of what was agreed to a year ago, more than a mere resumption of the discussion. We are being urged on by the growing danger that weapons may be perfected to the point where they become uncontrollable.

That is why we will work unrelentingly at those meetings for a palpable breakthrough, for tangible results in reducing strategic offensive weapons and banning weapons from outer space - the key to removing the nuclear threat.

What, then, are the grounds for our optimism, for considering that comprehensive security is really attainable? Here it is worth pausing.

At this new turning-point in world history, as we celebrate the seventieth anniversary of our revolution, which would not have triumphed without theoretical preparation, we are examining the theoretical aspects of the prospects for progress towards lasting peace. With the aid of the new thinking, we have largely established that a comprehensive system of international security in the context of disarmament is both necessary and practicable. Now we must prove that movement towards and attainment of this goal is also necessary and practicable. We must identify the laws governing the interaction of forces which, through rivalry, contradictions and conflicting interests, can produce the desired result. In this connection we should begin - and once again from the standpoint of our Leninist teaching, using its methodology - by asking ourselves some searching questions.

The first concerns the nature of imperialism. As we know, it is a primary source of the danger of war.

The nature of a social system cannot, of course, be changed by external factors. But is it possible, given the present stage of the world's development and the new level of its interdependence and integration, to influence the nature of that system in such a way as to block its most dangerous manifestations? In other words, can the laws operating in an integrated world, in which universal human values have high priority, be relied upon to limit the destructive effects of the egocentric, class-oriented laws governing the capitalist system?

The second question is linked with the first: can **capitalism** free itself from militarism and function and develop in **the economic** sphere without it? And is **it** not Utopian on our part to invite the Western countries to draw up and compare programmes for reconverting the economy, that is, switching it over to production for peaceful purposes?

The third question: can the **capitalist** system do without neo-colonialism, **which** is one of the factors essential to its survival? In other words, **is** the **system** capable of functioning shorn of its inequitable trade with the third world, with its unforeseeable consequences?

Another, **related** question: how realistic is the hope that **the awareness** of a the catastrophic danger **facing** the world - which, as we know, is even penetrating **the upper** echelons of the ruling **élite of** the Western world - will be translated into practical **policies**? After all, however **forceful the arguments of common sense, however** well developed the **sense** of responsibility, **however** powerful the instinct for self-preservation, there **are** still things which must **on no account be** underrated and which **are** determined by an economic, and hence, a class, interest.

In other words, we are asking whether **capitalism can** adapt to the conditions of a nuclear-free world, one without armaments, to the conditions of **a** new and **equitable economic** order, to the conditions in which the intellectual and moral **values** of **two** world systems can be compared **honestly**. These **are** far from idle questions. The answer will determine what **course** history will **take in the coming** decades.

But even posing these few questions is enough to grasp the full gravity of the task. The answers will come from life itself. The vindication of our **programme for** a nuclear-free and safe world will not only depend on the soundness of its scientific basis) it will also be tested **by** the course of events, which is **subject** to the most varied factors, many of them new.

And it is already being put to the test. Here, too, we **are** loyal to the Leninist tradition, to the very essence of Leninism - an organic blend of theory and practice, an approach to theory as a tool of practice and to practice as **a** mechanism for verifying theory. This is how we **are** acting, projecting the new thinking on to our foreign-policy **activities**, correcting **and** adjusting it in the light of experience gained from applying the policy.

And so, what are we counting on, knowing that a safe world will have to **be** built jointly with the capitalist countries?

The post-war period has witnessed a profound change in the contradictions that used to determine the major trends in the world's economy and politics. I have in mind, above all, the **trials** **which**, in the past inexorably led to war, to world wars between the **capitalist countries** themselves. Now the situation is different. It is not Only the lessons of the past war but also the fear of sapping its own strength in the face of socialism, by now a **world** system, that have prevented capitalism from carrying its internal contradictions to the **extreme**. These contradictions began to evolve into a technical race against competitors and were

/...

"dampened" by neo-colonialism. A kind of latter-day "peaceful" division of the world has occurred - in line with the rule Lenin identified as "according to capital", the bigger share going to *whoever* is wealthier and stronger at the moment. A number of countries began to ease the tension in their economies by rechanneling resources into the military-industrial complex on the pretext of a "Soviet threat". The changes that occurred within the technological and organisational infrastructure of the capitalist economy also helped to alleviate the contradictions and balance different interests.

But that is not all. If an alliance between a socialist and a capitalist State proved feasible in the past when faced by the threat of fascism, does that not provide an object lesson for the present, when the whole world is facing the threat of a nuclear catastrophe and the need to ensure the safety of nuclear-power production and overcome the danger to the environment?

These are all quite real and threatening issues, demanding that we not only grasp their significance but also seek practical solutions.

A further point: can the capitalist economy develop without militarization? This brings to mind the "economic miracle" that occurred in Japan, West Germany and Italy. It is true that, when the miracle was over, they reverted to militarism; but we must assess to what extent this changeover was founded on the substantive laws governing the operation of contemporary monopoly capital and what role was played by extraneous factors - the "contagious example" of the military-industrial complex in the United States, the situation caused by the cold war, considerations of prestige, the need to have one's own "mailed fist" so as to be able to talk to competitors in a language they understood, and also the desire to back up the economic invasion of the third world with strong-arm politics. Whatever the actual reasons, a period of rapid development of the modern capitalist economy in a number of countries with minimal arms spending did take place, and this experience is now part of history.

This issue can also be viewed from a different angle, the other way round, Ever since the war, the United States economy has been firmly directed towards and dependent on militarism. At first this seemed to stimulate it. But later on, this senseless and socially useless squandering of resources led to an astronomical national debt and to other troubles and setbacks. Over-militarization is increasingly aggravating the domestic situation of the country and upsetting the economies of others. The recent panic on the New York Stock Exchange and other stock exchanges around the world - a panic without precedent in almost 60 years - is a grave symptom, a dire warning.

A third point: the inequitable, exploitative relations with the developing countries. In spite of all the fantastic innovations in creating an "alternative" (man-made) environment, developed capitalism has been and will be unable to do without these countries' resources. That is an undeniable fact.

Reliance on severing the traditional world economic ties is dangerous and offers no solution. But the neo-colonialist methods of using others' resources,

the arbitrary practices of **transnational corporations** and the debt bondage, with obviously unrepayable debts reaching into the trillions of dollars, will **also lead** nowhere. This is also creating serious problems within the capitalist countries **themselves**. There is much speculation on this score) but essentially it **pinpoints** the third world as a kind of scapegoat for the **many** difficulties, including **falling living** standards, in the metropolitan countries.

Time and again attempts **are made** to "**rally the nation**" along chauvinistic **lines**, to lure the working people into a "partnership" for exploiting other countries while **inducing** the workers to accept the **policy** of the latest **form** of capitalist **modernization**. But none of these or similar strategems can **do away** with the problem **itself**. They can **only** mitigate it temporarily. Inequitable trade persists and will eventually culminate in an explosion. It appears that Western leaders are beginning to understand the possibility of such an outcome. **But** in the meantime they are merely responding with various stopgap **measures**.

Indeed, the novelty of the international economic and political trends of our time has not yet been fully **grasped** and assimilated. Yet **this** will have **to be** done, because the **continuing** processes **have the force of an objective law**, **Either** there a disaster will occur or there will **be** joint quest for a new economic order, with due regard for the interests of all parties on **an** equal basis. The way towards establishing such an **order, as we see it** today, can **be discerned: it lies** in putting into practice the concept of "disarmament for **development**".

Thus, in searching for an answer also to our third question, we **see** that the problem does not appear to be insoluble. In this area, too, contradictions can be **modified**. **But this necessitates** understanding reality and devising **practical** actions in the **spirit** of the new thinking. And this, in turn, will facilitate the advance towards a more **secure** world. In a nutshell, here **also** we are facing a historic choice dictated by the laws of our largely interconnected and integrated world.

There is another factor, even a decisive one. **Socialism forms an integral** part of the world we live in. Having embarked upon **its** history 70 years **ago and** then grown into a world system, it has in fact determined the **face** of the twentieth century. Today it is entering upon a new stage of its **development**, demonstrating once again its inherent potentialities.

Imagine, for example, the major possibilities for peaceful coexistence that the Soviet Union's perestroika holds. By ensuring that all our most important economic indicators attain world level, it will enable this vast and immensely **rich** country to take part in the world division of labour **and** resources as it has never done before. Its great scientific, technological and production **potential** will **become** a substantially **more significant** element in world economic relations. And **all** this will decisively expand and strengthen the material foundations for a comprehensive system of peace and international **security**. That, by the way, **is yet** another highly important aspect of perestroika: its appointed place in the destinies of contemporary **civilization**. The class struggle and other manifestations of social contradictions will influence **objective** processes in **favour** of peace.

Loading forces within the labour movement are seeking ways to raise its political level. They have to work in a highly complex, novel and changing environment. Not only questions of safeguarding the economic rights and interests of the masses but also those of the struggle for democracy, including democracy at the work place, are taking on new meaning. For example, workers are often offered "partnership", but one where access to the holy of holies of the business world is hermetically closed and where there can be no question of free choice of management personnel.

The Western world in full of "theories" to the effect that the working class is disappearing, that allegedly it has already become completely dissolved in the "middle stratum", has undergone social regeneration, etc., etc. Yes, the changes within the working class are great and far-reaching. But it is no use the class enemy lulling himself or trying to disorient and confuse the working movement. The working class which today, within its new social boundaries, represents a numerically predominant force, has the potential to play a decisive role, especially at abrupt turning-points in history.

The motive may be provided by a variety of factors. One of the probable ones is the insane militarization of the economy. The fact that the transition to a new stage of the technological revolution is taking place on a militaristic basis is a powerful catalyst, especially as it points towards war and consequently affects all sections of the population and expands the framework of mass protest beyond the limits of economic demands, so that here, too, the ruling class, the lords of monopoly capital, will have to make a choice. We are convinced - and science confirms it - that at the present-day level of technology and organization of production, the reconversion and demilitarization of the economy are possible. At the same time such a choice is also a choice in favour of peace.

The same applies to the consequences of the crisis in relations between the developed and the developing world. If matters reach the brink of an explosion and it proves impossible to continue enjoying the good things of life by exploiting the third world, the question of the inadmissible and intolerable nature of a system unable to exist without such exploitation may acquire - and very acutely, too - a political dimension. In sum, from this point of view as well capitalism faces a harsh choice: whether to let matters reach breaking point or to reckon with the laws of an interconnected and integrated world which demands a balance of interests on a basis of equality.

And the situation, as we see it, makes this not only necessary but also possible - especially as there are forces in the third world itself acting in the same direction.

It is a commonplace to talk about the decline of the national liberation movement. But those who do so are obviously juggling with concepts and ignoring the novelty of the situation. If they have in mind the impulse for liberation which was operative at the stage of struggle for political independence, then, of course, that impulse is slackening, as is only natural. But the impulse needed for the new, the current stage of development of the third world is only just taking

shape. We have to **recognize** this clearly and not yield to **pessimism**. The **factors** of which this impulse is constituted are varied and **non-homogeneous**. They include **a powerful economic process which sometimes assumes paradoxical form**. For example, **some countries**, while retaining features of underdevelopment, are rising to the level of major Powers in world **economy and politics**.

These factors also include the build-up of **political energies in the process** of the forming of nations **and the strengthening of nation-states in the true sense** of the **term**, countries with revolutionary regimes **occupying a substantial place among them**. And then there are the grapes of wrath **growing** from the **crude polarization** of poverty and wealth, the contrast **between possibilities and the real state of affairs**.

National identity, national self-reliance is a **force becoming** increasingly pronounced and active in **organizations** which reflect the **processes of the** developing countries' inter-State consolidation. This is characteristic to a greater or lesser degree of all such organizations, which are **numerous**: the Organisation of African Unity, the League of Arab States, ASEAN, the Organization of American States, the Latin American Economic System, the South Pacific Forum, the South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation, the Organisation of the Islamic Conference **and, especially**, the Non-Aligned Movement. They **reflect a** kaleidoscope of contradictory interests, needs, **demands, ideologies, claims** and prejudices **specific** to the present stage of history. Although **they have already become a noticeable factor in world politics**, none of them has as yet opened up all its possibilities. **But** their potential is colossal and **it is difficult to predict** the results even for the next half-century.

One thing is **clear**: this is a whole world seeking organisational forms for **its effective participation on an equal footing in resolving problems common to mankind**. Behind it stand two and a half billion people. And we are entitled to guess **that** it will take seven-league strides in terms not only of **its effects upon world politics** but also of its original role in shaping the world **economy** of the future.

For all **the** might of the transnational corporations, they will not determine the third world's **course**; more likely, they will have to adjust to the independent choices made by the peoples themselves. And the peoples, and the organizations representing them, have a vital stake in a new world economic order.

There is another important point to be made. In the **last few decades**, development within the capitalist **world** proper has spawned new forms of **social dissent** and movements. There are movements to counter the nuclear threat, to protect the environment, to counter racial **discrimination**, to oppose policies that **split society** into the fortunate and the doomed, **and to avert calamity in entire industrial areas sacrificed to the latest round of capitalist modernization**. These movements involve **millions of people**; they are inspired and led by prominent figures in science and culture, people of national and international standing.

Social-democratic, socialist and labour parties and similar or related **mass organizations** play a **consistently large** part in the political **process in several** countries, and in **some places they are** increasing their influence. **Thus, according** to all the parameters - economic, political **and social** - we see that in the modern world an assertion which Lenin held to be one of the **most profound in Marxism is** everywhere **being** vindicated: **as historical action gains in soundness**, the number of people involved in it will grow. This is always **a sure sign, and the most** potent element, of social progress and, **consequently**, of peace.

In fact, what **is** grand and new about **our age is that the peoples appear more** and more **clearly** and openly in the limelight of history. They now occupy positions which make it necessary to reckon with them immediately, **not at the end of the day**. This brings into sharp focus another new truth; constant **choice is** becoming **increasingly** typical of **the** course of history at the **threshold of** the twenty-first century. The rightness of our choices depends on the extent to which the interests and aspirations of millions, hundreds of millions of **people are heeded**.

Hence the politicians' responsibility, for policy **can be effective only if** allowance is made for this novel feature of the **times: the human factor** now **figures** in politics not **as a** remote, **more or less** random product of the lives, activities and intentions of the **masses**. It bursts right in on world affairs. Unless we understand that - in other words, in the absence of new thinking that **draws** support from present-day realities and the will of the people, politics **becomes** an unpredictable, impromptu affair which poses **risks** both at **home** and **in** other countries. Politics of this kind has no **lasting** support.

These are the **reasons** for **our** optimistic **view of the future and the prospects** for the creation of **a comprehensive system of international security**.

There is also a perfectly logical link between this **and our stand on defence**. As long as there is a danger of war and social revanchism **remains the backbone of** Western strategies and **military** programmes, we shall continue to do **everything** necessary to sustain our **defence** capability at a level which **makes the military** supremacy of **imperialism** over socialism unattainable.

During these celebrations, we pay due tribute **to** the accomplishments of the world communist movement. The October Revolution, which **has retained to this day** its international momentum, is the source of the movement's vitality. The international communist movement is growing and developing on its native soil, but there is something universal in the very image of **a Communist, no matter what his** nationality, no matter in what country he is working. This **"something"** is devotion to the idea of a better, **communist society, loyalty to the workers - above all the** working class, and struggle for their fundamental interests **and for peace and** democracy.

I feel that the third **Communist** International deserves to **be** mentioned on this anniversary. The entire truth of the matter still has to **be** resurrected and a **true**, complete history of it has yet to be written. For all its **shortcomings and** miscalculations, **and** bitter though it is to recall some **chapters of its history**,

the **Comintern** is part of **our** movement's great past. Born of the October Revolution, it not only became a school of internationalism and revolutionary brotherhood, it turned internationalism into a practical instrument of struggle for the interests of the working people and the social progress of nations large and small. It produced companies of true twentieth-century knights, men of honour and responsibility, of noble aspirations and unflinching courage, who identified with the sufferings of the millions of the oppressed all over the world, heard their pleas and roused them to struggle.

Communists were the first to sound the alarm about the danger of fascism, the first to rise against it, and its first victims. They came from all over the world to be the first to engage in an armed struggle against fascism, in Spain. They were the first to raise the banner of resistance in the name of their peoples' freedom and national dignity. Communists, above all Soviet Communists, made a decisive contribution to the crushing defeat of fascism in the Second World War.

Now, as then, **Communists** display the same implacability and courage as front rank fighters against reaction and obscurantism of every description. They are people of legendary heroism and self-sacrifice. Not isolated individuals, but hundreds of thousands of them, organized and united by a single will, iron discipline and incorruptible idealism.

The time of the **Comint.**, the Information Bureau and even of binding international conferences is past. But the international communist movement lives on. All parties are completely and irreversibly autonomous. That was stated as early as the twentieth Congress. It is true that the old ways were not cast off immediately, now, though, it is an unassailable reality. In this sense, the Twenty-seventh Congress of CPSU also marked a definitive, irreversible transition. I think we have proved as much in our relations with fraternal parties in the course of perestroika.

The international communist movement is at a watershed, as are world progress itself and the forces behind it. The communist parties are seeking new ground amid the profound changes of the dawning century. But their international movement is undergoing a revival, is being drawn together by a regard for similarly revised standards of confidence, equality and genuine solidarity. It is open to dialogue, collaboration, interaction and alliance with any other revolutionary, democratic and progressive forces.

CPSU harbours no doubts about the future of the communist movement - the custodian of the alternative to capitalism, a movement of the boldest and most consistent campaigners for peace, independence and progress in their own countries and friendship between all the nations on earth.

Comrades, the most important landmark in world history since the October Revolution has been the emergence of a world socialist system. Four decades have already gone by since socialism became the common destiny of many peoples and an important factor of contemporary civilization.

Our Party and the Soviet people value highly the **possibility** of **interacting** with friends upon **whom, as upon us**, State responsibility for socialism, for the **advance** of **socialism**, has rested for **the** past few **decades**. All the socialist States have accumulated a great deal of interesting and Useful experience in solving **social, economic** and ideological **problems** and in building a new life. **The socialist system** and **the endeavours** and experience it has tested in practice are a matter of importance to humanity at large. The socialist **system** has proposed to the world its **answers** to the central **issues** of human existence: **it** has **proved** its **humanist** and collectivist **values**, at whose centre stands the working human being. **The socialist system** instils in that being a **sense** of dignity, of **being** master of his country, protects him socially, gives him confidence in the future. It **opens up** unlimited access to knowledge and culture and creates the conditions necessary for the full development of individual abilities and gifts.

The **achievements** of the peoples of the socialist countries are the **object** of **our common** pride - the more so as they **are** the result of many **years** of fruitful co-operation, the fruits of truly fraternal association, unparalleled in its breadth and openness of their citizens - of Party and **public organizations**, production collectives, creative **associations and** cultural institutions, of family and **personal** links, of the joint **labour** and study of tens of thousands of people.

When **you** have climbed to a certain height **you** can **see many** things **more** clearly. Life **has** introduced corrections **in** our ideas about the laws governing the transition to socialism, **about** the time-limits involved, our understanding of the role of socialism on a world scale,

We are far from thinking that all progressive **changes** taking place in the world are due to socialism alone. But the way in which the **problems** most important to mankind are posed and in which the search for their solution is proceeding confirms that there exists an **indissoluble** link between world progress and socialism as an **international** force. That link is particularly evident in the struggle for the prevention of nuclear catastrophe and **in** the existence of a balance of world forces which gives different peoples a **better** chance to defend their social and political choices.

Accumulated experience **is** helping to **build mutual** relations between **socialist countries** more soundly upon generally accepted principles. They are: unconditional and complete equality; responsibility of the ruling party for **the** affairs of its State, patriotic service of its **people**; concern for the **common cause** of socialism; respect for one another, a serious attitude towards what has **been** achieved and tested **by friends**, voluntary co-operation in many forms; strict observance **by** all of the principles of peaceful coexistence. The practice of socialist internationalism rests **upon** these foundations.

The world of **socialism** appears before **us** today in all the variety of its national and social forms. And this is **good**, it is healthy. We have become convinced that being united does not **by** any means signify being identical, being uniform. **We** have also **become convinced** that socialism has not and cannot have a "model" to which everyone **must** conform.

The criterion of the development of socialism at any given stage and in any country is the sum total of genuine successes in reorganizing society in the interests Of Working people and the quality of those successes.

We are aware, too, of the damage that can be caused by a slackening of the internationalist principle in mutual relations between socialist States, by departures from the principle of mutual benefit and mutual assistance, by lack of attention to the common interests of socialism in actions in the world arena.

We note with satisfaction that our relations with all socialist States have Of late gained in dynamism and are being perfected. And, of course, co-operation within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty and CMEA has become more fruitful and more business-like - which, however, in no way sets their members fundamentally apart from other socialist countries.

The Twenty-seventh Congress has clearly defined the position of CPSU, in politics and in all other spheres of our interaction with each socialist country. the decisive element is that which ensures the combination of mutual interest with the interests of socialism as a whole. The strengthening of friendship and the development by all possible means of co-operation with the socialist countries is the top priority of the Soviet Union's international policy. In welcoming the delegations of socialist countries today, we salute in their person the peoples of the socialist countries.