

Mikhail Gorbachev meets French delegation

Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee had a meeting in the Kremlin yesterday with a big group of representatives of the French public (Initiative-87). The delegation consists of about 360 prominent French politicians and public figures. Their visit was timed to coincide with the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and provides for acquaintance with the life of the Soviet people and the CPSU's policy at the present stage.

During brief statements the French participants in the meeting put a number of questions to Mikhail Gorbachev concerning various aspects of the CPSU's policy. Replying to them the Soviet leader stressed that at present it is impossible to develop a new type of international relations without the participation of social forces and the peoples themselves. "Those politicians", he said, "who will take this into account will get the support of peoples. And conversely, those who ignore the views of the masses or engage in politicking, and politicking always involves deceit, can expect only a short life in the field of politics".

The Soviet leader dwelt on the processes of restructuring, or perestroika, in the USSR. He said he had recently completed work on a book about perestroika and new thinking. This book sums up to a certain extent everything that had been thought out, undertaken and carried out during these years. It also deals with plans for the future.

The USSR has traversed a long road during the past seventy years, Mikhail Gorbachev said. The USSR "has become what it is now precisely thanks to the revolution, thanks to its socialist choice". This is a society with a tremendous political, intellectual, scientific and natural potential. But it is a society which has many problems. Today, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed, "we are not satisfied either with the level of the country's development or the situation in the country. We want to have a better society in all its dimensions. But even today the Soviet citizen is reliably protected in social terms".

Mikhail Gorbachev described the interests of working people as the main criterion of the entire restructuring. Replying to a question whether there existed any political opposition to perestroika in the USSR, the Soviet leader stated: "There is no political opposition in the Soviet Union". In the sphere of perestroika it is the people, the working people, the working class

that have the most revolutionary mood. The Party has formulated the policy of perestroika, created a political, moral atmosphere in society by way of openness (glasnost) and democracy. And at the stage of carrying out the restructuring the Party will do everything for this process to advance.

Dwelling further on the USSR's foreign policy initiatives the CPSU General Secretary noted that the world has approached such a stage when new approaches are needed. "War must be ruled out as a means of solving political issues. The Clausewitz formula that war is a continuation of policy by other means no longer applies".

The list of new problems, new realities, compels the search for new approaches to conducting international relations. Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that today international relations could not be built on the interests of only one country. "This way we will not get either international peace or international co-operation. A balance of interests is needed". The developing countries also have their interests which should be taken into account, he went on. Today the relations of developed countries, one of which is France, with the developing world are of a non equivalent nature. Cheap manpower and cheap natural resources are being used

(Continued on back page)

Eduard Shevardnadze's speech at UN General Assembly

Eduard Shevardnadze, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, on September 23 addressed the 42nd session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York. He said:

COMRADE PRESIDENT, distinguished delegates, one of this organisation's rules of procedure reserves a minute for a prayer and meditation. Each session of the United Nations General Assembly is an occasion for reflecting about the future of the world. Today, the world is on the threshold of great changes, and our thoughts are about that.

For the first time in history, the idea of nuclear disarmament is close to the beginning of fulfilment. It is not a new idea. What is new is that this is proving to be possible. Only yesterday, all we could see ahead of us was a blank wall. Today, we can see far ahead. Two thousand warheads are but a small part of nuclear arsenals, but big enough for its disappearance to give the world a new vision.

Agreement on these weapons is only a small part of what has happened. Something much more important has happened. The Soviet Union and the United States have together finally authored the first word in the nuclear-free lexicon. When this word becomes deed, the world will also gain in knowledge. It will realise that nuclear weapons and security are not synonymous, and that security becomes stronger when these weapons disappear.

For now, this principle has been established in a specific case. But it is already being established in practice. The whole question now is whether we will be able, proceeding from the same logical premise, to abandon the entire nuclear arsenal rather than just a part of it, and to scrap all weapons of mass destruction. The Soviet Union is convinced that we will be able to do so, the launching pad is small, but it does provide a boost for a great undertaking. The recent agreement may be followed by accord on reducing, by as much as one half, strategic weapons, provided, of course, that the treaty limiting ABM systems is preserved.

Today, there is an increasingly realistic prospect of a convention on the prohibition and complete destruction of chemical weapons. We can expect a productive development of the parallel process of reduction of conventional weapons, based on the concept of sufficiency. There is a possibility of making headway because we have bold ideas and willingness to remove the remaining obstacles.

An affirmative answer to the question of whether it is possible to scrap nuclear arsenals will become a reality if the international community once again helps us.

There is no need here to claim the palm of victory, which does not go together well with the olive branch of peace. I could describe how the Soviet Union worked towards the global double zero, but let others claim the credit if they wish. For that matter, if we have to compete in something it should only be in nuclear disarmament. The important thing for us is that what was sought has now been achieved, and the outcome is not at variance with the will of the majority.

We are moved by the enthusiasm with which the world has welcomed the agreement. It once again convinced us that we are on the right track. Listening to the voices of approval and solidarity, which drown out the morose and solitary voice of nuclear profiteers, your Soviet colleagues — without sharing the euphoria and yet without curbing the optimism — keenly feel that today all of us here are truly united nations. United not merely by formal membership in this organisation, but by a common destiny and a shared objective.

Thank you for this wonderful feeling. It should be preserved and carried further.

Thank you for the atmosphere of a unity of thought, co-operation and support which alone could produce an agreement.

In that sense the agreement is yours. And the

IN THIS ISSUE

Mikhail Gorbachev meets French delegation	p. 345
Eduard Shevardnadze's speech at UN General Assembly	p. 345
Soviet Foreign Minister in Brazil	p. 348
Soviet-Western trade in first six months of this year	p. 351

fact that it belongs to everyone is, as we see it, the best guarantee for its implementation.

"We were born to live together. And our community is like an arch which holds precisely because the stones keep each other from falling over..."

One is amazed by the ability of human thought to establish the supreme ethical law for all times. "We were born to live together." Seneca wrote to Lucilius many centuries ago in his "Moral Letters", but it is only today that this idea is being understood as the imperative demand of our time.

Today, Lenin's decree on peace is perceived as a message of supreme morality, addressed to our time. The repudiation of secret treaties, open and public conduct of international affairs, the immediate withdrawal from the war and its rejection as a method for resolving conflicts reflected, even in 1917, a common need, which has now become the will of the entire international community.

It takes a long and difficult road for human thought to become action, but sooner or later it does happen.

When we were discussing in Washington the technical procedures for the destruction of nuclear warheads, we were suddenly struck by the fact that just a year ago this had seemed to be something beyond the skies. Our American partners can also confirm this.

October Revolution

Words to express this are hard to find. Let us just say: the past gives a powerful impetus to the present, and the present gives guarantees to the future.

"Reality and the Guarantees of a Secure World". This title of Mikhail Gorbachev's article, published before this session, conveys the gist of our thinking today.

A secure world is possible. It is possible because anything different is too dangerous. The possibility of a secure world is commensurate with the need for it. This is the reality. As for the guarantees, we see them in a comprehensive system of security. Giving inspiration to and taking the lead in building such a system is a natural undertaking for the United Nations.

This, reduced to a concise formula, is the logic of that article, which develops the doctrine of a secure world. It stems from the history of our country and is a fruit of a political thinking that honestly analyses the entire preceding period.

In this context I shall permit myself to remind this distinguished assembly that its 42nd session coincides with the eve of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

This is our celebration, and we are not imposing it on anyone. The feelings evoked by our state's birthday are ours. Nevertheless, I shall venture to share with you my thoughts on some international implications of that date.

I think it cannot be disputed that the October Revolution was a major event of this century, which has had a tremendous impact on the destinies of the peoples not only in the former Russian Empire.

We think that the process of renovation which is under way in our country is more than just a strictly domestic affair of the Soviet Union.

It is impossible to describe as purely the Soviet Union's concern its desire to do away with one of the products of the cold war, which is the splitting of the world into hostile alliances.

All this, naturally, is also part of the objectives of perestroika — our process of change, while glasnost, openness, and dialogue are, as logically, its instruments — in both domestic and foreign policies. Between them there exists a direct and open relationship, and

one cannot be implemented without the other.

This, and this alone, allows me, when speaking about the 70th anniversary of our revolution, to invite you to think together.

If we have a concept of a world revolution, which is most closely linked to the process of revolutionary change in our country, we make no secret of it. It is this: organising the entire human community on the basis of recognising peace as a supreme existential value, human life, freedom and dignity as a general yardstick, and peaceful coexistence as a universal principle of relations among states. This concept, proclaimed in the political report to the 27th Congress of our Communist Party, has been substantiated by a series of practical steps taken by the Soviet Union.

Perestroika has also heralded major changes in international affairs. It should not be obstructed.

But, of course, unlike 1917 or 1918, in 1987 no external action could halt our revolution. It is a different time, and a different country.

And that could be one of the greatest achievements of the October Revolution.

The price paid for this was enormous. It was set by the foreign intervention and the civil war, the ruined economy and the economic blockade, terror and the attempts to subvert the foundations of our multinational state, the Nazi aggression and the cold war, which was imposed on us, nuclear blackmail and perennial attempts at political diktat.

Not a single day passed without making us pay the highest price.

Unlike many other revolutions, the October Revolution was the most bloodless. Unlike many others, its architects never intended to build their temple on blood. They never thought, as many had before them, that cruelty, violence and fear were the best glue to cement their ideal.

Openness

It was the policies of conspiracy, terror and intervention against Soviet Russia that made it shut and lock the doors and cut itself off from the hostile world.

In order to survive it was necessary to do the maximum within a minimum of historical time. A permanent lack of time and unending pressure on all fronts — they, too, helped create the conditions in which there were innocent victims and irreparable losses.

We are saying this for all to hear. There is not and there cannot be any justification for that. We do more than just say it. Being the heirs to both victories and defeats, accomplishments and errors, we are doing our utmost to consolidate the victories and to prevent even the slightest possibility of the errors being repeated either in domestic or in foreign policies.

This is a distinctive feature of our perestroika, its dominant trend, an indicator of the vigour and health of our society, a guarantee of its future, of its profound internal democratism, openness and integrity. And there is no need to engage in linguistic research to try to provide the listeners with an English equivalent of the word "glasnost". One might go astray in a foreign language, as has already happened with the same speaker, who claimed that there is no word meaning "freedom" in the Russian language. And, generally, playing with words is dangerous in this audience, in which far from everyone is ready to applaud insults summarily flung at entire countries and peoples.

Freedom does serve peace — but it is not the freedom which is interpreted as a licence to interfere in the affairs of others and to finance counter-revolution as the most profitable business.

As for our perestroika, no one should indulge in illusions. We shall not turn off the main

road or borrow from others their own norms and rules of democracy. Thank you for your advice, but we shall conduct perestroika according to our own design, on our own socialist basis. Allow us to determine ourselves what the Soviet Union is going to be. It will be what the Soviet people want it to be.

Those who want to support us will also support the project of rebuilding international relations on a broad democratic basis. They will support the concept of a nuclear-free world and all questions to resolve the knottiest issues of world politics. For here the interests of most members of the community fully coincide.

This rostrum is not a pulpit for preaching "free enterprise", this hall is not a school room or a university auditorium, in which one can teach lessons of rhetoric or lecture the international community on the manners of "good political behaviour". It is even less serious to adopt the tone of pastoral admonition, to tell the organisation that "sometimes it has strayed" and that "it is time for it to come home".

New political thinking

One can say, however, that this rostrum and this hall are the place where new political thought should raise its voice.

However much the world is split by confrontation and hatred, it is united as it faces the need to preserve itself and to perpetuate mankind.

From this objective reality emerges another guiding light for new political thought: in our time the correlation between the national interest and the interest of all mankind has changed. It has changed in the sense that the truly national interests cannot be opposed to common interests.

If, under the pretext that something is contrary to the interests of national security or considerations of national prestige, you reject everything that is borne by the political thought of the systems or governments which you do not like, then this will sooner or later boomerang against the genuine national interests of your own people.

New political thinking must put an end to that. New political thinking will put an end to that if it is put into action. And there is no doubt that it will be, for action, the unity of concept and implementation, of thought and its realisation, of word and deed, are yet another crucial condition for the existence of mankind.

New political thinking will inevitably make its way, for it is nourished by some remarkable elements: by the accumulation of progressive political experience: by the strictly scientific analysis, evaluation and forecasts of contemporary realities, and, finally, by the freedom of new political thinking from national narrow-mindedness that provokes animosity towards countries, groups of countries or socio-political systems.

In this regard let me say that the policy of hostility towards socialism has gone bankrupt both in theory and in practice.

The very fact of the establishment of the United Nations contained the embryo of new political thought. Even then its principles were embodied in the articles of the United Nations Charter which is undoubtedly one of the greatest statutory instruments of all time and of all nations.

And the fact that our organisation has been functioning for over 40 years now is testimony to the triumph of mankind's common interests over narrow-minded nationalism and big-power attitudes.

In fact, all post-war decades have been nothing else but a history of the struggle between outdated political concepts and new political thought which was born in the agony of war.

When life on Earth depends on your ability to destroy it twenty times over, there is something wrong either with you and your trust in such a guarantee of life or with the very idea of deterrence. Most likely, it is both.

New political thought exposes the absurdity of the idea of safeguarding anyone's security with nuclear weapons.

However, a question immediately arises: is it possible to ensure peace by other methods and do such methods exist at all? New political thought answers: yes. And here again I would like to focus on a comprehensive system of international security.

As is clear from Mikhail Gorbachev's statements, we envision its formation as a multilinear process extended over time and implemented through collective efforts.

In substance, its objective is that peace should be ensured exclusively by the United Nations and its Security Council on the basis of strict observance of the principles and provisions of its charter.

I anticipate a question here: if that is the objective, then what is the meaning of your proposal? There is already the United Nations Charter and the universal organisation for peace.

Let me recall that the United Nations was established for a world free of nuclear weapons and its charter was, naturally, designed to solve the problems of such a world.

Peace and security

Nuclear weapons produced a different reality, which in the final analysis made it impossible to use the United Nations fully as the principal machinery for the maintenance of peace and security. It so happened that the nuclear tumour limited the scope of and the possibilities for applying the charter. And now the prospect of militarisation of space threatens to erode its principles even further.

There should be, however, no question of adapting the charter to the realities of the nuclear and space age or, even less so, of wrecking it. The charter is a great document, which even today contains all the provisions that mankind needs to live and solve its problems without wars.

Even the charter, however, cannot do the impossible. No organisation, no set of rules, no code of behaviour can save the world in the few minutes between the launching of a missile and a nuclear holocaust. If and when the implementation of the "Star Wars" programme begins, the "shagreen leather" of that time interval will shrink much further.

And yet that programme has been touted here once again as a way "to ensure a safer world".

This is not so. And here I will refer to a person whose statements have been quoted so readily by the President of the United States, including the day before yesterday.

That person is Academician Andrei Sakharov. I quote: "my opinion as regards this programme is different from that of the Reagan Administration . . . It is also wrong to assert that the existence of the SDI programme has made the Soviet Union negotiate on disarmament. To the contrary, the SDI programme impedes the negotiations".

If we are to believe the academician in one field then why should we not believe him in another, in which he really is a high authority.

Leave the ocean of space to peaceful vessels, so that future generations may not have to build space minesweepers.

Excluding the nuclear and space component from the security equation is the only way towards real security.

We regard a comprehensive system of security as an interim programme for reasserting the role of the United Nations and of its charter as the primary instruments for peace.

What, then, are the practical aspects of a comprehensive system? Over the past year the co-sponsors of the resolution on this question have held consultations with members of the United Nations and discussed their proposal at international forums. As a result, many things have now become clearer, our ideas have become more specific and an atmosphere of teamwork has emerged.

The system is taking precise shape in all its four aspects — politico-military, economic, environmental, and humanitarian.

In the politico-military area it comprises the obligations by governments not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, or any force or a threat of force; making military doctrines exclusively defensive in nature; making public the data regarding defence expenditures and calendars of exercises and manoeuvres; adoption by all of the principle of non-offensive defence; and instituting a reliable system of verification.

Peace-making

We are convinced that a comprehensive system of security will also provide the keys to the settlement of regional conflict situations. This may be one of the most difficult tasks. In this connection, I will make a brief digression to address some ideas presented here the other day. I am referring to the statement made by the President of the United States the day before yesterday. I am not going to enjoy engaging in polemics with him. The emotions evoked by the agreement we have reached, my status as a guest, and respect for seniority restrain me from taking up, point by point, the allegations and arguments which are groundless in the extreme. But since the President mentioned the human heart claiming, as it were, a monopoly on having a heart, while denying it to others, I should like to say this:

It is heartless to declare countries and continents as zones of special interest for the "free world", from which it pumps into its economy the resources belonging to other peoples;

it is heartless to recruit and arm mercenaries, to proclaim them freedom-fighters, and to pay millions of dollars for the murders committed by them;

it is heartless to put into the hands of bandits the weapons they use to shoot down civilian airplanes.

The human heart is a very sensitive organ. It shudders from such treatment.

Those who have not suffered have no compassion for anyone. As for us, we know what war on our own territory means. Therefore it is not for rhetorical effect that we declare our support for the efforts of the United Nations.

It plays an important peace-making role in Afghanistan, where the mission of the personal representative of the United Nations Secretary General combines organically with the policy of national reconciliation. It is now becoming increasingly evident that the Afghans themselves are able to determine the future of their country, and indeed are doing so. The new encouraging trend corresponds with our sincere desire to withdraw Soviet forces from Afghanistan as soon as possible, and in this we meet with full understanding on the part of the Afghan leadership.

In Central America, the states of the region have themselves made impressive headway towards long-awaited peace. Their success is shared by members of the Contadora Group and of the support group, by all Latin American countries.

Dialogue between the countries of Indochina and ASEAN has revealed some promising elements. The policy of national reconciliation is beginning to work also in Kampuchea.

Real possibilities exist for a settlement of the Korean problem. The yearning of the Korean people for an easing of tensions in the peninsula and for the withdrawal of foreign troops and nuclear weapons cannot but evoke sympathy.

The United Nations has a detailed plan for putting into effect the resolution on the granting of independence to the people of Namibia, whose implementation would also constitute a major step towards a settlement of the situation in southern Africa.

A consensus is emerging in favour of convening a conference on the Middle East problem.

In Cyprus, our organisation and its Secretary General have also been acting vigorously, refusing to retreat in the face of obstacles.

Here is our view of the situation in the Persian Gulf: it has become critically dangerous and can get out of control. We are not at all pleased that the development of events, which we warned was quite possible, shows that we were right. The greater the military presence, the higher the probability of yet another conflict and of involvement in it of a state not belonging to the region. This is a source of anxiety to us. It also strengthens our resolve to act in a sensible and carefully considered manner, and once again to raise emphatically the question of removing the danger of massive military presence.

Co-operation

In these circumstances, it is extremely important to preserve the unity in the Security Council. This is not an end in itself but a prerequisite for implementing resolution 598. In their individual actions, each member of the council must abide by the resolution's requirements and not violate them.

The safety of navigation in the Gulf can and must be ensured by the entire world community, on whose behalf the United Nations will be acting. If necessary, appropriate and sufficient forces should be made effectively available to it.

It is necessary to try to secure, concurrently and immediately, a ceasefire between Iran and Iraq and to work for the fulfilment of the Secretary General's mission with respect to an impartial body to investigate the question of responsibility for the conflict. The Security Council should receive a report within a clearly established timeframe.

This would also make it possible to painlessly withdraw foreign naval forces from the Persian Gulf.

It is very important now to maintain composure, giving full assistance to the Secretary General and the Security Council.

In the economic field a comprehensive system of security seeks to promote co-operation that would be free of confrontation and would cover the entire system of coordinates of international economic relations. A failure to resolve the issues in this area is fraught with an explosive potential which, if detonated, would spell catastrophe for mankind.

The picture of prosperity drawn here the day before yesterday fades in the harsh light of reality. It would be hard to imagine "a march of democracy" in the developing countries saddled with a trillion-dollar debt. It is impossible to talk seriously of equal opportunities when a new, technological, variety of colonialism is at work.

It is imperative to act.

We believe that the international community could reach agreement to reduce interest payments on bank credits; institute further benefits for the least developed countries; limit the annual debt-service payments by each

(continued on back page)

Soviet Foreign Minister in Brazil

EDUARD SHEVARDNADZE, who is currently on an official visit to Brazil, has met President Jose Sarney of the Federative Republic of Brazil.

Eduard Shevardnadze delivered a personal message to the President from Mikhail Gorbachev. The President expressed sincere gratitude for the message. It was pointed out with gratification that the regular exchange of messages between the leaders of the two states on topical international issues is evidence of a strengthening of mutual understanding and trust between the peoples of the two countries, the development of Soviet-Brazilian relations on the basis of full equality, mutual respect and mutual benefit.

The President has reaffirmed the invitation extended to Mikhail Gorbachev to pay an official visit to Brazil. Eduard Shevardnadze has reaffirmed the invitation extended to President Jose Sarney to pay an official visit to the USSR.

An exchange of views was held in a warm, friendly atmosphere on key international issues and bilateral relations.

The President stressed that in Brazil they are following Mikhail Gorbachev's foreign policy activity with much attention and interest. He spoke highly of the Soviet-American agreements on medium- and shorter-range missiles which are opening the way to even broader agreements in the field of disarmament. The efforts directed at eliminating nuclear and chemical arsenals, Jose Sarney said, meet the aspirations of the Brazilian people who hope that these efforts will be crowned with specific positive results.

A broadening of fruitful co-operation between the Soviet Union and Brazil in the international arena was pointed out with gratification, and the mutual wish was expressed to broaden such co-operation to work for improving the international situation, for real disarmament above all nuclear disarmament creating conditions for a safe peaceful development of all countries.

On the same day talks opened between Eduard

Shevardnadze and Brazilian Minister of Foreign Affairs Roberto Costa de Abreu Sodre. The ministers were unanimous that the key issue of the world today, which is increasingly interconnected and interdependent, is ensuring reliable peace in conditions of disarmament and building up confidence. Eduard Shevardnadze explained the conceptual views and practical proposals set forth in Mikhail Gorbachev's article "The Realities and Guarantees for a Secure World", stressed that the formation of the proposed comprehensive security system should be done by the collective efforts of all states acting above all within the framework of the United Nations Organisation and on the basis of its charter. As has been shown by the 42nd UN General Assembly session, which opened in New York, the idea of universal security meets with growing understanding and support from the international community. The Brazilian minister stressed that the Soviet-American agreement in principle on medium- and shorter-range missiles is a source of faith in the reality of nuclear disarmament.

The sides agreed that the efforts in the field of disarmament should be internationalised as much as possible. The Disarmament Conference in Geneva can serve as a good forum for that. Special emphasis was laid on the need for the speediest resolution of the question for putting an end to the nuclear weapons tests, drawing up a convention banning chemical weapons and scrapping of its stocks.

Roberto Costa de Abreu Sodre set forth the basic principles of Brazil's foreign policy and in this context the essence of the initiative put forward by Brazil at the UN on announcing the South Atlantic to be a zone of peace and co-operation. The Soviet side expressed its positive attitude to that initiative. The concurrence or closeness of stands was pointed out on questions pertaining to strengthening peace and eliminating the threat of war.

The talks will be continued.

The Brazilian Foreign Minister gave a reception in honour of Eduard Shevardnadze. The reception proceeded in a friendly atmosphere. □

Soviet Defence Minister's reply to letters on nuclear tests

A REPLY from the USSR Minister of Defence Dmitri Yazov to letters from Christine Toma, a representative of the West German section of the organisation International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, was presented at the Soviet Embassy in the FRG on September 28.

In her letters Christine Toma expressed the profound concern of physicians and the entire FRG public over the continued testing of nuclear weapons and the stockpiling of these instruments of mass annihilation. The letters contain a call for the ending of nuclear tests.

The ending of nuclear weapon tests, says the USSR Defence Minister's reply, is one of the most pressing problems of our time. In my country the attitude to this problem is unequivocal, the Minister stressed — to stop nuclear tests, achieve a substantial reduction of nuclear arms and then their elimination. Such is the Soviet Government's political will.

We have proved this also by our moratorium on nuclear explosions. Dmitri Yazov says further. It lasted for 18 months and was repeatedly extended, thus giving the United States a chance to follow our good example. This, however, did not happen and despite protests by

the world public the American side started a new series of nuclear tests on February 3, 1987. In this situation the Soviet Union could no longer continue its unilateral restraint to the detriment of its own security and that of its allies.

Nevertheless, Dmitri Yazov stressed in conclusion, we are prepared to put an end to nuclear tests at any day or hour, should the United States take such a step as well. So now it is entirely up to the United States.

Christine Toma expressed her thanks for the reply from the USSR Minister of Defence. "In our opinion the ending of nuclear tests would be an important step towards ridding the whole world of nuclear weapons. We are for greater friendship among peoples," she stated.

The Secretary of the West German section of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Ulrich Fit, who was present when the reply was handed over, said in an interview to TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov that West German medics were now mounting an extensive action in support of the demand to stop nuclear tests. More than 1,300 West German physicians have sent letters to the United States, the USSR, Britain and France calling for a solution to this problem. But a response came only from Moscow. Ulrich Fit went on. The Western powers have not shown any understanding of our appeals, he stressed. □

US policies in the Persian Gulf

US Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger strongly criticised a group of US Congressmen who had proposed that a time limit be set for operations of the US naval forces in the Persian Gulf zone. Caspar Weinberger particularly attacked their idea that such a period should be limited to 90 days.

The statement by the US Secretary of Defense concerning US policies in the Persian Gulf gives one grounds to speak of a "Weinberger concept". Its essence, as an analysis of the Pentagon's practical actions in that region demonstrates, is to legalise the presence of the US Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf and to

use every means available to get the consent of the Arab states situated there to an arrangement ensuring their "security" with the help of the American military "umbrella" that has already been unfolded there. And then, to incorporate US Armed Forces — by means of power politics no doubt — into a collective defence system being developed by the Arab states of the Gulf and, in doing so, to try and establish unlimited US military control over that explosive region.

This is undoubtedly what Weinberger has in mind nowadays as he is touring the Persian Gulf region.

However, this approach is at a basic variance with the spirit and the letter of the joint

(continued on page 349)

Gromyko receives Romanians

ANDREI GROMYKO, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on September 28 received in the Kremlin a delegation of the Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Romania headed by Ioan Anton, Member of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania and Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

The sides expressed satisfaction with the development of Soviet-Romanian relations. They pointed to the great importance of the official friendly visit to Romania by Mikhail Gorbachev last May and the arrangements reached during his talks with Nicolae Ceausescu for the strengthening of all-round ties and co-operation between the two fraternal socialist states.

The sides are of the opinion that the achievement of Soviet-American arrangements on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles has been a major event in international life. This arrangement opens an opportunity for a breakthrough in the efforts over many years aimed at the consolidation of peace. The Romanian side welcomes this arrangement and regards it as an event of historic importance.

Both sides noted the role played by parliamentarians in the consolidation of friendship and trust among nations. □

French socialist at CPSU Central Committee

YEGOR LIGACHEV, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Anatoli Dobrynin, Secretary of the Central Committee and Vadim Zagladin, Member of the CPSU Central Committee and First Deputy Head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee had a conversation at the CPSU Central Committee on September 25 with Lionel Jospin, First Secretary of the French Socialist Party.

Yegor Ligachev informed Lionel Jospin about the CPSU's revolutionary strategy for accelerating the socio-economic development of the USSR, the implementation of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the main aims and first results of the restructuring in various fields of society's life. He noted the special importance of the decisions of the January and June 1987 plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee for the CPSU's new political strategy directed at further democratising Soviet society and developing the self-management of working people, at carrying out radical economic reforms. The transformation continues the cause of the October Revolution of 1917 and opens up new

possibilities for consolidating and perfecting socialism. The restructuring has the full support of the Soviet people and has brought about an upsurge of the creative forces of the broad popular masses.

Lionel Jospin noted that the French socialists and the entire French public are keenly interested in the restructuring in the Soviet Union.

Views were exchanged on the most pressing international questions, first of all questions of ensuring peace and disarmament, and averting the nuclear danger.

Yegor Ligachev spoke about the importance of the Soviet initiatives and evaluations concerning questions of nuclear disarmament and the creation of a comprehensive system of security, outlined in Mikhail Gorbachev's article "The Reality and Guarantees of a Secure World". In present-day conditions one must advance to the strengthening of peace by restructuring political thinking in accordance with the realities of the nuclear-space epoch. The genuine prospects of the conclusion of the Soviet-American agreement on the total elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles will create a qualitatively new situation for advance along the road of strengthening peace and nuclear disarmament.

It was noted that, on the one hand, the international situation remains complex and contradictory. But at the same time there are growing signs of a change in the atmosphere of

international relations, in public sentiments in favour of peace, security and nuclear disarmament. Much depends on the role assumed by responsible political forces in Europe and in the whole world: will they facilitate the creation of favourable conditions for ensuring security and disarmament or will they impede advance along this road? Mention in this connection was made of the non-constructive approach displayed by some French politicians to problems of nuclear disarmament and ensuring security in Europe on a non-nuclear basis.

Lionel Jospin outlined the FSP's approach to problems of nuclear disarmament and security in Europe, in particular to the problems of French nuclear arms. He said that in the opinion of French socialists the conclusion of the Soviet-American agreement on medium-range and shorter-range missiles will be of a positive significance for the interests of peace and security.

When questions of Soviet-French relations were discussed both sides said that their further development in all fields fully accords with the interests of the peoples of both countries, the interests of peace and security in Europe and in the whole world. There exists a big untapped potential for developing Soviet-French co-operation and for imparting greater dynamism to it.

Yegor Ligachev said that the CPSU attaches much importance to developing the dialogue with socialists and social democrats, especially on questions of the struggle against the dangers of war, for peace and disarmament. The differences over political and ideological issues between communists and socialists should not be an obstacle to co-operation between them in the name of eliminating the nuclear danger and ensuring mankind's survival.

Questions of further developing ties and dialogue between the CPSU and the FSP were also discussed. Yegor Ligachev conveyed to Lionel Jospin an invitation from the CPSU Central Committee to send a delegation of the FSP to the celebrations of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution.

The conversation passed in a friendly and constructive atmosphere. □

At the Political Bureau of CPSU Central Committee

THE Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee at its meeting on September 24 discussed and endorsed the resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers 'On Comprehensive Reconstruction and Building up of Moscow's Historic Centre in the Period up to the Year 2000'. It reflects the main concepts of the development of the capital's centre, and sets out concrete measures for their implementation. It is emphasised particularly that the measures planned are of much social and political significance. They must be implemented at a high engineering and architectural level, on the basis of

profound scientific and historic research, in an atmosphere of broad openness, with the active participation of the public of the whole country and the capital in the discussion of the projects.

The Political Bureau discussed and endorsed measures for better organisation of the sales of goods manufactured by co-operatives and citizens engaged in individual labour.

For the purpose of further development and enhancement of the level of scientific research in the area of traumatology and orthopedy and the considerable improvement of medical aid to the population, it has been decided to set up the all-union Kurgan Scientific Centre, 'Rehabilitation Traumatology and Orthopedy'. It is intended to set up a network of branches of that centre in the Moscow region, Leningrad, Vladivostok, Volograd, Kazan, Krasnodar, Krasnoyarsk, Omsk, Sverdlovsk and Ufa.

The question of serious shortcomings in the activity of the Azerbaijan Institute of the National Economy has been discussed. The Political Bureau agreed to the proposal of the USSR Council of Ministers to close that institute. In order to meet the requirements of Azerbaijan's national economy in cadres of economists, it has been decided to open in Baku a branch of the Leningrad Financial and Economic Institute.

The USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education has been instructed to enhance the personal responsibility of heads of higher educational establishments for the level of training specialists, for educational and research work, quality of the teaching staff, the state of the material base, and recommended to carry out regularly the certification of the higher educational establishments of the country.

The Political Bureau also discussed some other questions of home and foreign policy and adopted appropriate decisions. □

Warsaw Treaty Military Council meeting

THE Military Council of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty member-states held a meeting in the capital of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on September 24-26. The meeting was chaired by Commander-in-Chief of the Joint Armed Forces Marshal of the Soviet Union Viktor Kulikov.

The meeting was attended by Military Council members and also senior officials of the Warsaw Treaty defence ministries and administrative bodies of the Joint Armed Forces.

The Military Council discussed the results of operational and combat training of the Joint Armed Forces for 1987 and specified tasks for their training in the new training year with due account to the joint document of the Warsaw Treaty member-states on the Military Doctrine and its strictly defensive direction, which was adopted at the Berlin Conference of the Political Consultative Committee.

A useful exchange of opinions was held on some other questions of the activities of the Joint Armed Forces.

The meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Military Council has demonstrated the identity of views on all questions discussed. It was held in an atmosphere of friendship and close co-operation between the Warsaw Treaty armies. □

(continued from page 348)

statement made by the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council following the meeting of the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, France, Britain and the United States with the United Nations Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar.

The statement, as the meaning of that document is understood in the Soviet Union, spoke not of military, but only of political, measures with the aim of terminating the Iranian-Iraqi armed conflict and restoring stability in the Persian Gulf region.

The statement emphasised that the sole basis for a comprehensive, just, honourable and lasting settlement of the conflict — and consequently for normalising the situation in the region as a whole — is resolution 598 of the United Nations Security Council.

(TASS, September 28)

Pivotal issue of world politics

THE ABM TREATY AND UNIVERSAL SECURITY

By V. Viktorov

THE Soviet-American agreement in principle on medium- and shorter-range missiles has been perceived with satisfaction throughout the world as an important and encouraging event.

Calling this accord a "step forward toward a nuclear-free world", international public opinion believes that it can pave the way to dramatic reductions in strategic offensive weapons. The USSR shares this viewpoint.

Mikhail Gorbachev observes in his article 'Realities and Guarantees for a Secure World': "a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles would be a fine prelude to progress at talks on large-scale — 50 per cent — reductions in strategic offensive arms in conditions of the strict observance of the ABM Treaty."

This statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee succinctly defines the role which the Soviet-American ABM Treaty signed 15 years ago, on October 3, 1972, should play.

From the very outset this treaty has been associated most directly with the task of curbing the race in strategic offensive weapons.

Proper spirit

The ABM Treaty has not only enabled the two states to avoid a dangerous and costly competition in creating anti-ballistic missile systems: it has gone far to weaken incentives to boost strategic offensive weapons for the purpose of topping the other side's ABMs. An interim agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms was signed together with the ABM Treaty and simultaneously became valid. The alternative to the conclusion of these Soviet-American agreements would in effect be an incessant and constantly growing race in the development by both sides of costly ABM systems, which would be accompanied by no less intensive build-up of strategic offensive weapons.

The Soviet Union has always advocated the consistent implementation of all the provisions of the accords reached. The statement of the Soviet Government, which was made when the treaty was being submitted for ratification, read in part: "the treaty and the interim agreement do not require any invented interpretations or conditions. What is important is that the provisions of the agreements concluded be unwaveringly implemented to the letter and in the proper spirit".

Quite a different, complicated political atmosphere took shape around the ABM Treaty in the United States. As soon as the agreement went into effect, there began rearing their head strident and rather influential people in military-political quarters, who, like former Air Force intelligence head General G. Keegan, started arguing that an ABM system is "technically possible and strategically justified", and therefore should be developed. Members of the Committee on the Present Danger, an ultra-conservative organisation set up in 1976, whose members subsequently made a substantial contribution to the formation of the Reagan Administration's political platform, zealously set about pushing this idea. They were eagerly joined by the "father" of the American hydrogen bomb, E. Teller.

Thus, the United States was gradually preparing the ground for the star wars concept

President Reagan introduced in politics in his TV address of March 23, 1983. The Strategic Defence Initiative, SDI, he put forward negated the very idea of the ABM Treaty as the basic SDI goal was an ABM system with space-based elements.

Loath to give up stockpiling strategic offensive weaponry and anxious to make a space missile shield, the US Administration meant the shield to cover its chance of the first, disarming nuclear strike. No less important, SDI schemes were meant to draw the Soviet Union into a ruinous multi-channelled arms race, make it again and again update its armed forces and waste huge sums of money on purposes unable to really protect its security. That's the purport of the latest US competition strategy, in which SDI is prominent.

New stand

Logically, the SDI proponents attacked the ABM Treaty, an obstacle in their way. The Pentagon's advocates came out with the so-called broad interpretation of the treaty, which allowed R and D and tests on any device for space ABM systems. Early this year, the Pentagon bosses started a noisy campaign to start as soon as possible a gradual unfolding of the first stage of missile defence: an overt violation of the ABM Treaty.

To justify its intention to set up a large-scale ABM system, America's higher echelons claim that it is a defence system to stabilise the global situation, and that the Soviet Union and the United States ought to reach an agreement on a well-ordered shift to deterrence with emphasis on defence. In that connection, it is said to be urgent to acquire a new stand on the correlation between offensive and defensive strategic forces.

Nevertheless, the treaty gives a precise answer to the question of how defensive and offensive forces are correlated: effective measures to limit missile defence would be instrumental to check the strategic offensive arms race and reduce the nuclear war danger. So free development of ABM systems would bring a contrary result, as the recent past shows. When America actively started designing its interceptor systems in the 1960s, no less active experiments started in means to overcome those systems. Even though the US did not go so far as to set up an ABM system, it was a common opinion that newly-developed MIRVed missiles upset the strategic balance.

The attempts by the USA to cancel the provision on the unlimited duration of the ABM Treaty testify to its striving to break this treaty. At the Geneva talks the American delegation proposed to limit the time of non-withdrawal from the treaty to seven years and to give each side the right to deploy an echelon of a space ABM system after 1994. To all appearances, this period of time fits in with the intentions of the SDI-makers to start implementing plans for setting up a large-scale ABM system.

A comprehensive analysis of the current state of affairs with the ABM Treaty shows that the circles which have aimed their efforts at torpedoing this agreement, at translating the SDI programme into reality have not succeeded so far. Their activity encounters considerable resistance even in the USA.

Now few people in the United States believe in a possibility of creating a ballistic missile-proof "space shield". In its report published in April 1987 the prestigious American Physical Society

exposed the administration's optimistic information on achievements in the field of "exotic" ABM systems, which has perceptibly strengthened the position of the critics of the SDI programme. The administration has failed to win support for its plans of early stage-by-stage deployment of a large-scale space ABM system.

A tangible blow at the administration's campaign in favour of a "broad" interpretation of the ABM Treaty was dealt by the report of Sam Nunn, Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, published in May 1987. On the basis of vast factual material taken from many sources, including the classified reports of the American delegation at the SALT-1 talks, this report reaffirms that only a "narrow" (i.e., traditional) interpretation of this treaty is valid. The other day a majority in the US Senate voted for a resolution demanding that the administration should receive the consent of Congress before it could start holding tests within the framework on the basis of its new interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

But, anyway, the supporters of SDI have not laid down their arms, despite the opposition to their plans. A few days ago Washington informed about the approval by the Pentagon of the programme to hold "demonstration tests" of elements of an ABM space system first echelon.

Soviet proposals

The task of preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty now remains one of the most pressing in world politics. Proceeding from this premise, at the Geneva talks the Soviet side submitted a draft agreement on certain measures to strengthen the ABM Treaty regime and to prevent an arms race in outer space. A number of proposals on this issue were tabled by the Soviet side at the Washington negotiations. Their essence is to come to terms on not withdrawing from the treaty for at least ten years in the context of strict compliance with its provisions. At the same time, the sides would continue observing this treaty even after ten years, taking into account its unlimited duration. The Soviet Union suggested that the experts of both sides should discuss and list devices to be prohibited from space, in order to remove all unclear points in the question of strict compliance with the treaty provisions. Even the characteristics and parameters of these devices were cited.

The American side has not yet responded to this initiative. Nor has it replied to the Soviet proposal to hold a meeting of the defence ministers of both countries during a regular meeting of the Standing Consultative Commission established in keeping with the ABM Treaty to discuss the mutual claims relating to violations of the treaty. Incidentally, the recent invitation for representatives of the US Congress to visit the Krasnoyarsk radar installation emphatically disproved the accusations against the USSR voiced by the USA in connection with this radar: if it were built in violation of the ABM Treaty, there would be no point in the Soviet Union inviting foreign observers to it.

The earlier concluded Soviet-American agreements on nuclear armaments are a product of a conscious choice made in favour of reserve and self-restriction in the most sensitive sphere of relations between the USSR and the USA. These agreements, above all, the ABM Treaty, form the foundation on which a future system of international security can be built.

(Pravda, September 29.)

Soviet-Western trade in first six months of this year

TRADE between the Soviet Union and industrially developed capitalist countries in the first six months of 1987 made up 13.7 billion roubles, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Trade has told TASS.

Soviet imports from these countries went down by nearly 1.5 billion roubles, as compared with the same period last year, while exports from the USSR remained practically at the same level.

West Germany is the biggest trading partner of the Soviet Union. Soviet-West German trade totalled 2.5 billion roubles over the six months. These include 1.4 billion roubles of Soviet imports from the Federal Republic.

Trade between the USSR and Finland reached almost 1.9 billion roubles, more than one billion of them accounting for Soviet purchases in Finland.

The volume of Soviet-Italian trade grew by 220 million roubles since last year to reach nearly 1.7 billion. Soviet imports stood at 860.4 million roubles.

Trade between the Soviet Union and France in the first six months of 1987 amounted to 1.3

billion roubles, Soviet imports reaching 649.1 million.

The Soviet-Japanese trade turnover stood at 1.2 billion roubles, 769.7 million of them accounting for Soviet purchases in Japan.

The volume of Soviet-British trade grew by 100 million roubles to reach 961 million. Soviet imports from Britain were reduced to 287.1 million roubles.

The Soviet Union's trade with Belgium went up to 541.2 million roubles, Soviet imports standing at 196.5 million.

The volume of trade between this country and the Netherlands increased by 110 million roubles to reach 526.3 million. The Soviet Union imported Dutch goods worth 139.7 million roubles.

Soviet-US trade was nearly halved and stood at 512.5 million roubles. The USSR bought in that country 410.9 million roubles' worth of goods.

Austria ranked tenth among the USSR's Western trading partners in the first six months of this year. Trade between the two countries reached 480.4 million roubles. The figure includes 311.9 million roubles of Soviet imports.

The Soviet Union's trade with Switzerland

made up 466.8 million roubles, Soviet imports reaching 302.5 million roubles.

With Sweden — 325.2 million roubles (136.6 million).

With Canada — 282.8 million (274.5 million).

With Spain — 276.5 million (89.4 million).

With Australia — 222.6 million (217.3 million).

With Greece — 130.4 million (20.6 million).

The Soviet Union traded also with other industrially developed capitalist countries.

Its trade with Denmark amounted in the first six months of 1987 to 93.7 million roubles (Soviet imports making up 46.4 million roubles).

With Norway — 54.5 million (28.2 million).

With New Zealand — 52.6 million (50.3 million).

With Iceland — 31.9 million (17.4 million).

With Portugal — 29.5 million (27 million).

With Luxembourg — 12.6 million (7.8 million).

With Ireland — 12.3 million (6.5 million).

With Malta — 8.4 million (3.5 million).

With Liechtenstein — 3 million (2.6 million). □

Licensintorg is 25 years old

LICENSINTORG, the Soviet foreign trade association which is engaged in the export and import of licences, know-how and concomitant equipment, is well known to over 2,000 firms and organisations in 40 countries. These figures were cited on September 25 by Valeri Ignatov, Licensintorg's Director General, at a press conference on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the association.

During the year of its operation Licensintorg concluded some 2,000 licence agreements with its foreign partners. Most of them with the industrialised countries of the West. US firms have introduced at their enterprises over 50 development studies by Soviet researchers, on average nearly 100 new developments were introduced by Japanese companies and some 100 by West German companies. More than 200 licence agreements were signed with the socialist countries.

Most Soviet development studies used by foreign firms are in such spheres as ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, machine-building, chemistry, transport, agriculture, the food industry, civil and industrial construction, industrial microbiology, and so on.

"In recent times," Valeri Ignatov said, "our foreign partners display special interest in licences for medicine and biosphere protection. Production of pharmaceutical preparations and medical instruments became a subject for agreements between Licensintorg and firms in Western Germany, the USA, Italy, Belgium, Hungary and other countries. Using Soviet licences, Japan, Italy, Britain and Spain manufacture installations for the dry quenching of coke, precluding discharges of dust, gases and phenol run-offs. Japan extensively uses water-purification filter-presses for cleaning industrial sewage."

The range of services rendered by Licensintorg expanded considerably in the last few years. Foreign partners are offered assistance to launch on a commercial basis man-made satellites and the performance of other operations in near-Earth orbit. Negotiations on this score are in progress with several organisations in the USA, France, Australia, Western Germany and other countries. It is planned to place in orbit an Indian satellite from a Soviet carrier rocket.

Soviet import of licences for manufacturing consumer goods considerably increased in the past few years. Co-production on a licence basis has become a new form of co-operation. Such agreements concluded with Spanish, West German and Italian firms create an opportunity for the partners to improve the quality of goods and to boost production of manufactures without unnecessary efforts.

Work by the mixed joint stock societies Tecnicon in Italy and Technounion in Western Germany promote Licensintorg's active operation on foreign markets. With the assistance of the latter Licensintorg concluded over 30 licence agreements with West German firms. Joint engineering work was carried out to create a unit for the dry quenching of coke in Brazil.

USSR-FRANCE Co-operation in the coal industry

THE programme for scientific and technical co-operation between Soviet and French specialists in the coal industry for the coming year, and for a longer perspective was approved by the seventh meeting of the bilateral sectoral working group which ended in Moscow on September 25. The USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry and the French state company Charbonnages de France agreed to expand considerably the exchange of information on the achievements of the two countries in developing coal deposits both by underground and strip-mining methods and defined priority themes for joint development studies.

They include methods of working effectively gently sloping coal beds, improvement of systems of efficient dispatcher control, technological communications and methods of controlling air conditioning in mines. Much attention will also be given to labour protection of miners, higher efficiency of operating cutter-loaders at faces.

Soviet organisations are involved with the French firms Aimco-Secoma and Benn-Marrel on questions of creating equipment for the coal industry. They are developing jointly a new drilling-loading machine and systems of controlling mechanised supports on the basis of microprocessor facilities.

The meeting also examined prospects for developing new forms of co-operation. For instance, it discussed the question of establishing in the Soviet Union two joint ventures — one to mine coal and the other to produce equipment for controlling the atmosphere in mines. □

Expert Opinion

- Restructuring Begins With Each One of Us, by Tatyana Zaslavskaya, Member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and prominent Soviet economist 40p
 - Siberia is the Most Dynamically Developing Region of the Country, by Valentin Koptug, Head of the Siberian Section of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR 40p
 - The Prospects for our Co-operation Are Good, by Vyacheslav Sychev, Secretary of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance 40p
- cheque postal order*

Three further booklets in this new series from Novosti Press Agency Moscow. Available from Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW (01-373 7350).

'Co-operation for Peace and Progress' (on USSR's policy of broad international co-operation in industry, science, culture and education)

Price 40p (Cheque PO)
Available from Soviet Booklets (SN),
3 Rosary Gardens, London SW7 4NW.

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV MEETS FRENCH DELEGATION

(continued from front page)

through transnational companies. This enables capitalism to manoeuvre, to sustain the living standard of working people. And at the same time there is hunger and poverty on the territory of continents with a population of 2.5 billion.

The new thinking, he said further, when it develops into practice, makes it possible to raise many questions and issues. It gives an opportunity to find solutions through scientific and technological progress, through a new economic order, through a reasonable and not egoistic policy, through compromises and mutual interest.

Dwelling on the problem of disarmament, Mikhail Gorbachev said it was a matter of top priority. A nuclear conflict, he said, may start without any political decisions. Considering the accumulated nuclear stockpiles, it might originate in an uncontrolled manner. That is why we must stop the process of the arms race and get down to disarmament. The Soviet leader recalled that when the USSR proposed a 15-year-long programme of eliminating nuclear weapons it proceeded from several fundamental provisions. The first of them is that "security can only be equal. Attempts to outsmart each other, to achieve superiority are fraught with serious consequences. This is impermissible". We want equal security both for ourselves and for America, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed. And we

count on an understanding of this approach by the French side. The Soviet leader spoke positively of his relations and dialogue with President Mitterand of France and described him as a "major politician of the modern world".

Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the USSR comes out for co-operation in the humanitarian field. He recalled the Soviet proposal to hold a conference on humanitarian problems in Moscow. "We know what to say to the whole world on this score," he stressed. Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the hope that France would support this idea.

At the same time the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee noted that the bourgeois press in France, more than any other press in the Western world in the past and especially now, when changes are taking place in the USSR, is coming out from the most vicious anti-Soviet positions. In Mikhail Gorbachev's opinion "the bourgeois press wants to ignore or distort the picture of the processes taking place in the USSR". But the real situation cannot be ignored today. "If the new thinking gains in strength, if co-operation expands — trust will appear and all these burdens will be removed. We are realists, we are patient, we will not renounce our policy of co-operation with France. And we count on a similar attitude on its part. And no doubts about it, we have faith in the French people," Mikhail Gorbachev stressed.

In the course of the friendly conversation Madeleine Gilbert, Executive President of the France-USSR Society, stressed that members of the society were trying to do everything to promote better knowledge in France of such a great country as the Soviet Union. Franco-Soviet friendship is based on the need to preserve peace, ensure security and global balance, noted the former minister of foreign affairs Jean Sauvagnargues.

Addressing Mikhail Gorbachev, the former prime minister of France Pierre Mauroy, stressed that the hour of disarmament, the hour of peace has struck thanks to the Soviet leader's efforts.

The Bishop of Poitiers, Joseph Rozier, as though continuing the remarks made by Pierre Mauroy, noted that the efforts made in the USSR along the road of promoting the ideas of peace and recognising human rights generate in many people a big hope of happiness for all those who suffer because at times they are still denied the right to life, creed and free choice of country. Happiness, peace and freedom in the world demand that your efforts should continue and bear fruit.

Pierre Pineau, the Deputy Mayor of Bordeaux, declared for better relations between countries, for the development of economic and cultural co-operation. □

(full report in our next issue)

EDUARD SHEVARDNADZE'S SPEECH AT UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(continued from page 347)

developing country to a fixed portion of its annual export earnings; accept export products of debtor nations as payment for their debts and remove protectionist barriers to their imports; refrain from charging additional interest for loan payment rescheduling or debt refinancing.

These are, of course, only suggestions for discussion, but even now consideration could be given to devising a programme of immediate action to ease the debt burden of the developing world.

Over the long term it is also necessary to restructure the international monetary system.

And, of course, nothing would be more conducive to the economic development of nations than the most far-reaching programme of disarmament.

We are also familiar with a different viewpoint,

which does not acknowledge the relationship between disarmament and development. There are some who explain poverty by people's inability to work and build their own life as they choose.

This is nothing but yet another variety of racism. No people is untalented or incapable of creating material and spiritual wealth. It is just different conditions that either help or thwart a people from realising its potential.

The elimination of economic discrimination creates favourable conditions for people to prosper economically and spiritually.

The environmental aspect of the proposed concept reflects the evolution of thinking about the relationship between man and nature. Mankind's environmental security is as imperative as the threat of an ecological disaster facing it is real.

Today, we have become convinced that protection of the environment must be assured on a worldwide basis. Confrontation narrows the scope for concerted action while co-operation can expand it.

Our concept provides for a set of measures in this area.

The human dimension is the primary yardstick for a comprehensive system of security. Nations can and must co-operate in establishing optimum international conditions for safeguarding the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual everywhere, democratising internal conditions and building trust and harmony on that basis.

We should begin to devise together a broad range of practical steps in the humanitarian area, promote co-operation to eradicate apartheid, racism, chauvinism, nationalism, and discrimination on that basis, jointly deal with the problems of national minorities and refugees and safeguard the rights of emigrants.

We submit that for states and nations trust begins at home and that to a large extent it is based on the unity of words and deeds and on complete accord between political declarations and actual positions. Our domestic and foreign policy is, and will continue to be, guided by that principle while reserving the right to demand the

same of all other governments. Political, social, economic, and cultural rights of the individual should be safeguarded on the basis of generally accepted international instruments.

This is how it should be everywhere.

The countries that have put forward this proposal do not claim a certificate of copyright.

The system of security grows out of what has already been accomplished in the process of peaceful coexistence of nations in the post-war years. It grows out of the activities of the United Nations. It is rooted in a broad legal foundation and the treaties which restrain the arms race; in the negotiations on the central problems of our time and the codification of human rights standards; in regional security-building processes, and in the Non-Aligned Movement.

As a logical result of the development of mankind's common culture in this century, that system promises to become in the future a sphere for a collective application of creative efforts of all countries and peoples. Today, when two thousand weapons can be removed from the face of the Earth, when a historic breakthrough has been achieved in the forty-two-year-long trend, such a system reflects what we believe to be a genuine irreversible process — a product of will and perseverance. For we are indeed born to live together, and we shall stand together if we become an arch in which we shall support each other.

Our session provides the best occasion for reflecting about that. Its time should not be taken up by confrontation and hostility. The world is tired of that. There have been too many quotations intended to prove that you are dealing with the spawns of hell. It's just not serious. There have been too many accusations that detract from the dignity of nations. It is time for us to proceed to an earnest dialogue, time to get down to business.

In these moments, as we stand face to face with the past and the present, we become keenly aware that when this pause for reflection is over we shall again have to act. □

(N.B. The cross-heads in this bulletin were inserted by Soviet News—Ed.)

The Meeting in the Kremlin

Speech by Mikhail Gorbachev
at the International Forum
"For a Nuclear-free World,
for the Survival of Humanity"
Speeches by Forum participants

Moscow, February 16, 1987

Price 30p

The above Novosti booklet is available from Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW (01-373 7350).

"GLASNOST"

Changes in the Soviet Union
as seen by Foreign Journalists

This new Novosti booklet is available from Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW (01-373 7350).

Price 30p.