

Mikhail Gorbachev's reply to Harare Appeal

Here follows the full text of the reply by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee, to the Harare Appeal, which he has addressed to the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, Prime Minister Robert Gabriel Mugabe of Zimbabwe:



Esteemed Comrade Mugabe,

I have studied carefully the Harare Appeal conveyed to me on October 8, 1986, by your special envoy, Foreign Minister Witness Mangwende of Zimbabwe.

This document expresses justified concern about the nuclear arms race and shows awareness of the exigent need for urgent action to save human civilisation. We understand very well this grave concern on the part of the heads of state and government of the non-aligned countries, which represent the larger part of the population on this planet.

We think highly of the position taken by the 8th Non-Aligned Summit in Harare on issues connected with the nuclear danger and of the Non-Aligned Movement's unique contribution to international development, and are convinced that this contribution will keep growing steadily.

You know well that the Soviet Union, following its foreign policy of principle and the directives of the 27th Congress of the CPSU, has put forward of late, both unilaterally and jointly with its allies, a whole package of peace initiatives embracing virtually all aspects of the problem of disarmament.

The march of events in the world, most notably the dangerous implications of the US Administration's policy, has made it imperative, and this was reflected at the Harare Conference which brought together the leaders of nearly 100 non-aligned countries, that a political will be displayed and decisive action taken to bridle the nuclear arms race.

Being aware of its responsibility for the fate of peace and international security, the Soviet leadership decided to seek a meeting with US President Ronald Reagan without delay.

Such a meeting was held on our initiative in Reykjavik. The position of the USSR is a forthright, bold and open one. Making for solutions to the cardinal issues of reducing and eliminating nuclear arms, it is based on the principles of equality and equal security and takes account of the interests of both countries and their allies. At the same time, and I would like to stress this, it meets the interests of all other countries and peoples.

This is why the platform we have advanced in Reykjavik has met with understanding in many countries, including non-aligned ones, and in the

most diverse political and public circles. We believe that our platform of interconnected proposals, which are carefully balanced from the standpoint of the interests of the negotiating parties themselves and of the entire community of countries, is a concrete manifestation of a new approach, of a new mentality which is necessitated by the realities of the nuclear-missile age.

My statements on the results of the Reykjavik meeting as well as the special envoys we have sent to a number of countries have provided detailed and objective information about that meeting and our evaluation of it. This relieves me of the need to dwell in detail once again on the positions of the Soviet Union and the United States at those talks. Let me remind you only that the compromise proposals tabled by the Soviet Union in Reykjavik offered a real possibility of reaching agreements on the problems of overriding importance to mankind, such as those of destroying nuclear weapons, banning nuclear tests and keeping arms out of space.

It did not prove possible, alas, to convert the understanding on the major problems of world politics, which had been practically achieved, into accords that would be binding on the signatories. This was due to the stubborn US striving towards implementing its militarist SDI programme and thus setting off a race in new kinds of arms.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it opposes to the 'Star Wars' plans a constructive alternative of launching large-scale co-operation in the peaceful exploration and uses of outer space.

The United States did not show readiness to hold talks either on another issue which had given rise to concern at the non-aligned summit—the

issue of ending and banning nuclear tests.

I have said on more than one occasion already that its attitude to this issue has become today the most graphic indicator of how seriously each of the major nuclear powers looks at disarmament, international security and the cause of peace in general. It is with every reason that we as well as others see the US refusal to join the moratorium as a striving to gain military superiority and continue the arms race, extending it into new areas, especially outer space.

As to the issue of the next Soviet-US summit meeting mentioned in the Harare Appeal, we are still for such a meeting, but on the indispensable understanding that it should be productive and take account of the objective fact that Reykjavik has brought about a fundamentally new international situation, the problem of nuclear disarmament has been advanced to a new, further frontier, and backpedalling from it is unacceptable and inadmissible.

We have given due attention to the declaration of readiness by the Harare summitters to continue to play an active role in accomplishing the task of ensuring international peace and security. Let me assure you, Comrade Chairman, that the Soviet Union, for its part, is also determined to continue active co-operation and interaction with the non-aligned countries—an influential and progressive force of the times—in solving the burning problems which face mankind today.

We believe that everything must be done so that the chance that has appeared for resolving the problems of war and peace in the interests of all mankind will not be missed.

With sincere respect,
Mikhail Gorbachev.

Mikhail Gorbachev's letter to Indian schoolgirl

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has sent a letter to Godavarthi Bobby Priskila Praveena in reply to her message to him and the Prime Minister of India Rajiv Gandhi. The letter says:

Dear Praveena,

Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to read your letter to Mr Rajiv Gandhi and myself earlier.

I am glad that you, an Indian schoolgirl, enjoyed your holiday in Artek, a genuine school of friendship for children from different parts of the world. As I saw for myself when I visited it last year, Soviet-Indian friendship could really set an example of good relations for other countries. Fruitful today, it promises to be even more so tomorrow.

I now come to the most important thing I want to tell you. If children, usually given to playing

and laughing, are thinking of imminent danger, it is high time for us, adults, to realise that the world has come to a critical point. The only way back from the edge of the precipice lies in the elimination of nuclear weapons. We should no longer make and perfect them. The Soviet Union is willing to take that approach and appeals to the world to do the same. It will be a difficult road to cover, and whether we make it to our goal does not depend on us alone.

We must all pool our efforts for the sake of the Earth, the home we all share.

The Soviet Union, for its part, will do everything in its power so that you and other children can grow up, study and do fine things on our peaceful planet.

I wish you happiness and every success.

Sincerely yours,
Mikhail Gorbachev.

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|--|--------|
| Mikhail Gorbachev's reply to Harare Appeal | p. 461 |
| Mikhail Gorbachev meets international trade union delegation | p. 462 |
| Nikolai Ryzhkov's speech at CMEA session | p. 463 |
| Statement by Soviet representative at UN | p. 465 |
| Soviet economy in 1986: pace of restructuring | p. 467 |

Mikhail Gorbachev meets international trade union delegation

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had a meeting on October 31 with a delegation from the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU).

The delegation consisted of Sandor Gaspar, WFTU President and Chairman of the Central Council of Hungarian Trade Unions, Ibrahim Zakaria, WFTU Secretary-General, and the following WFTU Vice-Presidents: Roberto Veiga, General Secretary of the Confederation of Cuban Workers; Karel Hoffmann, Chairman of the Central Council of the Revolutionary Trade Union Movement of Czechoslovakia; Indrajit Gupta, Secretary-General of the All-India Trade Union Council; Henri Krasucki, Secretary-General of the French General Confederation of Labour (CGT); Stepan Shalayev, Chairman of the Soviet All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and Harry Tisch, Chairman of the Central Board of the Confederation of Free German Trade Unions.

Sandor Gaspar handed to Mikhail Gorbachev a message from the 11th World Trade Union Congress, which was held in Berlin in September. The message is also addressed to US President Ronald Reagan and UN Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar.

The participants in the meeting shared with Mikhail Gorbachev their impressions of the Berlin Congress. They appraised the Congress as a new phenomenon in the trade union movement, and saw its programme as the starting point for very serious work meeting present-day requirements.

They expressed their considerations—with due regard for the experience of their countries and know-how gained from participation in the international trade union movement—on the responsibility of the international working class movement, in particular of WFTU, for the preservation of peace, for the new tasks and

difficulties encountered by the trade unions at the present stage, and on how the problems of disarmament and development have drawn close to the protection of the immediate interests of the working people and to the plans for perfecting the socialist society.

Interesting ideas were expressed about ways to enhance the prestige, independence and role of trade unions in the world arena and within the national framework, and about their potentialities in resolving the topical problems of the present.

Everybody was unanimous that the Soviet Union's foreign policy, especially its programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons, which has been so impressively and specifically mirrored at the Reykjavik meeting, opens up new perspectives in the fight for mankind's survival and imposes enormous new responsibility on the working class and its trade unions.

Everybody noted that the dynamism of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, which upholds general human values, above all peace on Earth, and the deep-going restructuring in socialist society have considerably heightened the interest of the working class and the whole mass of the working people in the world in socialist ideas, in socialism.

Receiving the message, Mikhail Gorbachev congratulated the comrades on the success of the Congress and pointed out that it was an important milestone. He backed the opinion that the implementation of the documents adopted there would require strenuous efforts to work in a new way, with due regard for specific features and responsibility at this juncture.

The message expresses the will of the working class, which mirrors the general human interest. The contents of the message, and its unanimous approval also by representatives of the trade unions that are not affiliated to the WFTU, is proof that new thinking is becoming increasingly widespread and is grasping the minds of the mass of the people.

Mikhail Gorbachev characterised the sources

of Soviet foreign policy: the essence of the socialist society, the awareness of the real nuclear threat to mankind, the conviction that with all its contradictory and diverse character the present-day world is a mutually interconnected integrity, which has its common problems and dictates the need for mutually acceptable decisions. History and the course of peaceful competition will judge which system is better.

Such are the dialectics on which the foreign policy concept of the 27th Congress of the CPSU is built. It allows us to look into the future optimistically and demonstrates the confidence of socialism in its own strength and in its righteousness.

Mikhail Gorbachev gave the participants in the meeting a broad panorama of the transformations started in Soviet society—through invigorating the human factor, through democratisation, a powerful social policy, perfection of the economic machinery and economic management. Work collectives and trade unions are called upon to play a tremendous role in all this.

Mikhail Gorbachev also spoke about the concrete measures being taken to enhance the prestige and independence of the Soviet trade unions, to strengthen their functions in the defence of the interests of the working people and to increase their vigorousness on issues of socio-economic and spiritual reconstruction and in relations with managers of the economy, administration and government bodies. The renewal in the activity of the Soviet trade unions is also evidence of the deep-going transformations of the whole of society, of an impressive broadening of socialist democracy.

The trade unions have a great role and responsibility in ensuring that the switching over of the economy onto an advanced scientific and technical basis should, unlike what is happening in the West, be turned to the advantage of the working man and exclude negative consequences damaging to his interests.

The enhancement of the role of the trade unions is also of tremendous international significance, especially in a situation of unprecedented onset by the conservative forces against the trade unions.

Much attention was devoted to questions pertaining to the pooling of the efforts of the working class and trade union movement in international terms. The organisations of the working class and the working people acting in different countries differ from each other. This is natural even for the socialist world. But they have the same roots, they are connected by the very essence and historical predestination of the working class. Unity is also necessitated by their responsibility for the destinies of the world and the determination of big business to destroy the trade union movement.

The tasks of the defence of the democratic and socialist values of the trade union movement are drawing closer. The effort to find a common language understandable to the trade union masses the world over on the basis of the ideas that are consonant with the requirements of the times—this is the way to develop a dialogue between various trade unions and increase the international strength of the trade unions.

The meeting was in the character of a lively, self-critical and profoundly comradely exchange of views, and proceeded in an atmosphere of mutual trust and optimism.

Anatoli Dobrynin, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, also took part in the meeting.

Gorbachev meets India's foreign minister

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received in the Kremlin on Monday Narayan Dutt Tiwari, India's External Affairs Minister.

Mikhail Gorbachev congratulated him on his appointment to the post and expressed confidence that his colleagues and he would carry on the cause of co-operation, mutual understanding, trust and friendship in relations between the two countries and that everything

built in that field over the decades would be preserved and replenished.

Even more importance is attached in the international situation after the Reykjavik meeting to the independent course pursued by the Indian leadership, the high level and meaningful content of Soviet-Indian relations, the dynamism and fruitfulness of political dialogue and mutual support, socio-economic contacts on the basis of the latest achievements of science and technology, and broad cultural exchanges. All this benefits the interests not only of the two great peoples but of the world community as a whole, both as an example of peaceful coexistence and as a factor for ending the arms race, achieving world security and ensuring equality for all states and their progress.

Mikhail Gorbachev reaffirmed anew that relations with India were for the Soviet Union a matter of principle, that they had a great value in themselves and were not subject to any fluctuations or external influences. The Soviet leadership would not take a single step in its international policy that could prejudice India's real interests.

Special attention was attached to prospects for bilateral economic, scientific and technological contacts, making use of new forms and possibilities and having due regard for the overall world economic situation.

Meeting with Oliver Tambo

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had a meeting on Tuesday with Oliver Tambo, President of the African National Congress (ANC) of South Africa, who is in the USSR at the head of an ANC delegation.

Welcoming the ANC President, Gorbachev expressed solidarity with the courageous struggle of the South African patriots against the inhuman apartheid system. He said that the Soviet Union regarded the ANC as the spokesman for the genuine interests of the South African people and the recognised leader of the national liberation movement in that country.

Nikolai Ryzhkov's speech at CMEA session

"WITH all the complexities, of an internal and external nature, which the CMEA countries have come up against in the past five years, the socialist economy has been developing steadily. Though its growth rates dropped somewhat, they were on the whole 50 per cent higher than in the capitalist economy." Nikolai Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, said this in Bucharest on Monday, addressing the 42nd sitting of the session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA).

"The social policy of the CMEA countries has been aimed invariably at ensuring the material well-being of the working people, the improvement of their living and working standards, environmental protection and cultural development," he continued. "And it should be borne in mind that all this is taking place at a time when in capitalist countries the unemployment rate is growing, the social programmes are being cut and social and class contradictions and differentiation are manifested even more acutely.

"When in the past five years one person joined in social production in the European socialist countries, one person lost a job in West European capitalist countries. Every time in the socialist countries a family moved to a new flat, someone lost shelter in the capitalist world.

"It is precisely in the eighties that a new social stratum of homeless, underprivileged people, deprived of human rights, started gradually forming in industrialised Western countries.

"The contrast between the two worlds is seen clearly in the international arena too," Nikolai Ryzhkov pointed out. "On the one hand, there exists the policy of militarism, reaction and violence, on the other, there exists the readiness for broad co-operation for the sake of peace on an equal and mutually advantageous basis. But the objective conditions, the realities of the nuclear age indicate that confrontation between the two world systems can take place only in the form of peaceful competition, while disputed questions must be decided by political means.

"With all the variety of conditions in which

socialist countries exist, they are tackling many common tasks," Nikolai Ryzhkov said further. Among these tasks, he singled out as the main one the speeding up of social and economic development on the basis of the intensification of social production, and a cardinal increase in its efficiency.

"The CPSU Central Committee is directing all state government bodies, all sections of the Soviet economic mechanism at the all-out widening of co-operation with the CMEA countries, at using to the utmost the advantages of the international socialist division of labour," he said.

Nikolai Ryzhkov noted that all CMEA countries were now exerting efforts to ensure that the Comprehensive Programme of Scientific and Technological Progress became the central link in socialist co-operation for many years ahead. The programme was called upon to resolve the most important problems of the development of the productive forces of the CMEA countries.

"Joint research on problems of the comprehensive programme has been started in the CMEA countries in the current year," the head of the Soviet Government said. "The national economies of the fraternal countries have been supplied with fuel and raw material resources as a result of coordination of plans. Their supply by the USSR remains at a high level and the supply of energy sources is to increase within the five-year period by 116 million tons in units of reference fuel.

"But assessing critically everything that has been done, it should be said openly that the existing possibilities for the development of co-operation and increase in mutual trade turnover has not been tapped sufficiently," Nikolai Ryzhkov said. "The export and import structure should be changed radically, the export potential of every country should be widened, first of all through the manufacture of the latest equipment, in order to ensure a dynamic and proportionate growth in mutual economic ties.

"The CMEA countries are united in the view that traditional ways are not enough now, that

they cannot ensure the intensification of the economy and that new forms are needed to step up economic development and co-operation. Being aware of this as a most important political and economic task, we declare persistently for using new forms of co-operation, for expanding direct ties to the utmost, for creating joint enterprises and organisations," Nikolai Ryzhkov said.

"A programme for the construction of nuclear power plants and nuclear heat-supply stations has been submitted for the consideration of the CMEA session," Nikolai Ryzhkov added. "The programme envisages bringing the total capacity of nuclear power stations in the CMEA countries, except for the USSR, to 50 million kilowatts by the year 2000 as compared with approximately eight million kilowatts in 1986. The output of electricity at nuclear power plants will make up 30-40 per cent of the total output of electricity. In the USSR, where this index is now about eleven per cent, it is also planned to be increased to approximately 30 per cent and the capacities of nuclear power plants are to increase five or six-fold. Besides that, nuclear heat-supply stations will be built, so that valuable organic fuel—gas and fuel oil—that is in short supply, will be saved."

Nikolai Ryzhkov stressed that external conditions for the economic development of the CMEA countries remained complex. "Imperialism resorts to methods of economic warfare against socialist countries, including credit blockades and all sorts of embargoes. The instability of the capitalist market also exerts an adverse effect on trade among CMEA countries. But the main thing is that international tension persists, that the threat of nuclear war has not been averted," he emphasised.

The speaker pointed out that the widening of economic and political co-operation in Europe could be promoted by the establishment of official relations between the CMEA and CMEA member-countries, on the one hand, and the European Economic Community on the other. Business ties between the two biggest integrated organisations would suit the interests of both sides, and would promote the consolidation of the material base of European and universal security. □

ADVANCES OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This fortnightly bulletin from the USSR will keep you up-to-date with the latest developments in Soviet science.

As a special introductory offer you can receive it regularly by post for 12 months for £6.00. The normal annual subscription rate is £12.00. Europe £16.00, USA and Canada \$50 airmail.

To subscribe simply fill in the form below and return it to: Circulation Dept. (ST), 3 Rosary Gardens, London SW7 4NW.

Please send me *Advances of Science and Technology* for one year. I enclose cheque/postal order for £6.00, payable to Soviet News.

NAME

ADDRESS

.....

.....

CMEA and electronics

"ELECTRONIC equipment occupies a prominent place among the banned goods that the US pressures the West not to sell the socialist countries, analyst Valeri Korzin has said on Soviet TV.

"Even the simplest computers are banned. They hope to hamper our technical progress using such 'trade tricks'.

"International trade serves the mutual advantage," Korzin pointed out, "and also contributes to sharing scientific and technical ideas. On the other hand, calculations that the socialist community will not be able to function without Western technology are groundless.

"Electronisation of the economy is a top priority area in the comprehensive programme for the scientific and technical progress of the socialist countries. Its task is not only to reach the frontiers of science and technology but also to gain complete technological independence from the West. This is an important political question, and we are tackling it through common efforts.

"A regular session of the CMEA (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance—the socialist

countries' trade and economic organisation) will be held in Bucharest in early November. It will centre on the accelerated development of electronics, as well as other areas of economic, scientific and technical co-operation, since today accelerated development is a component part of overall success," the analyst noted. □

N. RYZHKOV: Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and for the Period Ending in 2000.

Price 40p (cheque/PO)

Council for Mutual Economic Assistance: its aims and activities

Price 25p

Available from Soviet Booklets (SN), 3 Rosary Gardens, LONDON SW7 4NW.

Meeting of Political Bureau of CPSU Central Committee

THE Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, at its October 30 meeting, examined the draft state plan of the USSR's economic and social development and the draft state budget for 1987.

It was underlined at the meeting that these documents paid chief attention to consolidating and developing the positive shifts in the economy already achieved in the current year and setting into motion more fully the long-term factors of social production growth.

The Political Bureau said that the draft plan's major feature was that it provided for the implementation of a set of social measures encompassing all spheres of life of the Soviet people.

Special importance was attached to developing consumer goods production and services, and strengthening the material and technical facilities of the entire social and cultural sphere.

Having on the whole approved the drafts of the plan and the budget for 1987, the Political Bureau found it expedient to submit the documents for consideration to the forthcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Political Bureau heard a report from the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee on the conclusion of the discussion of the 13,500 appeals that came to the 27th CPSU Congress.

A report was discussed from the government

commission investigating the causes of the accident involving the liner *Admiral Nakhimov* near Novorossiisk in August 1986. The investigation showed that the accident had been the consequence of criminal negligence by the ships' masters and of the gross violation of navigation safety rules. The accident took a large toll. The Political Bureau expressed profound condolences to the families and kin of the deceased. State aid has been given to the bereaved families.

The ships' masters of the *Pyotr Vasev* and the *Admiral Nakhimov* who are directly responsible for the accident have been arrested and criminal proceedings against them have been instituted. The chief of the Black Sea Shipping Line Stanislav Lukyanenko was expelled from the Party and dismissed. Anatoli Goldobenko, the USSR Deputy Minister of the Merchant Marine, and Bronislav Mainagashev, member of the collegium and chairman of the all-union amalgamation *Moreplavanye* were relieved of their duties and strictly disciplined by the Party. The Deputy Minister of the Merchant Marine of the USSR, Boris Yumitsyn, was brought to account before the Party. It has been suggested to the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of the Merchant Marine that measures should be taken to improve radically the safety of shipping, and improve discipline and organisation in the functioning of sea transport.

The Political Bureau approved the results of the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Kim Il Sung, General Secretary of the Central Com-

mittee of the Workers' Party of Korea and President of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). It noted the importance of the exchange of views held to the further strengthening of Soviet-Korean relations, the deepening of ties in all areas of co-operation between the USSR and the DPRK, and the broadening of their interaction in work to promote peace and international security. The Political Bureau stressed that the improvement of the situation in the Asian-Pacific region would contribute to a peaceful solution of the Korean problem.

The Political Bureau summed up the results of the talks between the Soviet leadership and Denmark's Prime Minister Poul Schluter. It expressed satisfaction with the development of Soviet-Danish relations and confirmed the Soviet Union's readiness to deepen the political dialogue with West European countries both on European problems and on fundamental issues of world importance, above all issues of disarmament.

The Political Bureau heard Eduard Shevardnadze's report on the results of his visits to Canada, Mexico and Cuba, and also Pyotr Demichev's report on the visit of a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The meeting also discussed some other questions of Party building and development of state institutions, co-operation with the CMEA countries and translating into life Soviet initiatives in the work to halt the race in nuclear and space arms. □

Briefing at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs

GENNADI GERASIMOV, head of the Information Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, reported at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists last Thursday that a celebration sitting of the UN General Assembly devoted to the 20th anniversary of the adoption of international covenants on human rights was planned for November 3.

He pointed out that these covenants—one on economic, social and cultural rights and the

other on civil and political rights—had been adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union.

According to Gerasimov, the non-ratification of both covenants by the United States is evidence of its unwillingness to recognise in deed and to exercise human rights, irrespective of what some people try to tell us.

Gennadi Gerasimov described as a "dead duck" a report in the West German newspaper *Bild* which was then echoed by the Australian mass media to the effect that the USSR had allegedly outstripped the United States in SDI, and that it had allegedly installed strategic defence lasers, and that one of them is situated at

Sarochiganak in Kazakhstan.

According to these fabricated reports, the Soviet Union has allegedly put these lasers to combat use and has brought down or at least put out of action three US satellites. On October 29 the newspaper *Washington Post* carried an article also alleging that the Soviet Union is using anti-satellite weapons. It is claimed that over the past six months powerful microwave beams sent from Soviet territory into outer space have more than once put US reconnaissance satellites out of action.

"If the USSR has outstripped the United States in SDI," Gennadi Gerasimov queried, "why then doesn't the United States accept our proposal that research in that field be halted, laboratories opened for inspection and everything controlled so that no space-strike weapons can be created?"

"The Soviet Union has no laser weapons and the USA is well aware of that, because the USSR has already given explanations to the USA on this score. There is an experimental laser plant in Sarochiganak, but that is not a weapon. It can neither bring down satellites nor put them out of action; its only aim is to watch space and installations in space. Thus the West German newspaper *Bild*, the *Washington Post* and the Australian mass media have spread slanders."

Gennadi Gerasimov then touched upon a report in the American newspaper *Washington Times*, known for its ties with the current US Administration, which quoted US intelligence circles in issuing inventions to the effect that the USSR was planning to open consulates in the Mexican cities of Ensenada and Ciudad-Juarez. According to the inventions of the newspaper, a USSR consulate in Ensenada would be an ideal base for connections with "some Soviet agents" employed at numerous arms manufacturing

(Continued on Page 467)

Shevardnadze's statement in Vienna

EDUARD SHEVARDNADZE, USSR Foreign Minister and member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived in Vienna on Sunday for the opening of the meeting of the representatives of member-states of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

He made the following statement for the press upon arrival:

I would like to express the idea that the Vienna meeting of the representatives of member-states of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe could not be more timely. Had it not already been on Europe's political calendar it would have been urgently necessary to put it there. Such is the international situation now, such are the historical circumstances which require from us effective immediate actions.

This is even more urgent after Reykjavik where an understanding of the necessity and possibility of relieving Europe of nuclear weapons was reached, an understanding so vital

for the continent. The results of the summit in the capital of Iceland are making us take new stock of European and world realities. In the words of Mikhail Gorbachev, the reality of our time forcefully demands from us a new mode of political thinking capable of leading humanity on to the road towards lasting peace and mutually beneficial co-operation.

We attach much importance to the work of the all-European forum. We consider it necessary to conduct it dynamically, in a constructive spirit. The Soviet delegation is ready to co-operate with the representatives of all European states, the United States of America and Canada so that the Vienna meeting should end with substantial positive results.

We are pleased to be in Austria, a country whose neutrality corresponds so effectively with its own national interests and the interests of universal peace.

I take this opportunity to convey our best wishes to the Austrian people and the citizens of Vienna. □

Statement by Soviet representative at UN

"THE Soviet Union has always strongly advocated and continues to advocate a complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests and the opening of full-scale talks on the issue," said USSR representative Viktor Issraelyan on Friday, at the First Committee of the 41st session of the UN General Assembly.

"In Mikhail Gorbachev's reply to the message from the leaders of the six countries it was stated that: 'At present, there is no task more immediate and important than ending all nuclear testing. We associate this step with the beginning of movement down the road leading to a nuclear-free world.'

"The prohibition of nuclear weapons tests is an important self-contained disarmament measure. We believe that the nuclear states could address this issue even now, without waiting for the outcome of the talks that are under way on other aspects of the arms race," the Soviet delegate declared.

"The particular urgency of the problem of banning nuclear testing is due also to the fact that as a result of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, declared by the Soviet Union as from August 6, 1985, there has emerged an entirely new situation favourable to an early

solution of this problem.

"If the Soviet moratorium were to be joined by the United States, a serious and responsible step would be taken towards stopping the improvement and stockpiling of the most destructive weapons. To miss the opportunity that has opened up would not simply be a manifestation of indifference for the future of mankind but a criminal act," Viktor Issraelyan added.

"A declaration of a moratorium by all the nuclear powers—to be followed up by a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests—would have just about the same significance for making further progress. In a situation of world-wide silence at all nuclear test sites, it would be possible to concentrate efforts on charting the shortest possible routes to a safe world, a world without nuclear weapons.

"In introducing its proposals for banning nuclear tests, the Soviet Union stated that it was interested in enforcing a most stringent verification of such a ban, including international verification. The Soviet Government's consent to the installation of American monitoring equipment in the area of Semipalatinsk clearly proves this. The USSR has more than once expressed its readiness to take up the offer of the six countries from five continents to provide assistance in verifying the cessation of nuclear tests, including on-site inspection, provided the other side accepts the offer as well. The Soviet Union has

also expressed its positive view of the proposal to organise a meeting of experts from the said six countries together with Soviet and American specialists in order to seek mutually acceptable solutions to the problem of verifying the cessation of nuclear tests," the Soviet representative stressed.

"All this attests to the fact that there is no problem with the Soviet Union as regards the verification of a ban on nuclear tests. In essence, we agree to any form of verification. The United States' position is blocking concrete negotiations on this problem, which has long been ripe for solution," Viktor Issraelyan stated.

"It is becoming increasingly clear that Washington is motivated by the desire to retain for the United States the possibility of qualitatively upgrading old types of nuclear weapons and developing new ones and thus carrying on the nuclear arms race. The true reason for the US Administration's reluctance to renounce nuclear explosions is the desire to upset the existing balance of forces to its own advantage.

"A weighty contribution can and must be made by the United Nations to achieving progress towards the conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear tests. The UN efforts in this major area should be redoubled and made more dynamic and purposeful." □

Meeting of UN committee on relations with host country

THE UN Committee on Relations with the Host Country, the United States, met last week in New York to discuss the actions taken by the US against the United Nations missions of the USSR, Byelorussia and the Ukraine, actions which are at odds with the agreement between the UN and the US.

The latest such action was the ultimatum of the American authorities that 25 staff members of the Soviet UN Mission had to leave under threat of deportation.

The debates at the committee graphically illustrated the absolute groundlessness and legal untenability of the ambitions of the US to decide unilaterally, as it sees fit, the question of how many staff members one UN mission or another should have. Delegates from Afghanistan, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, Vietnam, the GDR, Iraq, Cote d'Ivoire, Mongolia, Poland, Senegal, the Ukraine and other countries were unanimous that Washington's actions constituted a flagrant violation of the USA's obligations under international agreements and a gross encroachment on international law. They noted that the United Nations Secretary-General and the legal adviser of the organisation had also characterised those actions as unlawful. Yet the American side declined the proposal of the UN Secretary-General on mediation to settle the problem.

The committee members drew attention to the political bias in Washington's unlawful actions. "These actions constitute a component of its overall policy of frustrating the Soviet-American dialogue. This is also illustrated by the decision taken by the US Department of State the other day to reduce the staff of the Soviet Embassy in Washington and the Consulate-General in San Francisco," said Alexander Belonogov, the Soviet Union's permanent representative to the United Nations. "There is one more aspect to this political action by the USA: it is directed against the United Nations itself," he said. "The US Administration makes it clear that the United States is ready to take repressive measures against any state whose policy is not to

Washington's liking, against those countries which are pursuing independent policies in spite of American pressure.

"The USA's unlawful actions must be strongly denounced and repulsed," the Soviet delegate said. "The United States should stop its unlawful actions and ensure proper conditions for the normal activity of the United Nations and the UN missions of all states. We hope that the Committee on Relations with the Host Country will take measures to put an end to the arbitrary

actions against the Soviet UN Mission. The result of coercive measures taken by the United States against the Soviet diplomatic missions is well known. One would like to hope that the American side has learned the lesson and drawn proper conclusions. As for us, we would like a line to be drawn under any attempt to pursue a policy from strength towards the Soviet UN Mission. This policy has not paid off now and will never pay off," Alexander Belonogov stressed. □

Viktor Karpov on Soviet-US talks in Geneva

"A SWIFT and profound breakthrough at the Geneva talks is possible. To achieve it it is necessary to rely on the foundation laid down by the Soviet-US summit in Reykjavik—to rely on it, not revise it," said Viktor Karpov, chief of a department at the USSR Foreign Ministry and head of the Soviet delegation to the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms.

His interview was published in *Izvestia* last Thursday.

"What has been achieved in Reykjavik requires a new approach to the talks in Geneva," the Soviet diplomat pointed out. "There is a need for a fresh look at the nature of the debates, for considering which aspects should be emphasised, which aspects should be in the focus of attention. Regrettably, we cannot say yet that the talks are proceeding in a new way, that they reflect the degree of understanding which was achieved at the Reykjavik summit," he said.

"Having presented the old proposals in the 'Reykjavik package', so to speak, the US side is clearly displaying in Geneva a striving to prevent the talks from overcoming the impasse into which Washington was leading them, by a stand that actually does not envisage the solution of the cardinal problems of nuclear disarmament," Viktor Karpov stressed.

"This tendency reflects something that for a

long time has been present in the stance of the USA, even perhaps throughout the duration of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms: while talking about nuclear arms reduction, Washington has all the time been making proposals which allowed for increasing the US strategic potential—which, according to the existing estimates, now amounts to some 14 thousand nuclear charges.

"The US side says that SDI is a purely research programme, and that it will remain at the stage of research for the ten years which were mentioned at Reykjavik," Viktor Karpov said. "It is precisely on this thesis that the Soviet Union's stand advanced at Reykjavik is based. It is asserted in the West that the USSR linked the solution of all other questions at Reykjavik to President Reagan's refusing the SDI programme, and thus doomed the meeting to failure. But this is not so.

"We have been proposing and are proposing to the President to agree that research and tests under the SDI programme should not go beyond the laboratory stage. And these proposals stand. Should the President agree, he would thus be pledging himself to comply with the ABM Treaty and would confirm what he is saying all the time—that is, would confirm the research character of the SDI programme. But the President has not agreed to this. This means that the statements about the research nature of the programme and real deeds are wide apart." □

PRAVDA:

George Shultz' remarks in San Francisco

THE following article was published in the newspaper Pravda.

Nowadays high-ranking Washington officials who are trying to distort the results of the meeting in Reykjavik wind up in the unenviable position of someone trying to renounce their own words. The latest example of this is the address made by US Secretary of State George Shultz at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco.

The remarks made by the head of the US Foreign Affairs Department, as he was trying to explain and justify the administration's stand of renegeing on the accords reached in Reykjavik, were in contradiction to his earlier statements.

For instance, he maintained that during the Reykjavik meeting the American President had allegedly agreed only to the proposal to eliminate inter-continental ballistic missiles.

"The President proposed to eliminate over time all ballistic missiles," Shultz said, addressing the Commonwealth Club.

However, suffice it to recall the news conference given by none other than the US Secretary of State right after the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik to see a clear distortion of facts.

During that news briefing Shultz said that an agreement had been reached in principle on the elimination of "all offensive strategic arms and ballistic missiles", over a ten-year period.

These are known to include intercontinental ballistic missiles, bombers with nuclear weapons

on board and submarines armed with nuclear missiles.

It is also appropriate to recall that, in the words of Senator Sam Nunn, in a conversation with him right after Reykjavik President Reagan admitted that the US side at the meeting had agreed to eliminate all strategic offensive arms over a period of 10 years.

"The Soviet Union", the *New York Times* said in its comment on the matter, "produced quotations from Mr Reagan at Reykjavik that made nonsense of the White House denials. In describing and re-describing what happened at Reykjavik, US officials have left the American version of the meeting without credibility."

The purpose of the allegations that the President "was misunderstood" is simple—to block off possible progress in the arms limitation field on the basis of what was achieved in Reykjavik and at the same time to shift the blame onto the Soviet Union, leaving Washington's dangerous plans for the militarisation of outer space above criticism.

Meanwhile, it is known that it was precisely the notorious 'Strategic Defense Initiative' that was the main obstacle on the road to a successful completion of the meeting.

In his San Francisco address the US Secretary of State tried—clearly with an eye on the mid-term congressional elections to be held on November 4—to reassure the American public, by saying that at the moment both sides were allegedly moving towards an agreement.

"For the first time in the long history of arms control talks, a genuine possibility of substantial reductions in Soviet and American nuclear arms has appeared," he said.

Yes, such a possibility has indeed appeared, but it is none other than the American Administration that is actively hindering its realisation, by falsifying the substance of the talks in Reykjavik.

The stubbornness with which the White House is forging ahead with the adventurous 'Star Wars' programme and trying to undermine the ABM Treaty confirms that the US Administration is not striving to start in Geneva with what was achieved in Reykjavik, but, on the contrary, is putting up ever new obstacles on the road to mutually acceptable accords.

It is not accidental that whilst making an address in Los Angeles the same day, Secretary of State Shultz used one phrase that should be taken note of.

"The Reagan Administration is profoundly convinced that, important as the reduction and eventual elimination of offensive nuclear weapons is, arms control can never be the main preoccupation of American foreign policy," he said.

In Reykjavik the Soviet Union advanced its proposals in a package which balances the security interests of both the Soviet and the American sides. The Soviet Union's concessions are also part of a package. If there is no package there will be no concessions. Therefore, all attempts at dividing that package into parts and taking individual elements out of it, while doing nothing to restore the balance of compromises, are unacceptable.

The current word-juggling by officials of the Reagan Administration who are trying to present the Soviet initiatives and the results of the Reykjavik meeting in a distorted light are an ungainly attempt at covering up shameful plans for extending the arms race with the help of demagoguery. □

Is Washington out to thwart Geneva talks?

THE US Administration, according to White House deputy press secretary Larry Speakes, has instructed the US delegation at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons to begin serious discussions on the basis of what was achieved in Reykjavik, reports military writer Vladimir Chernyshev.

Speakes said that the administration considered it possible to achieve progress on the basis of the foundation laid in Iceland.

These statements sound serious enough and could be viewed with optimism if, first, the instructions to the US delegation were really based on the foundation laid in Reykjavik and, second, the American negotiators had been instructed to look for realistic ways out of the deadlock caused by the American 'Strategic Defense Initiative' in the entire process of nuclear disarmament.

Yet in reality things are, regrettably, very different. To begin with, the US delegation has been instructed to press ahead at the talks with a distorted rather than the true accord on nuclear armaments that was reached in Iceland. According to Associated Press, what the Americans will propose is the abolition not of all strategic offensive arms by 1996, which was agreed upon in Iceland, but only of the Soviet and American ballistic missiles. The bombers and air-launched cruise missiles in which the US has a clear edge are not going to be scrapped by Washington. As for the statements on the possibility of making progress at the Geneva

talks, they are intended to mislead both American and world public opinion.

Spokesmen for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, unlike Larry Speakes, were quite frank: they said the Joint Chiefs of Staff had decided not to object to the American proposals on nuclear weapons because the Soviet Union would turn them down anyway. CBS television reports that, in the view of the Pentagon brass, if those proposals are to be declined, let it happen in Geneva. All this clearly shows that the US delegation to the Geneva talks has been given not what was mutually acceptable to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the US President in Reykjavik, but what suits the US military-industrial complex.

As for the tightening of the ABM Treaty, the US Administration insists—as repeated statements by its senior officials (including the President) indicate—on its obstructionist stand: all the planned work under the SDI programme will be carried through, which means that the administration intends to continue to subvert the treaty. Does this testify to the US readiness, as Speakes says, to begin serious discussions? Hardly so.

One more question prompts itself: are not the authors of the 'instructions' to the US negotiating team in Geneva merely going to thwart the talks, which are intended to complete constructively what was started in Reykjavik, to find ways of overcoming the obstacles identified in Iceland and to produce mutually acceptable accords? That is the impression one gets, because the untenability of the 'new' American stand is glaring. □

Georgi Arbatov on Reykjavik

"NO agreement was reached at the Reykjavik meeting only because of the 'Strategic Defense Initiative' and for no other reason. The point is that SDI, although it is nothing but an unrealisable illusion, constitutes the concentrated expression of a policy which is incompatible with nuclear disarmament and security," stresses Academician Georgi Arbatov writing in *Pravda*.

"SDI is an attempt to ensure security only for oneself and to jeopardise the security of the other side. There can be no unilateral security today: our two countries can survive or perish only together.

"Further, SDI represents an attempt to find a way of waging nuclear war and winning it—despite all the solemn declarations by the President to the effect that neither of these things is possible nowadays.

"Reykjavik made perfectly clear all the contradictions in present-day US policy. For instance, if nuclear weapons are to be scrapped in the course of the coming decade, why should this great cause be sacrificed for the sake of a weapon system for which there will be no ballistic missile targets in ten years?"

The US President's lack of seriousness about the talks "also makes clear the administration's stand with regard to the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and so on. It does not need them, they only restrict its actions. The same is true of international organisations, ranging from the International Court of Justice and UNESCO to the UN. This is logical: if one counts on force, armaments and military hardware, international law becomes a burden, and there is only room left for 'fist-law'." □

Soviet economy in 1986: pace of restructuring

By Gennadi Pisarevsky, *Novosti* political analyst

AS 1986—the first year of the 12th five-year plan (1986-1990)—draws to a close, the flood of economic news increases. It is mostly good news, though there is some bad. According to preliminary calculations, the national economic plan will be exceeded in many fields. The positive trends are dominating, but are not as yet dominant everywhere.

Industrial output is expected to grow in 1986—as compared with the previous year—by more than five per cent, as against the planned 4.3 per cent. Things are looking up in construction and transport. The agro-industrial complex is steadily and dynamically increasing the production of meat and milk. Sales are growing. Products are improving in quality.

The first results of the fundamental restructuring of the Soviet economy are here for all to see. But these successes are turning no heads: much work still lies ahead.

What are the good points? Output increment in most of the industries is being achieved through higher labour productivity. Targets for resource saving are being fulfilled. The rates of the modernisation and retooling of existing enterprises have shot up. The railways, only recently chronically lagging behind, have shown the highest growth of labour productivity—over 8 per cent. This is the result of material incentives, with greater pay offered for work done by fewer hands. I could cite even more examples.

What are the bad points? I will first point to breaches of contract discipline. In the first nine months of the year (January-September) clients failed to receive from suppliers a total of 6.4 billion roubles' worth of industrial products (one rouble is approximately 1.45 US dollars at the official rate of exchange for October 1986). This adversely affects the performance of many enterprises. From 1987 such violations will be strictly punished: deliveries under contract will be the main plan indicator. If it is not fulfilled, enterprises will be deprived of much of their bonus fund.

The shift coefficient is growing slowly. The most valued equipment—flexible manufacturing

systems, numerically controlled machine tools, robots and so on—are not in use 24 hours a day, as they are, say, in Japan, but often for one shift only. This is a luxury we cannot afford.

The continuing growth of deposits at savings banks is disquieting. It is, of course, good that people are saving up to buy high-priced commodities. But some of the deposits are deferred consumption: there is still a shortage of high-quality and fashionable goods. Customers systematically reject between 8 to 10 per cent of clothes, footwear and textiles. This is the worst form of wastefulness: non-selling goods absorb energy, raw materials and human labour.

This means that economic restructuring is still slow and that many reserves remain untapped. Positive advances should be consolidated and early successes exploited further, without leaving any room for complacency.

What are the top priorities today? As the process of reshaping proceeds, Soviet people are, perhaps, more concerned with social justice. For a long time we have put the emphasis on the material guarantees of human rights. We have guaranteed the rights to work, to housing, to education, to health, to rest and leisure, to security in old age, and to the enjoyment of cultural achievements. The material ensuring of these and other rights costs the state very dearly. In our country, for example, most of the housing is distributed free, and vast sums of money are allotted to subsidise meat, milk, children's goods, communal services and so on.

The material guarantees of rights in the USSR will continue to grow. But on the basis of social justice. The basic principle of our society is: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work". This principle, however, is occasionally violated, which is unfair.

A good worker should get more for his work than the average worker, let alone a slacker. The working people are especially insistent on the observance of this principle. We are now extending it to enterprises: there are good factories and there are bad, loss-making factories. The loss-makers have been able to survive at the expense of advanced plants. That was unjust. Now we are seeking to make things so that in the next few years every enterprise can

keep itself and conduct its affairs on the principles of recouping and self-finance.

What is holding up the restructuring process? It is conservatism in all its aspects. Not a few people still strive to resolve new problems by old methods, which is absolutely impossible. Good progress on the whole is being made in the agro-industrial complex. But difficulties still abound. And the reason is old habits. The collective and state farms now have the right to sell on the markets all surplus vegetables and fruit plus 30 per cent of the quantity purchased by the state. That is, a state plan fulfilled by 70 per cent is counted as 100 per cent fulfilled. Yet, to date, by November, only two per cent of this preferential quota has been sold on city markets, where prices are higher than those quoted by the state. Some managers do not wish to trade because it is troublesome, while others simply don't know how.

One more example. This year the best Soviet enterprises, whose products sell on the world markets, have been granted the right to dispose of a sizeable part of their foreign exchange earnings at will. But managements exercise this right unwillingly: they lack commercial experience. In brief, many managers will have to learn how to trade—on the domestic and on the international market. As a matter of fact, this is a new and unknown business for many. □

CMEA AGREEMENTS

BILATERAL inter-governmental agreements on the development of direct ties in the spheres of production, science and technology between economic organisations of the USSR and Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR and Czechoslovakia, as well as agreements on the establishment of joint enterprises, international associations and organisations were signed by the heads of government during the 42nd session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, now being held in Bucharest.

The agreements provide for the establishment in the CMEA countries of favourable economic, organisational and legal conditions for the development of direct links between enterprises, associations and organisations, and for their effective joint operation. Measures are specified for stimulating the initiative of cost-accounting sections in the development of scientific-technological and production co-operation between them, especially in carrying out the assignments of the CMEA's Comprehensive Programme for Scientific and Technological Progress to the Year 2000.

Enterprises of the fraternal countries will co-operate actively in modernising and assuring fuller use of production capacities, conserving resources and increasing the output of products meeting the highest world standards.

It was agreed to continue work to draw new enterprises and associations further into these advanced forms of co-operation.

The signing of the agreements marks a major practical step in implementing the course taken by the 27th CPSU Congress and the congresses of other fraternal parties towards developing new advanced forms of co-operation—an important reserve for intensifying the progress of socialist economic integration. □

(Continued from Page 464)

plants in California. As far as a consulate in Ciudad-Juarez is concerned, the newspaper claims, it would be very advantageously placed for Soviet radio-electronic intelligence to monitor tests within the SDI framework at the US proving ranges in Fort Bliss and Whitesense.

"This", the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said, "is a fresh example of a whipping-up of a spy-scare. By spreading such absurdities, the USA would like to cast a shadow on the development of Soviet-Mexican relations. In actual fact the question of opening the aforementioned consulates was not raised, there was no such question at all. Everything has been invented from beginning to end. It is, as they say, a complete fabrication."

Answering a question about the arrest in San Francisco on October 27 of a certain Allan John Davis on a charge of spying for the Soviet Union, Gennadi Gerasimov said that the FBI was continuing its game, which is that FBI agents posing as officials of the Soviet Consulate-

General in San Francisco tempt some or other American into selling them some secrets and then arrest them as "Soviet agents". That was the case this time too. "Thus," he continued, "one can find thousands of 'Soviet spies'."

"This provocative game is used for whipping up anti-Soviet hysteria and creating a spy-scare in the United States aimed at discrediting Soviet representatives." The spokesman added that none of the members of the staff of the USSR Consulate-General in San Francisco had ever met Davis or contacted him by phone.

In connection with a question put by the correspondent of *The Times*, London, on the Soviet Union's attitude to the 150 mile "exclusion zone" around the Malvinas (Falkland Islands) announced by the British Government, the spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry said that it was deplorable that the British side had taken unilateral steps running counter to the UN decision on those islands. Britain has done nothing to implement these decisions and by its unilateral actions has only hampered its implementation. □

Neo-globalism: the Nicaraguan tip of the iceberg

By Yuri Gvozdev, *Novosti* political correspondent

THE United States has shown once again complete disregard for legality and moral standards by vetoing in the UN Security Council a draft resolution urging it to comply with the ruling of the International Court of Justice concerning the complaint by Nicaragua and to stop the undeclared war against it. The Reagan Administration goes straight ahead, feverishly converting the 100 million dollars allocated by Congress into arms for the Contras, training them and preparing them for new acts of aggression. Moreover, the men in Washington have started talking of severance of diplomatic relations with Managua, of a blockade or undisguised armed intervention based on the Grenadian or some other scenario.

The United States' attempts to rise above the International Court of Justice, the United Nations and the public opinion of the vast majority of mankind causes profound indignation. No one has ever invited the US to decide the destinies of other peoples. Henry S Commajar, an American professor of history, the author of many scientific works, once remarked, not without irony, that it would be a folly to assume that providence or history had somehow entrusted the United States with being simultaneously the world's conscience and policeman and empowered it to rush about the planet, imposing its own concepts, policy and decisions on other nations.

Formerly, such a mode of action was called 'gunboat diplomacy' or the 'policy of the big stick'. Nowadays a new word, 'neo-globalism', is used to describe this kind of power politics, though its essence has remained the same. It spells crude intervention in other people's affairs. At the same time, such a line is tinged with

racism. This manifests itself in US actions in the developing world, where America's disrespect for the life, interests and rights of other people and states has become outrageous. Whence the sources of such policy? One can trace them, perhaps, back to the very history of that country, where not so long ago American Indians were exterminated mercilessly and methodically—whole families, villages and tribes. They were shot down, poisoned or starved to death. A reward was offered for the scalp of an American Indian: it was higher for the murder of a male than a female or a child. Then millions of slaves were brought in from Africa. And again man's price was expressed in dollars.

Such a disgraceful phenomenon as racial discrimination still persists in the United States today. Reynolds Farley, a sociologist at Michigan State University, has lately carried out investigations into racial segregation in the country's major cities. In Chicago and Detroit, for example, 88 per cent of black people live in ghettos and their children go to special schools for blacks. In New York, the figure comes to 81 per cent and, for Spanish-speaking people, to 65 per cent. Among these 'second-class citizens', the numbers of jobless and of people living below the poverty level are the largest. This 'way of life' cannot but manifest itself in the racist implications of Washington's policy towards the developing world. And Nicaragua is, of course, no exception. Everything seems to indicate that ruling circles in the USA just cannot imagine that its people have the right to decide their own destiny.

Back in August 1928, Augusto Sandino, the national hero of Nicaragua, pointed out in a message to the governments of Latin American countries: "Yankee imperialism is our cruellest enemy; its aim is to trample underfoot the dignity of our race and the freedom of our peoples through conquest." Nowadays, many countries in Asia and Africa are increasingly aware of the danger which the US aggressive policy of 'neo-globalism' spells for them. The racist implications of that policy are also evident, manifesting themselves not only in utter cruelty, in a readiness to resort to genocide, as was the case in Indochina, but also in close alliance with the South African apartheid regime and the Israeli Zionists. At the same time, leaders of the United

States are shamelessly styling themselves as advocates of human rights, freedom and democracy.

And now just a few words about freedom. In the middle of the 19th century, William Walker, an American adventurer, led an armed group of his fellow-countrymen and seized power in Nicaragua. In doing so, he had the covert backing of the United States ruling circles. Well, did he bring the torch of freedom to that country? Nothing of the kind. He instantly introduced slavery into the country, depriving it of its independence. Ever since, Washington has been bent on enslaving Nicaragua, now occupying its territory for many years, now imposing its Contra puppets on it.

If the world community today does not help the Nicaraguan people to uphold their freedom, intoxication with the feeling of having a licence to do anything may entice the United States to take ever more dangerous actions. Only recently it 'liberated' Grenada and bombed Libya and Lebanon. It is now threatening Syria. It seems that providence, said to be giving it the 'right' to dictate its will to the rest of mankind, might lead the USA too far.

It would, perhaps, not be out of place here to refer to one of Reagan's advisers, Professor Richard Pipes of Harvard University. In his view, if the Russians fail to renounce communism, no other alternative would be left except nuclear war.

This makes one instantly recall how the United States treats Nicaragua today, demanding that it should renounce Sandinism and threatening it with intervention, if it fails to do so. Or, maybe, some people in Washington are dreaming of a time when, after attaining military superiority through SDI, they will be able to impose their own order of things on the Soviet Union, too?

The Soviet Union is pursuing a fundamentally different policy. As Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out at the end of October during a meeting with a delegation from the World Federation of Trade Unions, the USSR's foreign policy draws on the following sources: the peaceableness inherent in socialist society, awareness of the really existing nuclear threat to mankind and the firm belief that, despite the contradictions and multifariousness of the world today, it is a mutually interdependent entity having common problems that prompt the need for mutually acceptable solutions. And it is history, the course of peaceful competition, that will decide which system is better. □

Cultural exchange serves peace

"INTERNATIONAL cultural co-operation promotes the achievement of mutual understanding among nations," Yevgeni Zaitsev, First Deputy Minister of Culture, has said in an interview with a correspondent from the newspaper *Sovetskaya Kultura*. Zaitsev headed the Soviet delegation at the opening ceremony of an exhibition of Russian art from the collections of the Tretyakov Art Gallery and the Russian Museum, which took place at the Renwick Picture Gallery in Washington on October 16.

This exhibition was held under the agreement on exchanges and contacts in the sphere of science, education and culture between the USSR and the USA, which was signed at the Soviet-US summit meeting in Geneva last year.

The Soviet exhibition was an immediate success and evoked great interest from the American public. Yevgeni Zaitsev said that about 2,500 people were visiting the exhibition every day. This again showed how necessary was the resumption of cultural exchanges between the USSR and the USA. "Such undertakings mean concrete implementation of the strivings of the peoples of the two countries for mutual knowledge, mutually advantageous co-operation and peace," the USSR Deputy Minister of Culture observed. "Culture, art, contacts and exchanges in the spiritual sphere will do a great deal for the achievement of mutual understanding and peace on Earth." □

HELSINKI FINAL ACT:

USSR wants cultural exchanges with West

THE Soviet Union wants to build its cultural relations with capitalist countries—including those involved in the Helsinki Conference—on a long-term contractual-legal basis. The newspaper *Sovetskaya Rossia* stressed yesterday.

The USSR already has agreements with most of them. Western countries now account for almost a third of all its international cultural exchanges. Since the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, more than 130,000 Soviet artistes and 2,148 companies have performed in the participating states, by arrangement with the Soviet Ministry of Culture. In the same period 673 exhibitions have been put on.

In 1985 alone performances were given by 827

Soviet art companies and 133 soloists, while exhibitions numbered 36. Soviet cinematographers work with their colleagues in over 100 countries.

The Soviet Union has for a long time been the undisputed world leader in the publication of translated literature. Since 1975, 20,000 books by foreign authors in 1.5 billion copies have been translated and published. Sales of books issued by foreign publishers have also increased steeply.

The Soviet stand on international exchanges in the cultural and spiritual sphere is a consistent one. It aims to promote peace and trust among nations, in complete conformity with the Helsinki Final Act. □