

SP2AEU

2nd draft

20 March

SPEECH IN MOSCOW

Introduction

Mr. General Secretary, Mr. Chairman,

Ministers and fellow guests.

I am proud to address the distinguished members of the Soviet leadership in this historic place.

Ya ochen rada opyats nakhoditsya v

Moskvye.

(I am very glad to be here in Moscow again.)

The Kremlin has been witness to many of the most momentous events in the history of your great nation.

I am proud to say that one of my most distinguished predecessors, Sir Winston Churchill, came here in 1942.

Speaking then, he said that he would not have come to Moscow unless he had felt sure that he would be able to discuss

realities.

I echo his words.

I thank you for inviting me to make this visit

- the first official visit by a British  
Prime Minister to the Soviet Union for 12  
years - and for your hospitality and warm  
reception.

Many people, very many people, in Britain  
remember vividly the highly successful  
visit which you paid us, Mr. General  
Secretary, just over two years ago.

One of the things which all those who met you

then remember most clearly is your

*direct approach.*  
~~refreshing frankness and directness.~~

We like that.

Indeed, I have a modest reputation in that

<sup>way</sup>  
~~direction~~ myself.

The relations between our two countries can  
only be sound if each side knows precisely  
what the other thinks, and <sup>the reasons why</sup> ~~why it thinks~~  
~~it.~~

And of course we can each learn something  
from the other.

You may recall that Yevgeny Onegin, the  
hero of one of Alexander Pushkin's novels,

learned all his knowledge of political  
economy from the British.

One of the first things we are told about  
him is:

"He spurned Greek poetry and myth,

But how he knew his Adam Smith!

As an economist profound

He understood and could expound

The means by which a state gets wealthy

And how its livelihood's controlled.

Smith said it has no need of gold -

Producing goods will keep it healthy.

(Yevgency Onegin, Chpt. 1, Stanza)

Our Starting Point

So, Mr. General Secretary, I want to use this  
opportunity to explain why we think the  
way we do on major issues.

And <sup>low</sup>~~where~~ we see the way forward.

I know that memories of the Second World War

are vivid in your country.

So they are in ours.

After all, we fought alone against the

Nazi menace for two years.

*Written*

The Soviet Union suffered unimaginable and

tragic loss of life and runious damge

*i* battles fought on your own soil.

As a young woman, I followed with anguish but also with admiration the suffering and the heroism of the Russian people.

That bravery and fortitude is as evident today.

A few weeks ago I was visited by one of your firemen who had fought the blaze at the Chernobyl nuclear power station with such outstanding courage.

He had been one of the first to enter the reactor, heedless of his personal safety.

He told me that special badges had been struck for the 24 members of his unit.

But 6 of them had died from burns and radiation.

Their badges were not needed.

He gave me one.

I wear it with pride this evening.

The achievements of our society

Mr. General Secretary, we in Britain are proud

of our achievements in

the forty years since that War.

We have created a society - and you were  
able to see it for yourself - in which our  
people enjoy an unprecedentedly high  
standard of living.

They travel abroad freely on business and for pleasure.

They enjoy a free press, freedom of worship and the rule of law.

They choose their own government from among several competing political parties - a process to which personally I look forward with confidence.

Our market economy has brought them unparalleled prosperity.

*Jan Paul  
Marti's book*

We don't pretend to have all the answers.

Unemployment is too high.

Our education system is not producing enough of the engineers and technicians whom we need to keep ourselves at the forefront of new technology.

We face major problems in some of the older industries.

There are problems of deprivation and

inner city decay to be overcome.

Nonetheless we believe that our particular way  
of life suits us best.

We are proud of it.

Frankly we believe it is better than the  
alternative systems which we see tried  
elsewhere.

And we are ready to put that belief to the  
test in peaceful competition.

But although we think our system is best, we do not want to force it on anyone else.

If you look at many of the countries which once made up the British Empire, you will see that they have chosen many different systems: parliamentary democracy, guided democracy, state socialism, parliamentary democracy.

That is their right and we do not

challenge it.

We are ready to fight the battle of ideas,  
by letting the results of our own  
democratic system speak for themselves.

But we will not accept attempts by others to  
impose their political views by armed  
force or subversion.

The role of NATO and of nuclear weapons in  
keeping the peace

We also know that our present prosperity has  
been made possible by the fact that  
we have enjoyed peace in Europe for over  
forty years.

Peace does not come about by declarations of  
faith.

Or by demonstrations.

Or by propaganda.

In a divided world riven by suspicion it comes from the absolute determination of a free people to defend their national independence and to maintain the forces necessary to do so.

And from the readiness of likeminded nations to join together for their common defence.

Mr. General Secretary, if peace is to be  
preserved - as both our nations wish - it  
is important that we should be realistic.

We in the West find our security in the North  
Atlantic Alliance which binds Europe and  
the United States.

It is a defensive Alliance.

We threaten no-one.

NATO has given a solemn assurance.

None of its weapons will ever be used  
except in response to an attack.

Some people make the mistake of believing  
that Europe can be divided from the United  
States.

Because NATO is a voluntary association of  
free nations, you will <sup>Sometimes</sup> ~~often~~ hear  
criticism of the United States in Europe,

and frustration with Europe in the United States.

That is the hallmark of democratic societies.

The readiness to welcome dissent as a strength, not reject it as a weakness.

~~###~~

But on the fundamentals and in our determination to defend our democratic values we are inseparable.

We also need to be realistic about nuclear weapons.

We might wish that they had <sup>never</sup> ~~not~~ been  
~~thought of.~~ <sup>wanted</sup>

We might yearn for a world free <sup>from</sup> ~~of~~ nuclear  
weapons, indeed of all weapons of <sup>mass</sup>  
destruction.

But nuclear weapons exist and the  
knowledge of how to make them cannot be  
erased.

They have kept the peace in Europe for  
forty years.

Let us never forget the horrors of  
conventional wars and the hideous  
sacrifice of those who have suffered in  
them.

→ Nuclear weapons have deterred not only  
nuclear war but conventional war as well.

A world without nuclear weapons is a cruel illusion, at least in your lifetime and mine, Mr. General Secretary. Without profound changes in the relations between East and West, based on a degree of trust and confidence in each other's intentions which is simply not conceivable at present, it would be a less stable and less peaceful world.

I recall to you some words of Sir Winston

Churchill:

"be careful above all things not to let go  
of the atomic weapon until you are sure,  
and more than sure, that other means of  
preserving peace are in your hands."

I believe that the honest course is to  
recognise that fact.

To accept that security can be found with  
*Jan* fewer nuclear weapons.

But to acknowledge also that the deterrent  
effect of weapons which can inflict  
unacceptable damage on an aggressor will  
remains a necessary defence:

- against the temptation to exploit  
superior strength in other sorts of  
weapons;
- ~~and against attempts to achieve by~~

force what cannot be achieved by  
peaceful means.

That is why <sup>the</sup> ~~my~~ government <sup>has</sup> will not abandon the  
security provided for our country and for  
the NATO Alliance by nuclear weapons.

Not because we are any less committed to  
peace than you are. *Peace with freedom*

*Peace is founded on a sense of life  
experience has taught us how*  
But because ~~we take a hard-headed view of~~  
how peace can best be maintained.

Our own nuclear forces will remain at the minimal level we need to guarantee our own security and contribute to the security of our Allies.

*Plus*  
~~It~~ may be very small compared to the forces of the Soviet Union.

But for us <sup>*US*</sup> ~~it is, and~~ will remain, crucial.

The grounds for hope

Mr. General Secretary, every nation has the right to be secure and feel secure.

Because it is only when we each enjoy security that we feel confident enough to begin the process of reducing the burden of armaments.

That process needs first of all greater trust.

It will not come easily.

~~We cannot just erase the pages of history.~~

~~We have been antagonists.~~

Profound differences between our way of  
life and political systems will remain.

But it is the task of leaders to offer their  
people hope.

And I see grounds for hope at present.

We are one world

We are increasingly one world.

National boundaries are no longer absolute barriers which keep our countries in separate compartments.

We learned that and you learned that in the tragic disaster of Chernobyl.

More and more we face problems that we can

only solve together.

We see changes taking place in the Soviet Union

We are also following with great interest the changes taking place in the Soviet Union. Secrecy breeds fear and suspicion. Greater openness and democratisation in your society can have an immense impact on international confidence.

We welcome the steps which have already been taken and we hope for more.

The extent to which you, the Soviet Government, meet the commitments which you have freely undertaken in the Helsinki Final Act determines how far other countries and other peoples have confidence in the undertakings you give on other matters.

I listen with understanding to the many calls which I hear for the release of prisoners of conscience and of those who have expressed dissent, as well as for the granting of exit visas to those who wish to leave the Soviet Union.

The more you respond to these calls - and *gladly* I acknowledge the steps which have been taken - the greater the readiness which

you will find in the West to believe that peaceful and friendly relations with the Soviet Union can be maintained.

Dealing with regional issues

Confidence and trust will also be created if we can tackle some of the regional issues which give rise to tension between us.

I have in mind particularly Afghanistan.

You yourself, Mr. General Secretary, have called Afghanistan a "bleeding wound".

The principles for a solution are clearly accepted by the international community:

- the complete ~~and immediate~~ withdrawal of Soviet forces;
  
- the right to self-determination of the

Afghan people;

- the safe and honourable return of the  
several million refugees;

- the restoration of Afghanistan's  
independence and non-alignment.

We shall support any move towards a genuine  
settlement based on these principles which

will allow an independent Afghanistan to live in friendly relations with its neighbours, including of course the Soviet Union.

The Middle East also desperately needs peace.

The Member States of the European Community last month declared their support for the principle of an international conference to discuss the

Arab/Israel conflict.

The Soviet Union and Britain could help by encouraging the parties to the conflict to narrow their differences so that a conference can be convened with a real prospect of making progress towards a settlement.

*log-ten*

The sincerity of the United States

There is another important ground for hope, Mr. General Secretary.

I believe that in the President of the United States you have someone whose commitment to peace is deep and genuine; who will negotiate firmly and vigorously for his country's best interests, but

whose deepest wish is to see peace  
prevail.

I hope that the Soviet leadership will be  
ready to respond in kind.

Arms Control

At the same time as we tackle the causes  
of mistrust, we should treat their  
symptoms.

The moment is a good one to set about the task of reducing the burden of armaments and freeing more resources for the standard of living of our people.

I do not believe that we can sensibly aspire to achieve an all-embracing arms control agreement in one leap.

The practical way forward lies in a

progressive approach based on smaller,  
more attainable steps.

The main ones are clear to us all:

- an INF agreement with restraints on  
shorter-range systems;
  
- a 50% cut in United States and Soviet  
strategic offensive systems; and

- a world-wide ban on chemical weapons.

You recognised the validity of this step by step approach, Mr. General Secretary, in your statement of 28 February, in which you proposed the conclusion of a separate INF agreement.

I very much hope that such an agreement can be reached.

But at each stage we must seek undiminished security at lower levels of weapons.

And in judging the security, we have to look at the whole range of armaments, not just one category.

We cannot just swap one threat for another.

In removing medium-range missiles, we cannot leave the nations of Western Europe

more vulnerable to another Eastern  
superiority, in shorter range nuclear  
weapons.

Negotiations to remove imbalance in these  
are, for us, equally indispensable.

So too will be negotiations to deal with the  
massive imbalance in the Soviet Union's  
favour in conventional forces.

You yourself recently proposed Mr. General

Secretary that the way to deal with this is not for the one with less to increase his forces but for the one with more to reduce them.

I agree entirely.

Deep cuts in strategic weapons should also be within our reach.

If properly balanced and carefully verified they should enable both sides to

preserve their security.

There is no reason to hold such reductions

hostage to limitations on the United

States' research programme on Strategic

Defence. *There is no way in which any country can stop the onward march of science. Man will forever seek to enlarge his knowledge and his control. Unhappily, this has led to discoveries which*

*of the armaments which will forever seek to enlarge his knowledge and his control. Unhappily, this has led to discoveries which*

It is well established and quite natural

that both the United States and the Soviet

Union are doing work in this field.

In your case, this is combined with

*have need an enormous difference do the kind of work of people in most countries of the world the world over. You cannot stop research & development - but we can seek to negotiate on how & its results can be applied.*

significant upgrading of your ABM defences round Moscow.

It is only common sense that this research should be taken to the point of establishing whether strategic defence systems are feasible.

But deployment, if it occurs, would have to be a matter for genuine negotiation.

What is needed now is an agreement which



I would remind you of what President Reagan and

I agreed at Camp David in December 1984.

The aim of any strategic defence system

should be to enhance not undercut

deterrence, not to achieve superiority

but to maintain balance.

The elimination of chemical weapons is a

hardly less important goal.

Both our countries have been working hard

in Geneva to achieve it.

I am encouraged by recent progress.

We must continue these efforts, with our  
respective Allies and with third  
countries.

Agreements in these three areas, with provision  
for strict verification in each case,  
would be a very remarkable achievement.  
I do not believe that it makes practical

sense to try to look beyond them.

If we are too ambitious, we risk  
sacrificing what can be achieved now.

### Bilateral Relations

Since your visit to the United Kingdom,

Mr. General Secretary, we have made modest  
but useful advances in our bilateral  
relations.

We have seen greater co-operation in energy and in agriculture.

But our trade has not developed as fast as we hoped.

When you came to Britain, you set a target of 40 per cent or 50 per cent for the expansion of our trade.

We have fallen well short of that.

We hope that the new structure of foreign trading in the Soviet Union will set us on

a new course.

Tomorrow we shall witness the signing of some

agreements between our two governments.

One of them sets out an ambitious

programme of exchanges, to improve

communication between us.

I attach very great importance to that.

We would like to see many more of your

young people come to Britain to see for

themselves.

And we would like to send more of ours to the Soviet Union.

The free movement of people and ideas is an essential part of creating trust.

#### Conclusion

Mr. General Secretary, Mr. Chairman, my visit takes place at a time of change in your

country.

You have called it a time of revolution.

Not long ago you implied that some in the West were hostile to this process of change.

So far as Britain is concerned, that is not true.

We welcome the opportunities which we hope these changes will bring - both for your

people and for the hopes of peace between East and West.

Despite our differences, we have one overriding interest in common: that there should never be a conflict between our peoples.

So, Mr. General Secretary, I raise my glass to you and to the success of the course on which you are embarked.

You carry our sincere good wishes.

I raise my glass to the well being of the  
peoples of your great country.

I raise my glass to all my Soviet hosts in  
gratitude for their magnificent  
hospitality.

And I raise my glass to a relationship of  
goodwill and mutual respect between our

two countries.

- Za vashe zdorovye. Zhelayu vam

uspyekha. (To your health: I wish you

success)