

## Mikhail Gorbachev's talks with Lazar Mojsov

TALKS between Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the Yugoslav leadership began in the Federal Chamber in Belgrade on Monday.

"Your visit opens a qualitatively new stage in our relations and will undoubtedly be of immense international significance," said Lazar Mojsov, President of Yugoslavia's Collective Presidency.

"Relations between the USSR and Yugoslavia are deep rooted," he said. "There were complicated periods, but we overcame the difficulties. The principles contained in the joint documents of 1955 and 1956 have been and remain the unchanged basis for our onward movement."

Mikhail Gorbachev shared the assessment of the current stage of relations between the two countries. He expressed confidence that the documents to be signed during the visit will create a firm foundation for deepening Soviet-Yugoslav relations and will undoubtedly acquire great international importance.

"We are prepared to go in relations with

Yugoslavia as far as the leadership of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia wishes," he emphasised.

Lazar Mojsov, in turn, stated that the Yugoslav leadership adheres to the same viewpoint in relations with the Soviet Union based on the known principles.

Elaborating on the idea of equality and mutual respect, Mikhail Gorbachev observed that no one has the monopoly on the "ultimate truth", no one could impose his model on others.

"Let us study each other's experience," he added.

"As is known, we are carrying out the perestroika or restructuring drive for ourselves," Mikhail Gorbachev went on to say. "It grew out of our conditions — internal and external. We do not impose its methods on anyone, although we do see and understand the interest shown in it in all countries.

"As perestroika proceeds we recall the past. We do this in order to draw lessons, so that negative developments never repeat themselves.

"We think that ideological support is one of the key issues of perestroika. We are looking

forward to the 19th All-Union Party Conference. It will sum up work done since the 27th CPSU Congress.

"The main thing is that it will define the principal directions in restructuring our political system and, of course, this should entail rethinking the Party's role and methods of its work.

"We will work here on the basis of Lenin's directives with a view to enhancing its importance as society's political vanguard."

A thorough exchange of views on a broad range of international issues was held during the talks.

The Yugoslav leader spoke about the Balkan foreign ministers' meeting and the establishment of a peace and cooperation zone in the Balkans. Yugoslavia came out in favour of peacefully solving regional problems, resolutely backed Mikhail Gorbachev's Statement on Afghanistan, and favoured convening the peace conference on the Middle East.

Discussing issues related to the Nonaligned Movement of which Yugoslavia was one of the founders, Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out that the Movement is advancing to a new level. This follows from the results of the Harare Conference. On many issues the Conference adopted clear-cut principled positions especially concerning disarmament for development.

"We will do everything possible so that the train of disarmament does not stop," Mikhail Gorbachev emphasised. "We will participate in all international forums and congresses for eliminating nuclear and conventional arms and for eliminating chemical weapons.

"Some people in the West are regrettably trying to evade resolving these problems and are replacing them with talk about modernisation, re-armament, compensation, and so on."

The present-day international realities demand another kind of thinking. It was stressed in this context that the assessment of the current situation by the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia is identical. Their policy in the international arena is identical or close also.

## Mikhail Gorbachev's talks with Bosko Kronic

THE talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and the Yugoslav leadership continued at the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia yesterday.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Bosko Kronic, Chairman of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee, held a thorough exchange of views on topical issues of the activity of the CPSU and the LCY, on the present state and prospects of developing relations between the two parties and countries and on key problems of the present times and the international communist and workers' movement.

Speaking of the perestroika drive in the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out that it is being carried out on CPSU initiative and under its effective guidance.

He described forms and methods of the Party's organisational, ideological, political and educational work, tasks facing it in securing the success of the radical economic reform, the

implementation of self-management principles, the consolidation of democratisation and glasnost, and the assertion of social justice in keeping with the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society.

Highly assessing the present level of cooperation between the CPSU and the LCY and the firm and reliable basis of Soviet-Yugoslav ties, Mikhail Gorbachev and Bosko Kronic emphasised that they attach special importance to the further expansion of inter-Party ties, the development of their new forms and directions, and the deepening of exchanges of views on topical issues of theory and practice of socialist construction.

## Mikhail Gorbachev's reply to Chinese schoolchildren's letter

"I WAS moved by your letter in which you so passionately and sincerely wrote about the most important thing for children and grown-ups — about peace on Earth and the happiness of all nations," Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out in his reply to a letter from Chinese schoolchildren.

"I'm sure that Soviet children share the feelings of the Chinese schoolchildren, that they also dream of a lasting peace on our beautiful planet," the Soviet leader said.

"Thanks for the good words about the Soviet Union and the warm wishes to our youth. I want to tell you that Soviet people, our youths and girls, deeply respect your country and wish the great Chinese people happiness, prosperity

and successes in building socialism.

"You and your Soviet coevals are the future of our countries. After some time you will take over work on developing their economy, science and culture and join in running state and public affairs.

"The future of our countries, the future of socialism, will depend on the extent you will succeed in handling these tasks.

"We elders believe that your generation, which can be described as the generation of the 21st century, will continue the noble cause of strengthening Soviet-Chinese friendship and the friendship of all peoples on Earth."

In their letter to Mikhail Gorbachev pupils of a  
(continues on page 96)

### IN THIS ISSUE

Mikhail Gorbachev's talks with Lazar Mojsov .....	p. 93
Mikhail Gorbachev's talks with Bosko Kronic .....	p. 93
Mikhail Gorbachev's talks with U.S. Senators and scientists .....	p. 94
Dmitri Yazov's interview .....	p. 96
Geneva — the need for two priority agreements .....	p. 97

# Mikhail Gorbachev's talks with U.S. Senators and scientists

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV had a meeting in the Kremlin on Friday with U.S. Senators Alan Cranston, Sam Nunn, Alan Simpson, Carl Levin, William Cohen and scientists James Clarke, David Hamburg, Sidney Drell, Charles Towns, Donald Rice, Robert Legvold and Deana Arsenian.

He described their arrival in Moscow and conversations with Soviet colleagues as an important contribution to developing the Soviet-American dialogue in which personal contacts have played and continue to play a very significant role. Mikhail Gorbachev reiterated his high appraisal of his recent meetings with President Ronald Reagan, Secretary of State George Shultz and other American leaders. The political capital accumulated as a result makes it possible to count on continuity in the matter of improving relations between the two countries. This is a demand of the time. It is desired throughout the whole world. And it is the duty of the two great nations to find means of embarking on the reliable road of constructive mutual relations, a balance of interests, to learn to live together in the complex contemporary world and cooperate for the benefit of each other and of all the rest.

Mikhail Gorbachev noted the improvements that are taking shape along the lines of cultural and information ties, contacts between businessmen, scientists and the public of the two countries. An exchange is developing between the U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet and all this is acquiring growing content, he pointed out.

The issues of security and arms reduction, international stability and confidence-building dominated the meeting.

The interlocutors expressed the conviction that the INF treaty will be ratified. For this reason emphasis is shifting to the issue of strategic nuclear arms and conventional weapons.

"Our efforts are directed at getting a good reliable treaty on strategic offensive arms," Mikhail Gorbachev stressed. "A bad one won't make it either in your country or here."

The Soviet leader reminded the visitors about related proposals made the last time George Shultz was in Moscow. Mikhail Gorbachev did not rule out the possibility of considering proposals put forward by Senator Cohen.

The Soviet leader voiced confidence that the strategic offensive arms treaty could be prepared in time for the U.S. President's arrival in Moscow. "But the way things have been going in Geneva these past few weeks cannot but arouse apprehension. And some recent official statements have added to the uncertainty," the Soviet leader added.

Answering a question from Senator Levin he reiterated the allegiance of the Soviet Union to its position on the direct linkage between cuts in strategic offensive arms and compliance with the ABM Treaty of 1972.

"Violating it destroys the entire machinery of the agreement. We shall never be able to bridle

the rabid charger of the arms race if it is let loose in outer space.

"There are also other points which, if we fail to reach agreement on them, will put the strategic offensive arms treaty in doubt.

"This applies first of all to the sea-launched cruise missile problem for we may not reduce some kinds of weapons while counting on having others outside of control or even building them up," Mikhail Gorbachev emphasised.

The complexity of the problem of reducing conventional arms is universally recognised. Within this context answers were given to the question raised by Senator Cranston as to how the arms sufficiency principle is understood in the Soviet Union.

"We see it as including the exceptionally defensive nature of the military doctrine, parity and equal security, a change of the character of military activities, the pattern of the armed forces, their location, the mandatory reduction of armaments and armed forces and strict verification," Mikhail Gorbachev answered. "There are lots of problems in this respect, and they are extremely complex."

Senators Nunn and Levin expressed a number of specific proposals which could likewise be the subject of talks or of preliminary elaborations. Mikhail Gorbachev also called for inviting scientists more substantially to analyse all these problems. A thorough look into the problems and the highest competence are needed here.

"The main thing is that it is essential to begin, at last, the talks themselves, to put the cards on the table, as has been repeatedly said, to figure out everything and to start 'bargaining' on all points, including asymmetries. What is needed here, just like in all other things, is consistency and frankness which rule out a one-sided approach and emphasis on the partner's having an edge in something, while forgetting one's own edge in other types of arms."

In this connection Mikhail Gorbachev stated that the recent Brussels session of NATO at summit level had made no headway.

"There was little real politics there. They dealt more with ideology and propaganda, and demonstration of NATO's unity. It must also be said at the same time that we are against loosening alliances. This would only breed suspicion, and would slow down disarmament."

One even gets the impression that certain NATO figures are afraid of talks, whereas talks are indispensable. It is only through talks and by joint efforts that the entire character of Soviet-American and Soviet-West European relations can be changed for the better. No one can afford to ignore Europe's interests — neither the USSR nor the United States. We are all linked by common destiny.

Senator Simpson raised the question of regional conflicts above all in Central America. It became clear again that a wrong view of the Soviet Union's policy in this matter is prevalent in the USA.

Mikhail Gorbachev repeated that the USSR has no special interest in Central America — no plans to create military bases in Nicaragua or try to use its relations with Nicaragua to anybody's detriment. "But we solidarise with the Nicaraguan people's struggle for the right to independent development. And we do not see what threat small Nicaragua can pose to the USA, a superpower. We are in favour of the resolution of that regional conflict in the framework of the Guatemalan Agreement, by the efforts of the Contadora Group and Latin Americans themselves. President Reagan was

told this in Washington and the proposals we made then remain valid."

"We have already taken practical steps to invite the United States and other countries to cooperate in achieving political settlement of regional conflicts without interference in the internal affairs of the countries involved in them. In this sense the problem of Afghanistan is the gauge of a really serious wish to act precisely in this spirit."

"Meanwhile, after understanding has been reached with the USA, we witness attempts to bring aggravating elements into the process of the talks conducted between Afghanistan and Pakistan through the mediation of Diego Cordovez."

"When George Shultz was on a visit in Moscow we showed a constructive approach also in the question of the Middle East settlement, and we count on the continuation of joint efforts to convene the international conference."

David Hamburg recalled Mikhail Gorbachev's idea of enhancing the role of scientists in world politics. Mikhail Gorbachev expressed a number of considerations as to how he views the organisation of their joint work and their establishment of contacts with political leaders. "Nowadays politics cannot be conducted in earnest without enlisting the potential of the intelligentsia," he said. "Without this, politics are deprived of the human factor, so important now. Therefore the Soviet leadership treasures so much the deepening contacts with scientists and workers in arts."

Mikhail Gorbachev said he appreciated the seriousness of the approach of those present and of the responsible circles in the USA in general to studying what is taking place in the Soviet Union. To be understood and to apply the correct understanding to politics and the sphere of communication among states is a most important factor of the transformation of international relations.

"Perestroika in the USSR does not threaten anyone. It leads to stabilisation and economic upsurge and also firmly asserts humanistic principles in Soviet society. Transformations in such a country as the Soviet Union require huge efforts. This is an extremely complex undertaking. Therefore it is natural that we are interested in reliable peaceful external conditions."

Our foreign policy is determined also by the new thinking, that has enabled us to see the imperatives of the modern world better and transform them into practice," Mikhail Gorbachev said.

"The experience of the past three years has convinced the Soviet leadership even further that we cannot pursue any other policy but perestroika inside the country and any other foreign policy but the one based on the new thinking.

"This is also true about our course for improved relations with the United States. That we are having debates is not only normal but even essential — so as to make fewer mistakes and guard ourselves against voluntarism and subjectivism which will doom us to vacillation and uncertainty at home and be fraught with difficulties for the entire world.

"Favouring fundamental changes in the Soviet-American relationship we do not entertain illusions or daydream. We proceed from realities, see the entire complexity of the real contradictions and problems clearly and have based our entire concept for checking the

*(continues on next page)*

# At the CPSU Central Committee Political Bureau

THE Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee at its meeting on Thursday examined the results of the conference of the secretaries for international matters of the central committees of the communist and workers' parties of socialist countries and approved the work done there by the CPSU delegation.

The Havana conference was a marked step in deepening cooperation between the fraternal parties in international activities and in their efforts to limit arms, bring about disarmament and development and strengthen international and regional security.

Instructions were given to realise the understandings reached at the conference.

The Politburo examined and approved the

results of the meetings and conversations held in Havana by Anatoli Dobrynin and Vadim Medvedev with Fidel Castro and other Cuban leaders.

It approved the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with Franz Muhri, Chairman of the Communist Party of Austria, which confirmed the concurrence of their views on the present-day situation in the world and the need for efforts to ensure security and international cooperation.

The Politburo considered the issue of streamlining management in the lumbering industry and forestry. It is provided to precisely delimit the functions of control over the integral state forest stock and the functions of putting it to economic use.

With this aim, it is planned to set up a union-republican USSR State Committee for Forests and a union-republican USSR Ministry of

the Lumbering Industry on the basis of existing management agencies.

The meeting examined a draft resolution on measures to expedite the economic and social development of the Murmansk Region in 1988-90 and the period ending in 2005, which was drawn up taking account of the results of the visit made by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the region.

It was found essential to carry out a package of large-scale measures to build up and improve the use of the production potential and ensure a statesmanlike approach to the comprehensive development of the Kola peninsula's natural and raw material resources, which are nationally significant.

The Politburo at its meeting discussed also some other home and foreign policy issues.

## CPSU Central Committee Conference

A CONFERENCE at the CPSU Central Committee last Wednesday heard reports from the First Secretary of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan Kyamran Bagirov and the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia Karen Demirchyan on the situation taking shape in these republics in connection with the events in Nagorny Karabakh.

As was noted at the conference, the situation in these republics is returning to normal although it continues to have its difficulties. Enterprises and educational establishments are functioning. The shortfall in industrial output is being made up. Public order is being observed. The investigation of the crimes perpetrated in Sumgait on 28 February 1988 is continuing.

The population of the republics give ardent support to Mikhail Gorbachev's appeal to the Azerbaijani and Armenian working peoples. Students, workers and collective farmers regard as extremely timely the statement by the leader of our Party that complex questions of inter-ethnic relations can be solved only within the

framework of the democratic process and law and order without permitting the slightest detriment to the internationalist cohesion of the Soviet people, without surrendering the most serious issues of the people's destiny to the power of any spontaneity and emotions whatsoever.

Addressing the conference, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that the main thing now is to consistently implement the Leninist principles of the nationalities policy, to strengthen the friendship of the Azerbaijanian and Armenian peoples, of the peoples of the Soviet Transcaucasus and the whole country. Any aggravation of the situation can hurl us back from the great gains of the friendship of peoples attained by our country in the seven decades of its existence.

On decision of the Politburo the Central Committee's Secretariat has been instructed to organise a profound and all-round study of the accumulated problems in the Nagorny Karabakh Autonomous Region and the causes of the aggravation of inter-ethnic relations around it, to draw up relevant proposals and when they are ready submit them for consideration by the CPSU Central Committee and the Government of the USSR.

At the same time it has been recommended to the central committees of the Communist Parties

of Azerbaijan and Armenia to work out a set of long-term measures to improve the internationalist education of working people and to solve in a coordinated manner topical questions of the social, economic, everyday-life, scientific, cultural, linguistic and other aspects of the mutual relations of these republics on the basis of the Leninist principles of internationalism.

Summing up the conference, Mikhail Gorbachev again stressed that not a single question of perestroika can be solved today without due account for its impact on ethnic relations, that the progress of perestroika requires the concerted, determined and close-knit work of all working people, representatives of all nationalities of the Soviet Union.

Taking part in the discussion at the conference were Andrei Gromyko, Yegor Ligachev, Nikolai Ryzhkov, Alexander Yakovlev, Pyotr Demichev, Vladimir Dolgikh, Georgi Razumovsky, Anatoli Lukyanov, as well as the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Azerbaijan Gasan Seidov, the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Armenia Grant Voskanyan and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Armenia Fadey Sarkisyan.

(from previous page)

arms race and fashioning a secure world on precisely these premises," the Soviet leader continued.

Responding to remarks by Donald Rice, he explained the reasons for his optimism about the outlook for the immediate future.

"What has already started in public and scientific circles and in real politics makes it possible to look at developments optimistically. This is not euphoria. Unlike it, optimism is based on realism.

"We have as yet only made the first steps to getting on to the constructive road. And it will take a lot of patience to withstand the strain of the first three or five years which are needed to bolster the healthy trends and get new generations involved in them.

"It is very important to keep on this currently very difficult course without relapsing into confrontation again," Mikhail Gorbachev emphasised.

In this connection Mikhail Gorbachev responded with interest to Mr Legvold's

reflections on the need to overcome the 'enemy image' in relations between the two peoples and systems.

"At least three aspects are important here — recognition of the right of each people and each country to an independent choice without the imposition of a way of life by anyone else, understanding inevitable differences between countries, peoples and societies and the ability even to find something positive in these differences, which generates competitiveness and useful comparison; and the realisation of the scope of contemporary threats and the unprecedented nature of problems concerning everyone."

"Scientists' responsibility in mastering the entire range of conditions for the survival of civilisation is immense. Figuratively speaking, these are intellect and conscience. Their combination forms the necessary humanistic factor which is now so badly needed by every country and the whole of mankind so that they could proceed to new achievements."

The subject of perestroika in the Soviet Union and its international consequences ran throughout the conversation.

Matters pertaining to exchanges of students, scientific and cultural contacts, humanitarian issues and human rights were touched upon.

"We see the forces which want to push us off the constructive road," Mikhail Gorbachev said in conclusion. "This is why consistency, firmness and the conviction that Soviet-U.S. relations can and must be improved in the interests of our two peoples and the whole world are needed."

In parting, Mikhail Gorbachev had a brief chat with each of the American participants in the conversation.

The meeting continued for about three hours and was held in an atmosphere of openness, wellwishing and high sense of responsibility, and was notable for the mutual desire to consolidate the positive elements in Soviet-U.S. relations and for a businesslike approach to contentious issues.

# Dmitri Yazov's interview

SOVIET Defence Minister and General of the Army Dmitri Yazov and U.S. Defence Secretary Frank Carlucci will have a meeting on March 16-17 in the Swiss city of Berne in keeping with an agreement reached earlier.

The first meeting of this kind in the history of Soviet-American relations is attracting world-wide attention.

The Soviet Defence Minister on Monday answered questions from a TASS diplomatic correspondent. We view the meeting between the Soviet and U.S. defence ministers in the context of the Soviet-American dialogue — the importance of which for international security, for the destinies of peace is generally recognised. Dmitri Yazov stated.

The joint Soviet-American Statement adopted during the first summit in Geneva in November 1985 stresses that any conflict between the USSR

and the United States would have disastrous consequences.

Preventing war — nuclear or conventional — between them is of principled importance. The sides pledge not to seek military superiority.

We link the forthcoming meeting with Mr Frank Carlucci with the possibility of having a substantive discussion of military-political and military-technical issues for the sake of mutual understanding and trust between the USSR and the United States.

It is planned to discuss and compare during the meeting the basic provisions of the military doctrines of the United States and the Soviet Union and consider fundamental issues concerned with reducing and limiting armaments.

There is no aim to substitute for the official talks conducted by the foreign ministers and the delegations of the USSR and the United States at Geneva.

The goal is to facilitate the search for ways to resolve the most acute and immediate issues of

strategic offensive weapons and the ABM Treaty, reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, termination of nuclear testing, and prohibiting and eliminating chemical weapons. We count on frank and constructive discussion.

We are prepared to discuss issues of preventing incidents between the armed forces of the United States and the USSR.

During the meeting we hope to exchange views on developing contacts in the military field.

We believe that all this can further deepen Soviet-American dialogue.

Dmitri Yazov stated that contacts between representatives of the USSR Defence Ministry and the U.S. Defence Department will be continued. Marshal Sergei Akhromeyev, Chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, is for instance to visit Washington this year at the invitation of Admiral William Crowe, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

## At the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva

THE delegations at the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons met in plenary session in Geneva on Friday. At the session the USSR delegation presented a set of proposals in connection with the preparation of a draft memorandum of understanding regarding the data base, which is an inalienable part of the future treaty on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive armaments.

Like the Soviet proposals on the protocols on inspections and procedures for eliminating the weapons submitted earlier last week, the documents presented by the USSR delegation on Friday are compiled in the form of a combined text in which the coincident elements in the sides' approaches to the memorandum of understanding and also the divergencies that remain for the present are reflected.

So the Soviet side took a new important

and constructive step at the negotiations aimed at drafting, without losing time and in line with the instruction which was given to both delegations as a result of the talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz in Moscow last February, the texts of all of the three aforementioned documents (protocols on inspections and on procedures for eliminating the weapons, and also the memorandum of understanding) by the time of the regular Soviet-U.S. meeting at ministerial level this March.

By submitting the specific proposals, which take into account in large measure the American side's approach and draw on the positive experience of preparing the INF treaty, the Soviet side has reaffirmed its determination to get the tasks faced by the delegations accomplished — to prepare a set of documents on 50% reduction in strategic offensive armaments provided there is compliance with and nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty ready for signing at the coming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Moscow in the first half of this year.

A special group to address verification issues, among them those involving the monitoring of mobile intercontinental ballistic missile launchers and long-range air- and sea-launched cruise missiles, also got down to work on Friday on the initiative of the Soviet side within the framework of the negotiations on nuclear and space weapons.

Work is continuing in the groups to get agreement on the draft protocols on inspections and on the procedures for eliminating the weapons.

Meetings within the framework of the group on space weapons were also held last week. Under the understanding reached at the Moscow talks with George Shultz, the USSR delegation pursues a consistent line for working out an agreement on abiding by the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972 and on the nonwithdrawal from it during the agreed-upon term on the basis of the decisions on this score formulated in the joint statement of Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan of 10 December 1987.

(from front page)

secondary school of Yunyang, Sichuan Province in the People's Republic of China. Zhang Yang and Xiong Shuhuei, said — "We know that today you are at the lead of a new revolution whose ideas have inspired the hearts of Soviet people.

"They are also close to Chinese youth.

"Your activity is directed at safeguarding the truly peaceful and happy future of mankind. Please convey best wishes to Soviet young people and tell them that we want to make friends with them."

Thousands of Chinese children put their signatures to the letter.

Mikhail Gorbachev's reply was handed over to the Chinese schoolchildren by representatives of the Soviet Embassy in China at a ceremony in Yunyang.

## Soviet representative speaks at Vienna meeting

Major-General Viktor Tatarnikov, member of the Soviet delegation to the Vienna follow-up meeting of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, spoke in Vienna on Thursday voicing a number of considerations regarding the Brussels statement adopted by the NATO council on March 2.

He called attention to the fact that as set forth in the document, the position of the NATO members on armed forces and conventional armaments was not conducive to progress in working out a mandate for future talks on these matters.

The NATO statement had made far-fetched claims about a 'Soviet military threat' and a 'military superiority' of the Warsaw Treaty countries and other allegations in the spirit of old thinking, Tatarnikov said.

At the same time it hadn't offered any ideas for effecting mutual cuts and eliminating imbalances and asymmetries simultaneously in the armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. Instead, the statement had put forward an absurd concept for unilateral reductions in the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty, the Soviet representative noted.

The NATO leaders, he said, would like to reduce only tanks and artillery, while leaving such destabilising weapons categories as attack aircraft and combat helicopters, where NATO enjoyed an advantage, intact.

Besides, the NATO statement had sidestepped the main issue of key importance to completing the drafting work on the talks' mandate, namely the issue of including dual-purpose systems on the agenda of the talks.

The Soviet representative expressed concern about that NATO attitude to disarmament problems, saying it could complicate the Vienna negotiations.

### Disarmament and Development

Vladimir Gurevich

Available from Soviet Books, 3 Rosary Gardens, London SW7 4NW.

Price 30p.

# Geneva — the need for two priority agreements

By Lev Semeiko, Deputy Chairman of the Disarmament Commission of the Soviet Peace Committee

THE Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva are entering their decisive stage. Agreements should be reached in the very near future for the next meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan to become not only possible, but also successful. However, there are difficulties at the Geneva talks. One of them lies in the problem of preventing an arms race in space. This problem is primarily linked with the observance of the ABM Treaty, notably during the implementation of the U.S. SDI programme. It is very important here to have a correct idea about the positions of the sides and their sources, including the SDI question. Let's recall that the U.S. is doing everything to create the impression that SDI is a response to a 'superpowerful' Soviet effort to develop its own large-scale abm system. We should not lag behind the USSR, it is said, for otherwise its military superiority will become inevitable.

These premises are utterly false. First, let's speak about the Soviet effort in the abm field. Of course, the USSR is engaged in fundamental space research. One of its aspects is a search for potential countermeasures to the deployment of an American space-based abm system. But these countermeasures are aimed at neutralising American strike space weapons — laser, beam or kinetic weapons for 'Star Wars'. The USSR is not going to create in the U.S. wake a kind of space astrodome over its territory, or, at least, over nuclear or other strategic objects.

This question reflects in quintessence the difference in the sides' approach to the arms race. The U.S. wants to have initiative in developing latest weapons which would be greatly superior to Soviet ones, and is going

to rely on last-minute technology to achieve this. The USSR is not going to catch up with the U.S., not to mention leaving it behind. Nor is it going to copy American attempts to surge ahead. The Soviet position is different — if the U.S. wants to develop these or other weapons, we should immediately think about potential countermeasures — cheaper but effective and easy to be implemented in a short time.

Such an approach is obvious concerning space weapons. We should learn to withstand incinerating laser beams, and parry strikes by space-based homing missiles. But to do this we have to conduct research. We need it exactly to counter SDI, but not to create a 'defensive' system of our own, as our leaders have stated more than once. We are against a space-based abm system. Nuclear weapons should be eliminated rather than made obsolete and impotent with SDI implementation. Reagan's stake on SDI is a great mistake which may play a fatal role by engendering an unheard-of race for both defensive and offensive weapons.

Now the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Europe have entered a very delicate stage. For the USSR the main task is not just to agree on the character of a 50% cut in strategic offensive arms, but also to make this cut possible. And it will become possible if both sides take a pledge to keep to the ABM Treaty as signed in 1972 during a negotiated period. It is still to be negotiated. The USSR stands for 10 years or more. As the leaders of both powers agreed at the last meeting in Washington, no later than three years before the end of a negotiated period, the sides will begin to discuss intensively the questions of strategic stability in a situation which will take shape by that time. After that period, if the sides won't reach any other agreement, each of them will be free of obligations and will receive the right to decide on its actions itself. So, now we need two agreements — on halving strategic nuclear arms and on non-withdrawal from the ABM Treaty during a negotiated period. Another major step in the field of nuclear disarmament will become possible only if these agreements are reached.

The USSR insists that the crucial ABM Treaty provisions should not be violated in the process of SDI research, development and testing if

necessary. After all, this Treaty is indispensable for continued nuclear disarmament.

Are there real opportunities for signing accords in the middle of the year? Not long ago President Reagan began to doubt this — the problems look too sophisticated for the draft of the proposed treaty to be worked out as it was planned before. True, the problems are really sophisticated, but the President himself believes that success is possible if there is political will. The USSR does have it, so the ball now rests in the U.S. court.

Serious policy should be oriented to realism. And the most serious policy of all is the one which is aimed at the early elimination of a threat of total destruction. Hence, the sides should exert tremendous efforts to reach agreement on the indisputably difficult questions of Geneva. But they have already accumulated experience in this field. In particular, now it is much easier to solve the problems of verifying agreements, for the measures envisaged in the INF treaty can well be applied to strategic arms. Quite recently, the Soviet side made new proposals aimed at an early elaboration of a strategic arms treaty. These proposals consider the American position in many respects. I mean the definition of initial terms to be used in the proposed treaty and other questions. Earlier the USSR expressed its readiness to share with the U.S. its achievements in the sphere of verification, notably its method of determining not only the presence, but also the yield of nuclear charges with national technical facilities. This is the most intricate problem in solving the entire question of sea-based cruise missiles.

The main point is to strive for positive results in reality. Moscow believes that success is quite probable. May or June are proposed for the conduct of the fourth summit, this time in Moscow. Reasons for this were given by the recent Moscow talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. They were encouraging. March and April will be critical months, judging by all. Let's hope that the scheduled monthly meetings between the heads of the Soviet and U.S. foreign policy departments will ensure political solutions in those spheres where technical ones have not yet been found, and where the political approaches of the sides are still different.

## Missiles arriving at elimination site at Saryozek

NEW entries are being added to the chronicle of the nuclear disarmament process, which was started on December 8, 1987 by signing the Soviet-U.S. treaty on eliminating intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, as the document has begun to be translated into reality.

Trains carrying Soviet shorter-range OTR-22 ('ss-12') and OTR-23 ('ss-23') missiles, which were removed from the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia late last month — even before the treaty's ratification — by agreement with the governments of those countries, are arriving at the settlement of Saryozek in the remote Kazakh steppes.

A group of Soviet correspondents and their colleagues from socialist countries visited that once top-secret facility last Saturday.

The reporters, who represented news agencies, the press, radio and television, witnessed the unloading of the second train with missiles and carriers from Waren, the GDR.

Four more such trains are expected this week from the GDR and Czechoslovakia.

The unloading over, the column of carriers with missiles and a bus with the newsmen went to the storage site where the weapons will be kept up to their elimination following the INF treaty's ratification by both sides and its entry into force.

Saryozek is the only place in the Soviet Union where all Soviet shorter-range missiles will be destroyed.

The early withdrawal of Soviet shorter-range missiles from the GDR and Czechoslovakia to the elimination site is evidence that the Soviet Union is prepared to honour its commitments consistently and in good faith.

The Warsaw Treaty members have begun to

undo the nuclear missile potential created by them to offset the deployment of U.S. Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles in Western Europe.

Taking this move the Soviet Union and its allies are convinced that they are on the right track to stronger international security.

Returning the Soviet missiles to Soviet territory is a call for trust among nations and for a search for mutually acceptable solutions to conflict situations.

Talking with reporters at Saryozek, Colonel Vyacheslav Ogurtsov, a spokesman for the political administration of the Central Asian military district, said:

"We have made the goodwill gesture without waiting for the treaty's ratification, and are entitled to expect it to be interpreted correctly by the other side since the treaty can only be fulfilled completely when there is reciprocal movement."

# Moscow's 70th Anniversary as the Soviet capital

A jubilee was marked in Moscow on Friday. Moscow became the capital of Soviet Russia 70 years ago. On 11 March 1918, the Soviet Government headed by Lenin moved to Moscow from Petrograd, now Leningrad — the capital of Russia since the times of Peter the Great.

Moscow has been developing rapidly over the seven decades, the Mayor of Moscow, Valeri Saikin, stated in an interview on Friday. It now has a population of 8.8 million. Its present

territory is five times the area of the city within the limits of 1918. Every three years Moscow builds housing with an area equal to that existing in Moscow in 1918 (12 million square metres). Now the housing stock of Moscow, one of the biggest cities in the world, surpasses 2.5 million flats. We aim at providing a separate flat for every family in Moscow before the year 2000.

Moscow is now a major Soviet industrial centre where more than a thousand factories and plants in nearly 170 branches are operating. Moscow, for instance, accounts for 14% of cars manu-

factured in the USSR, 21% of watches, 11% of tv sets.

Moscow has long been a centre of theatrical life. It now has 35 repertory theatres and some 130 cinema houses. They are attended by 125 million people a year. The Soviet capital has 73 museums, and 1,250 lending libraries whose stock surpasses 52 million books. Dozens of clubs and palaces of culture function in Moscow.

A long-term plan for Moscow for the period up to the year 2005 has been envisaged. Moscow's population is predicted by then to reach 9,660 thousand.

## On the forthcoming 19th CPSU Conference

AS the Soviet Communist Party is going to hold its 19th National Conference next summer, the leaders of Party committees and rank-and-file communists write to the press, first of all the Party daily *Pravda*, raising problems they believe should be discussed there and suggesting ways of tackling them.

Their articles and letters only reflect, of course, their personal views, but they are still interesting as representing a portion of public opinion as well.

The Conference's agenda will include two issues, namely the initial results of the perestroika (restructuring) drive under way in the country and measures for further democratisation in the Party and society.

On the latter issue, everybody taking part in the press debates ahead of the forum has supported the idea of broadening and extending intra-Party democracy.

"Perestroika has compelled us to take a fresh look at many habitual things in the affairs of the Party and Party committees," Yeilbek Auyelbekov, First Secretary of the Kzyl-Orda Region Party committee in Kazakhstan, wrote to *Pravda*.

### Perestroika in administrative machinery in USSR

A reduction in the excessively inflated administrative machinery in the Soviet Union is becoming a reality. Professor Boris Milner of the Economics Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR points out in the Moscow-based weekly *Arguments and Facts*.

Recalling that this country has more than 800 all-Union and republican ministries and departments and nearly 14 million administrative personnel, Milner recognises that "even for such a vast state as ours these are immense figures". The personnel of the ministries and departments is expected to be reduced by a third on average. In Moscow alone nearly 100,000 members of the administrative personnel will be relieved of their jobs and given jobs in other fields of activities.

The number of personnel at an enterprise, whether this number should be larger or smaller, should be dictated by the specific conditions and interests of the economy. The machinery should be cheap and flexible. This is now all in the hands of the managers and the work collective councils, Professor Milner emphasises.

He suggested changing the practice of electing the secretaries of the bureaus of primary Party organisations and Party committees at factory, district and region levels and begin electing them by secret ballot at Party meetings and conferences.

Currently, this category of Party workers is elected by the particular committees themselves.

Writing in the daily *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, Anatoli Baikov, a member of the Roslavl City Party committee in the Smolensk Region in western Russia, proposed working out and endorsing a single procedure for both elected Party leaders and people working full time on the staffs of Party committees to respond promptly and publicly to criticisms levelled personally at

them at Party meetings and the plenums of Party committees.

Muscovite Leonid Korbut, in a letter to *Pravda*, suggested that the Conference discuss the replaceability of Party leaders.

"That there is no systematic renewal of Party bodies is not conducive to greater intra-Party democracy," he wrote. "For many members of the central committees and regional, territorial and district committees, serving on them has become a kind of privilege for life."

These and other ideas communists have been suggesting as subjects for discussion at the 19th Party Conference are directed at further consolidating the democratic foundations of intra-Party affairs.

### CPSU Central Committee conference

A meeting was held today at the CPSU Central Committee which discussed a number of questions connected with ensuring the safety of railway, road, air, sea and river traffic, as well as with enhancing Party guidance over this sphere.

The meeting was addressed by V. I. Dolgikh, Alternate Member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He said that the situation in this important sphere remained unsatisfactory. This refers, in the first place, to railway and road transport and civil aviation.

It was pointed out at the meeting that most of the traffic accidents took place because of a low level of labour and production discipline, gross violation of regulations and instructions and a careless attitude of some workers to their professional duties.

The growth of the number of accidents involving private transport evokes serious concern. The share of automobile accidents caused by drivers of private vehicles went up in the past five years from 55 to 66%.

The meeting outlined the main spheres of enhancing Party guidance over the labour collectives of transport enterprises and separate transport units with a view to ensuring their work safety.

### Reference book on Africa

THE staff of the Institute of African Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences and other scientific centres together with the *Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia* publishing house have prepared and issued a two volume encyclopaedic reference book with the title Africa.

The edition consists of a general survey and an alphabetically arranged portion with more than 3,500 entries. *Pravda* reported last week.

In the reference book the reader can find explanations of another 8,000 terms reflecting the realities of the continent.

The edition gives a vivid idea of present-day Africa, and is richly illustrated (approximately 2,000 photographs, maps and charts most of which are colour).

### Expert Opinion

- Activating the Human Factor — the Main Source of Acceleration**, by Yegor Ligachev, Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee ..... 40p
- Overhauling the Entire System of Prices**, by Valentin Pavlov, Chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices ..... 40p
- Speaking to the Audience in the Language of Truth**, by Kirill Lavrov, Chairman of the USSR Union of Theatrical Workers ..... 40p

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

# Pravda on U.N. Geneva meeting

THE 44th session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights has come to a close. The session which was held in Geneva was attended by representatives of 43 member states, 60 observer countries and more than 100 non-governmental organisations.

"The opinion of the Soviet delegation is that the recently concluded session reflected the new spirit of changes taking place in the world and, first of all, the spirit of growing realisation by adherents of most diverse political and ideological convictions and religious beliefs of the interconnected nature of our contradictory but integral world," Vladimir Lomeiko, the leader of the Soviet delegation at the session, writes in yesterday's *Pravda* in an article

headlined "The Collapse of Myths".

"The session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights showed in particular the growing interrelationship between socio-economic and civil and political rights," the article says.

"This is important because the United States and other Western countries continue to proceed from the premise that political rights are the most important thing while social and economic rights cannot be guaranteed for everyone. The United States up to now refuses to ratify the international covenants on human rights. It will only be to the benefit of the human rights situation in the West if real measures are taken to ensure employment and better social security for the unfortunate proportion of the population and if civil and political freedoms are fully endorsed there," Vladimir Lomeiko points out.

"An important phenomenon of our times has

manifested itself at the 44th session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. One of the obsolete doctrines of confrontation—the myth about a closed nature of socialist society—is collapsing. The reorganisation and democratisation processes in our country have dealt a serious blow to this doctrine. The Soviet Union's frank readiness for a dialogue on human rights with all countries on the equal basis of unified international standards snatches the ground from under the feet of those who are fond of teaching others how they should live."

"One of the major results of the session," Vladimir Lomeiko points out in conclusion, "is that it has clearly shown that an overwhelming majority of countries reject the ideology and practice of confrontation and favour a search for ways for cooperation in the human rights field."

## Ambassador Nikolai Kozyrev's statement

NIKOLAI KOZYREV, Ambassador-at-large of the USSR, made the following statement in Geneva on Thursday:

As is known, the Afghan-Pakistani negotiations on the political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan held through the personal representative of the U.N. Secretary-General Diego Cordovez have been conducted at Geneva for over six years. The main item on the negotiations' agenda is the settlement of the issues related to ending the foreign interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs and to the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from this country. In other words it concerns the elimination of the external factors, which will pave the way to the internal Afghan settlement and to the unblocking of the entire Afghan problem.

During the whole process of the negotiations the Afghan side acting in contact with the Soviet side has repeatedly showed a flexible and constructive approach aimed at expeditious conclusion of the negotiations.

It is this approach which made it possible to prepare the entire package of the Geneva agreements: the bilateral agreement on the principles of mutual relations, in particular on noninterference and nonintervention, the declaration on international guarantees, the bilateral Afghan-Pakistani agreement on the voluntary return of refugees, the instrument on the interrelationship of all elements of the settlement including the withdrawal of the Soviet troops to be signed by Afghanistan and Pakistan and certified by the USSR and the USA, and the monitoring mechanism to observe the obligations undertaken by the sides. However, a major issue of the settlement, that is the problem of the timing and the stages of the withdrawal of Soviet troops, has not been resolved so far. Despite the willingness of the Afghan and Soviet sides to agree on the question and the flexibility which they showed for this purpose, no progress till the current round has been made.

The Soviet-Afghan initiatives declared in the well-known statements by Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the Republic

of Afghanistan Najibullah of February 8th, which defined a 10-month period for the Soviet troops withdrawal starting from May 15 1988, paved the way to the solution of the problem.

After that the Afghan delegation in Geneva which sought in every possible way to speed up the signing of the agreement and thus to allow the Soviet troops withdrawal from the date agreed upon, that is from the 15th of May, acting in agreement with the Soviet side proposed to the Pakistani delegation that the Soviet troops be withdrawn in a 9-month period with 50% of the contingent being withdrawn in the first three months. These proposals were fully consistent with the Pakistan and U.S. positions and certainly were adopted by them.

After this the negotiations appeared to be on the final lap as nothing prevented ending them with the exception of some questions left. However it is very surprising that after the key issue was solved, namely the timing and stages of the Soviet troops withdrawal, the negotiations have not advanced but have bogged down for a week.

A very strange situation arises: the Pakistani side is simply killing time instead of finalising the documents and preparing them for signing. Besides evading on various pretexts agreement on some remaining issues, they at the same time put forward new demarches and this is done contrary to the fact that the two sides from the very beginning agreed not to raise

new issues as it is fraught with the revision of already adopted documents.

However, the recent declarations of the Pakistani leadership, in which an attempt was made to link the political settlement with the creation of a new government in Afghanistan shed light on such a 'strange' (at first glimpse) position of Pakistan. Without going into the substance of the problem of the national reconciliation in Afghanistan, I would like to stress that such a linkage can only aggravate the situation, block the signing of the Geneva documents and, thus, the solution of the entire Afghan problem. It is the Geneva agreements, the termination of outside interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and the withdrawal of Soviet troops, that can create the prerequisites for peace and consent between all Afghans. On the contrary, if the Geneva agreements are not signed, then a new flare up of bloodshed and fratricidal war in Afghanistan cannot be excluded. I hope that those on whom the signing of the Geneva agreement depends understand that fact and that the common sense and comprehension of the existing realities of the Afghan settlement will finally prevail. Otherwise, it will be clear who will bear the responsibility for the failure to sign the Geneva agreements, which are supposed to play the most important role in disentangling the Afghan knot and making the first breakthrough in the chain of regional conflicts.

## Vladimir Tikhonov on Soviet cooperatives

THE speedy growth of the number of cooperatives is a consequence of the drive for more democracy currently under way in this country, Academician of the USSR Academy of Agricultural Sciences Vladimir Tikhonov believes.

Speaking in a TASS interview, he recalled that the USSR has now already more than 14,000 cooperatives and after the adoption of the law on cooperatives their number will indisputably grow considerably.

There will be not only quantitative change, the scholar said. While now the cooperative movement exists chiefly in the field of retail trade, every-day services and public catering, in the future many production and building cooperatives will appear. There are already the "first swallows". For example, the Volkhov

cooperative in the Novgorod Region (north-west of the USSR) with a personnel of 150, beat all records of performance in building. Certainly, the earnings of the members of the Volkhov cooperative have also proved to be record ones.

The draft law on cooperatives being discussed now is designed, according to the Academician, to eliminate many shortcomings and distortions in the activities of the co-operatives existing in this country now, including such as excessive, unjustified high earnings. The economic instrument for the management of the co-operatives proposed in the draft law now — the progressive income tax for its members — will not only ensure the principle of social justice, but serve as an incentive for a cut in the prices of the products or services provided by the cooperative societies.

It is essential that the draft law eliminates many of the restrictions existing now, including

(continues on back page)

# Literaturnaya Gazeta to be published in English

SOVIET newspaper *Literaturnaya Gazeta* — widely popular for its pungent journalistic and impartial critical surveys — is to be published in English.

From January 1989 it will start reaching the readers of Britain, the United States and other English-speaking countries, it was announced at a press conference in Moscow on Friday.

Alexander Chakovsky, Editor-in-Chief of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, regards the emergence of its English-language edition as "an illustration of the lively interest being shown around the world in the processes taking place in the Soviet Union and, on the other hand, as recognition of the services of the creative staff of the editorial

office in their coverage of perestroika and democratisation of Soviet society."

Numerous comments in the world press, the Editor-in-Chief pointed out, indicate that most varied people — politicians, businessmen, intellectuals and journalists of various countries — take interest in the articles published in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. From now on they will be able to receive literary and other news from the Soviet Union first-hand.

The forthcoming publication of the newspaper in the English language is the result of co-operation of Soviet journalists with a British and North American publishers' consortium, co-publisher from Britain Mark Jones said. The readers will receive it once in two weeks. The initial circulation in the United States and Britain

will be 30,000 and subsequently it is planned to bring it up to 70,000.

The newspaper will be run and published in the Soviet Union while our task is to reveal demand, determine the market and distribute the newspaper among readers, Mr Jones pointed out.

The newspaper's English-language edition will retain all the main rubrics customary for the Soviet reader. At the same time, taking into account the specificity of the foreign reader, it is planned to invite leading Western publicists to contribute to it widely and to run ads.

It was pointed out at the press conference that negotiations were under way to publish *Literaturnaya Gazeta* in Italy as well.

## USSR-Britain — cooperation in publishing

PERESTROIKA in the USSR and the associated positive changes in the international atmosphere have favourably affected a rise in Soviet-British book exchange. This was noted at a meeting of publishers of the USSR and Britain held in Moscow on Thursday.

Lynette Owen, Vice-President of the British Publishers Association, at a meeting held at the Soviet Copyright Agency shared her impressions of her stay in Uzbekistan, the Soviet Central Asian republic. The British publishers have invited their Uzbek counterparts to participate in the International Book Fair being held in London late this month.

The Soviet reader has every opportunity to get to know British literature well. Classics — works by Dickens, Kipling, Wells, Defoe and Galsworthy are put out in big editions. The issue of works by contemporary British authors is

on the rise. Six thousand titles of books by British authors have been issued in the USSR since the end of the Second World War. The circulation of these editions exceeded 350,000 copies.

At the meeting it was noted that the agreement on publication of the annual "Perestroika in the USSR" book in Britain by Pergamon Press — concluded in Moscow late last month — testifies to growing interest in Britain in life in the USSR and in changes taking place in the country.

In an interview in the Uzbek capital of Tashkent the day before, Lynette Owen noted that of her 12 trips to the USSR, the current one is the most fruitful. It ended with the establishment of direct ties with the Uzbek branch of the Soviet Copyright Agency. For the first time ever the International Book Fair being held in London will feature books published in Soviet Uzbekistan — including historical works, illustrated albums, books on oriental medicine and scientific works. The

Association will promote the signing of contracts on the publication of these books.

Lynette Owen pointed out that both sides are interested in a proposal to establish in Tashkent a joint publishing house. It could bring out books in several languages on a mutually advantageous basis.

### British industrialists in Moscow

A delegation from the British Federation of Manufacturers of Construction Equipment and Cranes began a visit to the Soviet Union on Monday to discuss prospects for developing trade and scientific and technological co-operation between the two countries.

The group includes officials from 13 firms, mostly those yet seeking to establish a foothold in the Soviet market, delegation leader Rob Oliver explained.

During their visit, arranged with the assistance of the British-Soviet Chamber of Commerce, the businessmen will have talks with Soviet ministry officials and make contacts with Soviet factories that have been granted the right to deal directly with external markets.

Oliver said they were aware that one such enterprise, the heavy-duty crane works in the Ukrainian city of Odessa, has already launched a partnership with the West German firm Liebherr.

He said British manufacturers with much experience in building construction equipment and cranes were interested in broader co-operation with Soviet contractors as well.

The British businessman pointed to the production of excavators and individual items of construction equipment as the more promising areas of cooperation.

the restrictions on joining the cooperatives. It does not require any permission from the local authorities for the setting up of a cooperative. The local authorities only register cooperatives set up on the initiative of the persons concerned.

The draft law on cooperatives completes, as it were, the streamlining of the structure of social production based on the democratic principles inherent in socialism — self-administration, self-financing and cost-accounting. Academician Tikhonov pointed out in conclusion.

## Soviet industry for joint ventures

ENTERPRISES of the motor industry are actively participating in establishing joint ventures both in the USSR and abroad, Alexander Zvyagintsev, deputy director-general of the Soviet association Avtoexport, emphasised in an interview on Friday. This new form of work will enable the industry to meet better and quicker its requirements in technology and ready-made products.

One of the pressing problems facing the industry is computerisation of car-building. On joining the founders of the the recently established Soviet-American enterprise to put out personal computers, the ministry will be at the same time one of the main consumers of its products.

The chance to invest free financial funds to get a share of profits from a joint enterprise is another impetus (important under the conditions of cost-accounting) for establishing joint ventures.

"We see in joint enterprises not a tribute to a current fashion," noted Alexander Zvyagintsev,

"and not an all-purpose means for tackling economic problems but a logical development of established traditional forms of economic interaction with partners abroad." A Soviet-Bulgarian enterprise which has started production of car electronic systems in Plovdiv (Bulgaria), is based exactly on such principles. The USSR's Ministry of the Motor Industry has invested additional funds to develop this joint venture.

Talks are now in progress between the USSR Ministry of the Motor Industry and Hungarian and Czechoslovak organisations on setting up joint ventures to manufacture machine-tools and processing centres. Establishment of joint car-hire companies of the "rent-a-car" type on the basis of Avtoexport technical centres (operating in these countries) can become a promising area of business cooperation with the same partners.

Though there are only a few joint enterprise projects in the auto-building industry for the time being and their share in the aggregate product of the industry is small, they are aimed at producing concrete results. This work will continue, emphasised the Avtoexport director-general.





# Joint statement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States,

issued following meetings  
in Moscow  
May 29-June 1, 1988

In accordance with the understanding reached during the Soviet-US summit meeting in Geneva in November 1985, and confirmed at the Washington summit in December 1987, Mikhail S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Ronald W. Reagan, President of the United States of America, met in Moscow May 29-June 2, 1988.

Attending on the Soviet side were member of the politbureau of the CPSU central committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Andrei A. Gromyko; member of the politbureau of the CPSU central committee,

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Eduard A. Shevardnadze; member of the politbureau of the CPSU central committee, secretary of the CPSU central committee, Alexander N. Yakovlev; alternate member of the politbureau of the CPSU central committee, Minister of Defence of the USSR, Dmitri T. Yazov; secretary of the CPSU central committee Anatoli F. Dobrynin; assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU central committee, Anatoli S. Chernyaev; Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Alexander A. Bessmertnykh; and Ambassador of the USSR to the United States of America, Yuri V. Dubinin.

Attending on the US side were Secretary of State George P. Shultz; Secretary of Defence Frank C. Carlucci; Presidential Chief-of-Staff, Howard H. Baker, Jr; Assistant to the President for National Security, Colin L. Powell; Ambassador-at-Large and Special Adviser to the President and the Secretary of State on Arms Control Matters, Paul H. Nitze; Special Adviser to the President and the Secretary of State on Arms Control Matters, Ambassador Edward L. Rowny; Ambassador of the US to the USSR, Jack F. Matlock; and Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs, Rozanne L. Ridgway.

The general secretary and the President view the Moscow summit as an important step in the process of putting Soviet-US relations on a more productive and sustainable basis. Their comprehensive and detailed discussions covered the full agenda of issues to which the two leaders agreed during their initial meeting in Geneva in November, 1985 — an agenda encompassing arms control, human rights and humanitarian matters, settlement of regional conflicts, and bilateral relations. Serious differences remain on important issues; the frank dialogue which has developed between the two countries remains critical to surmounting these differences.

The talks took place in a constructive atmosphere which provided ample opportunity for candid exchange. As a result, the sides achieved a better understanding of each other's positions. The two leaders welcomed the progress achieved in various areas of Soviet-US relations since their last meeting in Washington, notwithstanding the difficulty and complexity of the issues. They noted with satisfaction numerous concrete agreements which have been achieved, and expressed their determination to redouble efforts in the months ahead in areas where work remains to be done. They praised the creative and intensive efforts made by representatives of both sides in recent months to resolve outstanding differences.

Assessing the state of Soviet-US relations, the

general secretary and the President underscored the historic importance of their meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington, and Moscow in laying the foundation for a realistic approach to the problems of strengthening stability and reducing the risk of conflict. They reaffirmed their solemn conviction that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, their determination to prevent any war between the Soviet Union and the United States, whether nuclear or conventional, and their disavowal of any intention to achieve military superiority.

The two leaders are convinced that the expanding political dialogue they have established represents an increasingly effective means of resolving issues of mutual interest and concern. They do not minimise the real differences of history, tradition and ideology which will continue to characterise the Soviet-US relationship. But they believe that the dialogue will endure, because it is based on realism and focused on the achievement of concrete results. It can serve as a constructive basis for addressing not only the problems of the present, but of tomorrow and the next century. It is a process which the general secretary and the President believe serves the best interests of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States, and can contribute to a more stable, more peaceful and safer world.

## I Arms control

The general secretary and the President, having expressed the commitment of their two countries to build on progress to date in arms control, determined objectives and next steps on a wide range of issues in this area. These will guide the efforts of the two governments in the months ahead as they work with each other and with other states toward equitable, verifiable agreements that strengthen international stability and security.

### INF

The general secretary and the President signed the protocol on the exchange of instruments of ratification of the treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. The two leaders welcomed the entry into force of this historic agreement, which for the first time will eliminate an entire class of Soviet and US nuclear arms, and which sets new standards for arms control. The leaders are determined to achieve the full implementation of all the provisions and understandings of the treaty, viewing joint and successful work in this respect as an important precedent for future arms control efforts.

### Nuclear and space talks

The two leaders noted that a joint draft text of a treaty on reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms has been elaborated. Through this process, the sides have been able to record in the joint draft text extensive and significant areas of agreement and also to detail positions on remaining areas of disagreement. While important additional work is required before this treaty is ready for signature, many key provisions are recorded in the joint draft text and are considered to be agreed, subject to the completion and ratification of the treaty.

Taking into account a treaty on strategic offensive arms, the sides have continued negotiations to achieve a separate agreement concerning the ABM Treaty, building on the language of the Washington summit joint statement dated December 10, 1987. Progress was noted in preparing the joint draft text of an associated protocol. In connection with their obligations under the protocol, the sides have agreed in particular to use the nuclear risk reduction centres for transmission of relevant information. The leaders directed their negotiators to prepare the joint draft text of a separate agreement and to continue work on its associated protocol.

The joint draft treaty on reduction and limita-

tion of strategic offensive arms reflects the earlier understanding on establishing ceilings of no more than 1,600 strategic offensive delivery systems and 6,000 warheads, as well as agreement on subceilings of 4,900 on the aggregate of ICBM and SLBM warheads and 1,540 warheads on 154 heavy missiles.

The draft treaty also records the sides' agreement that, as a result of the reductions, the aggregate throw-weight of the Soviet Union's ICBMs and SLBMs will be reduced to a level approximately 50 percent below the existing level and this level will not be exceeded.

During the negotiations the two sides have also achieved understanding that in future work on the treaty they will act on the understanding that on deployed ICBMs and SLBMs of existing types the counting rule will include the number of warheads referred to in the joint statement of December 10, 1987, and the number of warheads which will be attributed to each new type of ballistic missile will be subject to negotiation.

In addition, the sides agreed on a counting rule for heavy bomber armaments according to which heavy bombers equipped only for nuclear gravity bombs and SRAMs will count as one delivery vehicle against the 1,600 limit and one warhead against the 6,000 limit.

The delegations have also prepared joint draft texts of an inspection protocol, a conversion or elimination protocol, and a memorandum of understanding on data, which are integral parts of the treaty. These documents build on the verification provisions of the INF Treaty, extending and elaborating them as necessary to meet the more demanding requirements of START. The START verification measures will, at a minimum, include:

A. Data exchanges, to include declarations and appropriate notifications on the number and location of weapons systems limited by START, including locations and facilities for production, final assembly, storage, testing, repair, training, deployment, conversion, and elimination of such systems. Such declarations will be exchanged between the sides before the treaty is signed and updated periodically.

B. Baseline inspections to verify the accuracy of these declarations.

C. On-site observation of elimination of strategic systems necessary to meet the agreed limits.

D. Continuous on-site monitoring of the perimeter and portals of critical production facilities to confirm the output of weapons to be limited.

E. Short-notice on-site inspection of:

(i) declared locations during the process of reducing to agreed limits;

(ii) locations where systems covered by this treaty remain after achieving the agreed limits; and

(iii) locations where such systems have been located (formerly declared facilities).

F. Short-notice inspection, in accordance with agreed-upon procedures, of locations where either side considers covert deployment, production, storage or repair of strategic offensive arms could be occurring.

G. Prohibition of the use of concealment or other activities which impede verification by national technical means. Such provisions would include a ban on telemetry encryption and would allow for full access to all telemetric information broadcast during missile flight.

H. Procedures that enable verification of the number of warheads on deployed ballistic missiles of each specific type, including on-site inspection.

I. Enhanced observation of activities related to reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms by national technical means. These would include open displays of treaty-limited items at missile bases, bomber bases, and submarine ports at locations and times chosen by the inspecting party.

The two sides have also begun to exchange data on their strategic forces.

During the course of this meeting in Moscow, the exchanges on START resulted in the achievement of substantial additional common ground, particularly in the areas of ALCMs and the attempts to develop and agree, if possible, on a

solution to the problem of verification of mobile ICBMs. The details of this additional common ground have been recorded in documents exchanged between the sides. The delegations in Geneva will record these gains in the joint draft text of the START Treaty.

The sides also discussed the question of limiting long-range, nuclear-armed SLCMs.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan expressed their joint confidence that the extensive work done provides the basis for concluding the treaty on reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms which will promote strategic stability and strengthen security not only of the peoples of the USSR and the USA, but of all mankind.

Guided by this fundamental agreement, the general secretary of the central committee of the CPSU and the US President agreed to continue their efforts in this area energetically and purposefully. The delegations of the two countries have been instructed to return to Geneva on July 12, 1988. It has been agreed as a matter of principle that, once the remaining problems are solved and the treaty and its associated documents are agreed, they will be signed without delay.

### Ballistic missile launch notifications

The agreement between the USSR and the US on notifications of launches of inter-continental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles, signed during the Moscow summit, is a practical new step, reflecting the desire of the sides to reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war, in particular as a result of misinterpretation, miscalculation or accident.

### Nuclear testing

The leaders reaffirmed the commitment of the two sides to conduct in a single forum full-scale, stage-by-stage negotiations on the issues relating to nuclear testing. In these negotiations the sides, as the first step, will agree upon effective verification measures which will make it possible to ratify the USSR-US Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974 and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty of 1976, and proceed to negotiating further intermediate limitations on nuclear testing leading to the ultimate objective of the complete cessation of nuclear testing as part of an effective disarmament process. This process, among other things, would pursue, as the first priority, the goal of the reduction of nuclear weapons and ultimately, their elimination. In implementing the first objective of these negotiations, agreement upon effective verification measures for the USSR-US Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974, the sides agreed to design and conduct a joint verification experiment at each other's test sites.

The leaders therefore noted with satisfaction the signing of the joint verification experiment agreement, the considerable preparation underway for the experiment, and the positive co-operation being exhibited in particular by the substantial numbers of personnel now engaged in work at each other's test sites. They also noted the substantial progress on a new protocol to the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty and urged continuing constructive negotiations on effective verification measures for the Threshold Test Ban Treaty.

Expressing their conviction that the progress achieved so far forms a solid basis for continuing progress on issues relating to nuclear testing, the leaders instructed their negotiators to complete expeditiously the preparation of a protocol to the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty and to complete the preparation of a protocol to the Threshold Test Ban Treaty as soon as possible after the joint verification experiment has been conducted and analysed. They confirmed their understanding that verification measures for the Threshold Test Ban Treaty will, to the extent appropriate, be used in further nuclear test limitation agreements which may subsequently be reached. They also declared their mutual intention to seek ratification of both the 1974 and 1976 treaties when the corresponding protocols to the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the

Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty are completed, and to continue negotiations as agreed in the Washington joint summit statement.

### Nuclear non-proliferation

The two leaders noted that this year marks the 20th anniversary of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, one of the most important international arms control agreements with over 130 adherents. They reaffirmed their conviction that universal adherence to the NPT is important to international peace and security. They expressed the hope that each state not a party to the treaty will join it, or make an equally binding commitment under international law to forego acquisition of nuclear weapons and prevent nuclear weapons proliferation. This will enhance the possibility of progress toward reducing nuclear armaments and reduce the threat of nuclear war.

The two leaders also confirmed their support of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and agreed that they would continue efforts to further strengthen it. They reaffirmed the value of their regular consultations on non-proliferation and agreed that they should continue.

### Nuclear risk reduction centres

The leaders expressed satisfaction over the activation of the new communications link between the nuclear risk reduction centres in Moscow and Washington, established in accordance with the Soviet-US agreement of September 15, 1987. It was agreed that the centres can play an important role in the context of a future treaty on reducing US and Soviet strategic nuclear arms.

### Chemical weapons

The leaders reviewed the status of on-going multilateral negotiations and bilateral Soviet-US consultations toward a comprehensive, effectively verifiable, and truly global ban on chemical weapons, encompassing all chemical weapons-capable states. They also expressed concern over the growing problem of chemical weapons proliferation and use.

The leaders reaffirmed the importance of efforts to address, as a matter of continuing urgency, the unique challenges of a chemical weapons ban and to achieve an effective convention. While noting the progress already achieved in the talks and the difficult problems with regard to effective monitoring of the global prohibition of chemical weapons and the non-use of dual-capable chemicals for chemical weapons purposes, the leaders underlined the need for concrete solutions to the problems of ensuring effective verification and undiminished security for all convention participants. They gave instructions to their respective delegations to this effect.

Both sides agreed on the vital importance of greater openness by all states as a way to build confidence and strengthen the foundation for an effective convention. The leaders also emphasised the necessity of close co-ordination on a multilateral basis in order to ensure the participation of all CW-possessing and CW-capable states in the convention.

Both sides strongly condemned the dangerous spread and illegal use of chemical weapons in violation of the 1925 Geneva protocol. They stressed the importance of both technical and political solutions to this problem and confirmed their support for international investigations of suspected violation. Noting the initial efforts being made to control the export of chemicals used in manufacturing chemical weapons, the leaders called on all nations with the capability of producing such chemicals to institute stringent export controls to inhibit the proliferation of chemical weapons.

### Conventional arms control

The leaders emphasised the importance of strengthening stability and security in the whole of Europe. They welcomed progress to date on development of a mandate for new negotiations on armed forces and conventional armaments. They expressed their hope for an early and balanced conclusion to the Vienna CSCE follow-

up meeting. The general secretary and the President also noted that full implementation of the provisions of the document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-building Measures and Disarmament in Europe can significantly increase openness and mutual confidence.

They also discussed the situation in the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) negotiations in Vienna.

### Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe

They expressed their commitment to further development of the CSCE process. The USSR and the US will continue to work with the other 33 participants to bring the Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting to a successful conclusion, through significant results in all the principal areas of the Helsinki Final Act and Madrid concluding document.

### Ballistic missile technology proliferation

The leaders agreed to bilateral discussions at the level of experts on the problem of proliferation of ballistic missile technology.

### Third Special Session of the UN General Assembly

The general secretary and the President noted the importance of the ongoing third special session in disarmament.

## II Human Rights and Humanitarian Concerns

The general secretary and the President engaged in a detailed discussion of human rights and humanitarian concerns. The leaders reviewed the increasingly broad and detailed Soviet-US dialogue in this area and agreed that it should be conducted at all levels in order to achieve sustained, concrete progress. They noted that this dialogue should seek to maximise assurance of the rights, freedoms and human dignity of individuals; promotion of people-to-people communications and contacts; active sharing of spiritual, cultural, historical and other values; and greater mutual understanding and respect between the two countries. Toward this end, they discussed the possible establishment of a forum which, meeting regularly, would bring together participants from across the range of their two societies. They noted steps already taken to establish the exchange of information and contacts between legislative bodies of both countries, as well as discussions between legal experts, physicians and representatives of other professions directly involved in matters pertaining to human rights, and between representatives of non-governmental organisations.

## III Regional issues

The general secretary and the President thoroughly discussed a wide range of regional questions, including the Middle East, the Iran-Iraq war, southern Africa, the Horn of Africa, Central America, Cambodia, the Korean Peninsula, and other issues. They expressed satisfaction with the April, 1988, conclusion in Geneva of accords on an Afghanistan settlement. Although the discussions revealed serious differences both in the assessment of the causes of regional tensions and in the means to overcome them, the leaders agreed that these differences need not be an obstacle to constructive interaction between the USSR and the US.

They reaffirmed their intention to continue Soviet-US discussions at all levels aimed at helping parties to regional conflicts find peaceful solutions which advance their independence, freedom and security. They emphasised the importance of enhancing the capacity of the United Nations and other international institutions to contribute to the resolution of regional conflicts.

## IV Bilateral affairs

The general secretary and the President reviewed progress in further expanding bilateral contacts, exchanges and co-operation since their meeting in Washington DC in December, 1987. They noted the increasingly important role that mutually beneficial interchange between the two countries can play in improving mutual understanding and providing stability in the Soviet-US relationship. They stated their intention to intensify such ties.

They noted with particular satisfaction that concrete agreements had been reached in most of the areas identified at their meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik and Washington.

### Bilateral agreements and co-operative activities

The general secretary and the President welcomed the conclusion of a number of bilateral agreements which open new opportunities for fruitful co-operation in the following fields: co-operation in transportation science and technology; maritime search and rescue; operational co-ordination between Soviet and US radio-navigation systems in the Northern Pacific and Bering Sea; and mutual fisheries relations.

The two leaders welcomed the recent signing of a new memorandum on civilian nuclear reactor safety under the bilateral agreement on peaceful uses of atomic energy. There was an exchange of notes to extend that agreement.

They expressed satisfaction with the recent signing of a new protocol under the bilateral housing agreement for co-operation in construction research relating to extreme geological and unusual climatic conditions.

They reviewed the status of negotiations between the two countries concerning maritime shipping, the USSR-US maritime boundary, basic scientific research, and emergency pollution clean-up in the Bering and Chukchi Seas. They instructed their negotiators to accelerate efforts to achieve mutually acceptable agreements in these areas at the earliest opportunity.

The two leaders welcomed the start of bilateral discussions on combatting narcotics trafficking. They noted with satisfaction ongoing consultations between the two sides concerning law of the sea, air and sea transportation safety, and areas of mutual interest in the field of law.

### Cultural and people-to-people exchanges

Noting the expansion of exchanges in the areas of education, science, culture and sports under the general exchanges agreement, the two leaders welcomed the signing of a new implementing programme for 1989-91 under the agreement and expressed their intention to continue expansion of such exchanges. During the time in which this programme is in force, the two sides, taking into consideration their mutual interest as well as financial and technical conditions, will conduct negotiations on the opening of culture/information centres in the USSR and the US with the aim of signing an appropriate agreement on behalf of the governments of both countries.

They expressed satisfaction that, over the course of their dialogue, people-to-people contacts and exchanges between non-governmental organisations have significantly increased and become one of the most dynamic elements in the bilateral relationship. They reaffirmed their commitment to further growth of such exchanges, which contribute to mutual understanding, and welcomed plans for increased exchanges of young people in the future. In this context, they expressed their readiness to consider in practical terms the idea of further developing exchanges of high school students. They cited recent joint Soviet-US initiatives on culture, theatre and the cinema as examples of new opportunities to engage those involved in the creative arts.

Noting the rapidly growing sports ties between the two countries, including their National Olympic Committees, the two leaders expressed their support for the international Olympic movement, which promotes international co-operation and understanding through athletic competition.

### Other co-operative activities

The general secretary and the President noted the successful expansion of scientific co-operation within the framework of bilateral agreements in environmental protection, medical science and public health, artificial heart research and development, agriculture, and studies of the world ocean, and expressed their intention to continue to expand activities under these agreements in areas of mutual benefit to the two sides.

The general secretary and the President noted with pleasure the commencement of work on a conceptual design of an international thermonuclear experimental reactor (ITER), under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency, between scientists and experts from the Soviet Union, United States, European Atomic Energy Community, and Japan. The two leaders noted the significance of this next step toward the development of fusion power as a cheap, environmentally sound, and essentially inexhaustible energy source for the benefit of all mankind.

The general secretary and the President welcomed agreement by representatives of the Soviet Union, United States, Canada and France, to institutionalise in the near future the Cospas/Sarsat space-based, life-saving global search and rescue system.

Both leaders reaffirmed their support for the WHO/UNICEF goal of reducing the scale of preventable childhood death through the most effective methods of saving children. They urged other countries and the international community to intensify efforts to achieve this goal.

### Global climate and environmental change initiative

The two leaders expressed their satisfaction with activities since the Washington summit in expanding co-operation with respect to global climate and environmental change, including in areas of mutual concern relating to environmental protection, such as protection and conservation of stratospheric ozone and a possible global warming trend. They emphasised their desire to make more active use of the unique opportunities afforded by the space programmes of the two countries to conduct global monitoring of the environment and the ecology of the Earth's land, oceans and atmosphere. They underscored the need to continue to promote both bilateral and multilateral co-operation in this important area in the future.

### Initiative for expanded civil space co-operation

Recognising the long-standing commitment of both countries to space science and exploration, and noting the progress made under the 1987 USSR-US co-operative agreement in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, the two leaders agreed to a new initiative to expand civil space co-operation by exchanging flight opportunities for scientific instruments to fly on each other's spacecraft, and by exchanging results of independent national studies of future unmanned solar system exploration missions as a means of assessing prospects for further Soviet-US co-operation on such missions. They also agreed to expand exchanges of space science data and of scientists, to enhance the scientific benefit that can be derived from the two countries' space research missions. They noted scientific missions to the Moon and Mars as areas of possible bilateral and international co-operation.

### Arctic contacts and co-operation

Taking into account the unique environmental, demographic and other characteristics of the Arctic, the two leaders reaffirmed their support for expanded bilateral and regional contacts and co-operation in this area. They noted plans and opportunities for increased scientific and environmental co-operation under a number of bilateral agreements as well as within an international arctic science committee of states with interests in the region. They expressed their sup-

port for increased people-to-people contacts between the native peoples of Alaska and the Soviet North.

The general secretary and the President noted the positive role played by the multilateral Antarctic Treaty and emphasised the importance of Soviet-US scientific and environmental co-operation in that region.

### Trade and economic affairs

The two sides reconfirmed their strong support for the expansion of mutually beneficial trade and economic relations and noted recent activity in this area. They reiterated their belief that commercially viable joint ventures complying with the laws and regulations of both countries could play a role in the further development of commercial relations. They welcomed the results of the meeting of the joint USSR-US commercial commission in April and noted with satisfaction that working groups had been created under the commission to further the establishment of better conditions under which mutually advantageous trade can develop. Taking note of the 1974 joint statement and protocol amending the long-term agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to facilitate economic, industrial and technical co-operation issued at the conclusion of the joint commercial commission, they agreed that the commission should continue to meet to build upon the forward momentum which has been generated.

The two leaders cited expanding relations between Aeroflot and Pan American airlines under the government-to-government civil air transportation agreement as a positive example of mutually beneficial co-operation.

### Consulates exchange/diplomatic and consular missions

The general secretary and the President reaffirmed their agreement to open Consulates General in Kiev and New York as soon as practicable.

The two leaders discussed questions relating to ensuring adequate and secure conditions for Soviet and US diplomatic and consular establishments and their personnel in each other's territory. They agreed on the need to approach problems relating to such matters constructively and on the basis of reciprocity.

## V

### Future meetings

The general secretary and the President, recognising the importance of their personal involvement in the development of relations in the months ahead, instructed Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and Secretary of State Shultz to meet as necessary and to report to them on ways to ensure continued practical progress across the full range of issues. Expert-level contacts will also continue on an intensified basis.

Moscow — June 1, 1988

# Mikhail Gorbachev's summit statement to the world's press

**WE PUBLISH an abridged version of Mikhail Gorbachev's statement to the news conference in Moscow on June 1 and some of the questions put to the Soviet leader.**

The fourth meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU central committee and the President of the United States in three years has ended. This is not just arithmetic. I believe this is a statement full of meaning and great political importance.

Four meetings in three years. This characterises the intensity of the political dialogue, the level of our relations. And I think that already, by itself, this is very meaningful.

It is only natural that in the whole world, first of all in the Soviet Union and the United States, and evidently among you journalists, there arises the question — what has the Moscow summit produced, where has it led to? Has it added anything new to the previous meetings?

I will begin by saying that we all, and I am convinced of this, were participants in a major event. The meeting has really demonstrated again the importance of the dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States, confirmed once again the correctness of the choice of the road made in Geneva two-and-a-half years ago. By way of Reykjavik and Washington, we came to Moscow. This is a unique process in post-war history.

In my three years in the post of general secretary of the CPSU central committee I have had more than 200 meetings of an international character. I do not recall a single meeting with friends from socialist countries, with representatives of capitalist and non-aligned countries at which an interest would not have been expressed and emphasised in seeing Soviet-American relations directed into a normal, healthy channel.

Yet, why has such an intensive dialogue, a process of immense importance, become possible?

I think it is thanks to realism. I mean realism in the policy both of the Soviet Union and of the United States, for the manifestation of this

approach by one side alone would not guarantee the possibility of such a process.

I don't want to engage in guesswork as to where confrontation would lead us if it continued; if the the Kremlin and the White House lacked the resolve timely to turn the steering wheel in the right direction — from confrontation to the search for areas and spheres of co-operation, to the build-up of a political dialogue.

When the realities became clear, we started a dialogue accompanied by negotiations, and these negotiations, in turn, brought about agreements.

The relations that had harboured a dreadful threat to the entire world, to the very existence of mankind, started to change. The two most powerful nations began reforming their relationship in their own interests and the interests of the international community.

That was a hard thing to do.

Things are not easy, but on the whole an important, productive and positive process is under way.

Each of the four meetings was both a difficult and fruitful search for the balance of interests, each stepped up the efforts for finding solutions to major problems of universal human importance.

To illustrate the point, I will remind you of Reykjavik, the Reykjavik drama. This is but one example of how hard, sometimes dramatically so, the political dialogue between the two world powers is evolving.

What are the results of the fourth summit? The principal outcome is that the dialogue has been continued, now encompassing all vital issues of international politics and bilateral relations. The Moscow meeting has shown again that the dialogue has come to deal with real politics.

I will not say that our meetings got rid of propaganda moves, démarches and attempts to score

points through propaganda manoeuvring. Nevertheless, these meetings are increasingly characterised by the striving, desire to make real politics. I'm convinced that this is a correct path, it is precisely in this way that we should act.

When in Washington, at the very first meeting, we felt an attempt at coaching us, we declined this approach and said that we had arrived to engage in real politics. We acted in the same way at this, fourth summit.

That is why it is characterised by deep-going, at times keen debate, up to the last minute of negotiations, not at the table, but when we had already stood up — "wall against wall", as we say in Russia.

I would like to emphasise once again the idea of continuity that prevailed throughout the atmosphere of the meetings. You will find that in the final document. I regard it as a large-scale document. It embraces the idea that the dialogue, our fourth summit, lays bricks into the building of our future relations, and launches movement to continue in the 21st Century.

What specifically has been accomplished? Following the political dialogue, which I place highest, we have completed the process of agreeing on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Preparations for the fourth meeting pushed on that process, and we were able to exchange the instruments of ratification. This was not merely a formal act. I'll permit myself to use the following solemn phrasing: the completion of the procedures for putting into effect the INF Treaty has made the Moscow meeting a landmark event in Soviet-American dialogue, and in world politics as well.

Not only the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States but also their allies, the entire world public and the entire world community can congratulate themselves. This is a joint victory of reason and realism. It has become possible because today on all continents, in all countries, irrespective of their social choice and other values which each people chooses and determines itself, there is a common understanding that the world has found itself at a line where one must stop, when it is necessary to open the road in another direction — the direction towards a nuclear-free, non-violent world, towards an improvement of international relations.

Many are those who have made a real, substantial contribution to the attainment of this major victory. I must also note the role of the press. When it put difficult questions to politicians and to the participants in the talks this too was a necessary contribution because the questions put by journalists helped to raise the talks to the level at which they were concrete and convincing, helped to find solutions and arguments, helped to work out the forms of verification.

It is now a matter of honour, first of all for the Soviet Union and the United States, and not only for them but for other states as well, for every letter and comma of the treaty to be observed and implemented.

Further I must say that the President and I have approved a joint statement. As I have already said, it sums up what has been accomplished after the Washington meeting and what was done here, in Moscow. At the same time, the statement confirms a sort of agenda for the Soviet-American dialogue in future. In short, this is an important political document heralding a whole stage in our relations. The most substantial are the provisions relating to the importance of continuing and building up the political dialogue between countries and intensifying talks.

I would note the advance also in the sphere of disarmament. This is a very difficult process, especially concerning the question of strategic offensive arms. This, it appears, is the most complex task which we have encountered in post-war world politics. But I must firmly state that step-by-step we are advancing towards the treaty on the reduction of these weapons. Today one of the correspondents, maybe of those present here, asked whether after the talks held here I would retain my optimism concerning the conclusion of this treaty already this year, already during the present administration. I can say that if work

is conducted effectively, if the present administration, if both sides act effectively, we can achieve the treaty.

I want to draw attention to our initiative, that has gained much ground, concerning talks on the reduction of armaments and armed forces in Europe. It was published and I will not be repetitive.

A whole package of agreements concerning bilateral relations between our countries has been signed. They too have been published.

There was an in-depth discussion of the problem of regional conflicts. It was present at all our conversations with the President and at two plenary meetings. It was discussed with particular detail and thoroughness today.

I think that we have come to face a situation when it is possible to state that real chances have emerged in the world's "flashpoints" for resolving regional problems and untangling these tight "knots" on the basis of political approaches, on the basis of the balance of interests.

We today stated the following: firstly, there is Afghanistan, and I will speak about that later on. Secondly, there is a process concerning the Middle East. It is proceeding, positions are drawing closer and there is growing understanding of the need for its solution along the lines of an international conference. This has already been recognised. But the point at issue is how to regard this conference. All these issues will be specified in the course of future efforts.

There is a Kampuchean problem. Thanks to the initiative recently displayed by Vietnam and Kampuchea, it is being moved into the plane when it can be resolved in the nearest future.

A real process is under way, and there is a possibility of solutions, in Central America, in southern Africa, and so on.

If some view my considerations as unjustified optimism, as an attempt at wishful thinking, I think, they are wrong. Let us compare the situation three to four years ago and today. The situation has substantially changed. There have emerged chances for a political solution of all these conflicts. Formidable forces have been set in motion in these regions and in the world as a whole. I have always stressed in conversations with the President and all American officials the principal idea — we should not lose, pass up this chance.

In this connection I directly told the President that the signing of the agreements on Afghanistan creates a precedent that exceeds by its importance the framework of this very problem. This is the first instance when the Soviet Union and the United States, along with parties directly involved in conflict, have signed an agreement paving the way for a political solution.

We will try our utmost to abide by the agreements, and expect the same attitude from all other parties to the accords, including the United States of America. I think that if we fail this time, if this positive precedent does not materialise, this will have far-reaching consequences and tell upon approaches to similar problems in other regions.

There are grounds for concern. Two worrying events occurred recently: firstly, the city of Kabul, the Soviet Embassy and our troops in Kabul are being fired upon. Secondly, our comrades perished in the Kandahar area yesterday, several people were reported missing. We promised that Soviet troops would not participate in hostilities from the moment of the troop withdrawal. We did act in this way. But we made the reservation to the effect that such would be their actions if there were no provocations and bandit attacks on our troops. If this happens, we will respond in a proper way. This should be clear, too.

I think that the United States and the Soviet Union can make a constructive contribution to the solution of regional conflicts on the basis of political approaches, taking into account the balance of interests of all the participants in a conflict, on the basis of realism.

I can note a certain advance on humanitarian issues, on human rights. I set the question before the President as follows.

Some concrete problems arise in this sphere

from time to time. We have always attentively studied and solved them. And we shall further study and solve them. But the more thought I have to the situation, the more I arrive at the conclusion that the American administration does not have an understanding of the real situation with human rights, with the processes that are taking place in our country in the sphere of democracy. Probably we, too, do not have a clear understanding of the American situation in this sphere of life. I proposed: let us organise a seminar within the framework of inter-parliamentary exchanges at which the representatives of our parliaments, political and public circles would meet and exchange information and evaluations as to what is taking place in America and in our society in this sphere. We are prepared for this.

So far there are very many speculations regarding the issue of human rights. And I must say that propaganda moves, all sorts of shows have prevailed in this part of the fourth summit. So when I learned, true with a delay, only today because I was too busy to read newspapers, that our press reacted to this accordingly, I arrived at the conclusion that it had acted correctly, within the framework of glasnost. This part of the President's visit had to be shown to our people. The people should know everything.

I am not thrilled by this part of the fourth summit. I think that it is necessary to engage in realistic politics. When the President expressed to me his views about human rights in the Soviet Union I also asked him a lot of questions. And it took him a long time to explain because he wanted me to change my opinion of the human rights situation in the United States. On hearing him out I said, "Mr President, your explanations are not convincing because I used facts based on data from the American Congress, not to mention the press which prints many materials on this question. In my position it is best to proceed from official data."

I think this is the only way to conduct talks. Let us look at one another with open eyes, let us see each other's history, traditions and values, let us respect each other's choice, respect our peoples. For, after all, it is they who are making the choice. Incidentally, the peoples always come out for rapprochement, for mutual knowledge, for friendship. Much was told to the President on this score yesterday. So let us listen to what our people want. Since they are elected by the people, politicians should detect what the people want and implement this in concrete policies. We should help this process if we are set to improve Soviet-American relations and the situation in the world as a whole.

I must say that the possibility to make contact with Soviet people was a substantial fact of the US President's visit to the Soviet Union. This was the first visit by the President and his wife, the first acquaintance to replenish their impressions of the Soviet Union, of Soviet people. There was much within the framework of the programme, while in several instances they acted of their own choice, outside the programme.

Mrs Reagan's programme, which enabled her to get acquainted with the Soviet Union, was a substantial element. Yesterday, when the President conversed with our people, with me present, somebody asked him, and I think this got into the press, whether he still regarded the Soviet Union as an "evil empire".

"No," he replied. Moreover, he said this at a press conference near the Tsar Cannon, in the Kremlin, in the centre of the "evil empire". We take note of this and it means, as the ancient Greeks used to say, "everything flows and everything changes". This confirms my thought that the President has a sense of realism. Regardless of what the realities are, one must look them squarely in the eye. It is only a policy based on analysis, on an evaluation of real processes that merits to be termed a policy.

In short, this is how I would sum up the results: The President's visit and the talks will serve the improvement of Soviet-American relations, their development and strengthening and will raise them to a still higher level.

Could more have been attained? This, natural-

ly, interests both you and us. We have just had a discussion and that is why my colleagues and I were late for the meeting with you. The discussion did not produce an advance; we stopped half way. I was compelled to say, well, politics is the art of the possible. But I hold that more could have been achieved at this meeting.

For example, I proposed to the President to make a new big stride in spelling out the political realities of our time as a platform of intentions and political actions.

Here my colleagues in the leadership and I proceeded from the experience that we have accumulated after Geneva. There we stated: nuclear war is impossible, impermissible, there can be no victors in it and, in general, no war at all between the Soviet Union and America is permissible.

This did not mean that everything would be solved and nuclear arms would vanish on the second day or on the second week after the meeting. No, the arms remain but this joint statement was invested with tremendous meaning, evoked a great response throughout the world. Today we are arriving increasingly at the conclusion that problems should be solved by political means, on the basis of a balance of interests, on the basis of respect for the social choice of peoples. Whether we want it or not, we are all obliged to learn to live in our real world.

If you take the latest book containing the President's speeches and the book of selected articles and speeches by the general secretary of the CPSU central committee, in the first and in the second you will see these statements. So proceeding from the understanding of lessons that have been drawn from the practice of recent years, we proposed to include this political understanding in the present joint statement. Here is the draft that I suggested to the President: mindful of the existing realities in the modern world, we both believe that no outstanding issues defy solution and that they should not be solved by military means, that we both regard peaceful coexistence as a universal principle of international relations, and that the equality of all states, non-interference in internal affairs and freedom of socio-political choice should be recognised as standards that are inalienable and obligatory for all. I gave the President the Russian and the English texts. I like it, he said on reading the text.

When we came today to reach agreement on the final text of the joint statement it turned out that not all in the President's milieu liked the idea of such a wording. And this became the subject of a discussion. We felt that there was a dislike for the term "peaceful coexistence", as it had been used in the past in documents which were signed by the Soviet leadership with Nixon and Kissinger. We withdrew this term since it was unacceptable although we really do want to coexist, and I think nobody will put this to doubt.

There appeared a new variant and the President himself suggested elements of that formula. Yet it did not appear in such a form in the concluding statement although serious common understandings are stated in it. But they could have been more serious and weightier. This does not mean at all that were we to state jointly today that we should proceed from the premise of using political methods to solve problems and not bank on their military solution, that troops and armaments would vanish overnight.

No, nuclear arms did not vanish after we noted in Geneva the unacceptability and impermissibility of nuclear war. But that was a very important political point of reference both for the Soviet-American dialogue and for dialogue in the world. We regarded that as a very important statement, the more so that this view was expressed separately by the leaders both of the Soviet Union and the United States. I think that at the meeting here a chance was lost to make a big step towards forming civilised international relations.

We failed to agree on the subject of the talks on conventional arms in Europe. We suggested using the summit meeting, but, naturally, without replacing the Vienna forum, to make its work easier. For the point at issue is that we,

the Soviet Union and the Americans, come to some accord, to some understanding on such an important issue as the subject of the talks, the issue that now restrains the process of preparing a mandate in Vienna.

This position, by the way, was brought forth in Geneva at a meeting between Mr George Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. Nonetheless, despite the positive attitude to it from both sides, it has not been included in the statement. Even though the excuse was quite plausible — it was not, purportedly, proper to replace the Vienna dialogue.

That we were not going to do. On the contrary, we wanted to make work at it easier by offering our viewpoint that could be used by the participants in the Vienna meeting. What I think is: there is much talking to the effect that one cannot advance the process of nuclear disarmament, 50 percent reductions, without handling the problem of conventional arms and the reduction of armaments in Europe. But as soon as we come to real proposals in order to advance that process, there begin incomprehensible manoeuvring and departure.

The West was alarmed by the Warsaw Pact's alleged superiority in strength. When we said: let us exchange data to clarify the entire matter, the other side evaded giving an answer. Now we proposed the following: let us say that we have reached an understanding on the subject of the negotiations. This will make work easier in Vienna. Nothing has come off.

The Americans have not accepted our bold and quite realistic plan consisting of three stages and integral parts directed at eliminating asymmetry and imbalance in Europe and effecting resolute transition to creating in the continent a situation when the structure of arms and armed forces is non-offensive and their level is considerably lower.

I believe that a good chance to impart proper dynamics to the talks on diminishing the danger of confrontation between the two most powerful alliances and, thus, contributing to international security has been passed up.

Politics is the art of the possible. Anyway, I wouldn't draw dramatic conclusions because not everything that could have happened came off. Nevertheless, I ought to share my considerations so that you have a fuller understanding of the content of the talks.

Before concluding my statement, I would like to mention one general impression. I wouldn't be quite honest and truthful with you if I failed to say this. I am forming an impression about the contradictory character of the American stance. This observation is based not only on the results of this meeting. We have already come across this phenomenon before.

What is contradictory about the American approach, about the American stance? On the one hand, we have a joint statement to the effect that war should be prevented, that it is inadmissible. We conduct a business-like discussion about reducing weapons, about disarmament, talk about the preference for political solutions of problems. On the other hand, we constantly hear, and we heard this time in Moscow and many times before the President's departure for here, about the stake on force.

This means that force — armed force, military might — is proclaimed to be the chief principle of United States policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, and not only the Soviet Union. How does one tally the Geneva statements with this approach? On the one hand, the President and I state that both our peoples want to live in peace, in co-operation and even be friends. This also finds its reflection in what ordinary people say. I have read American press reports. Asked about their vision of our relations in the year 2000, the Americans preferred development of friendly relations and co-operation to rivalry.

It would seem that we should proceed from this, guide ourselves in accordance with the will of our peoples. This does not happen in real politics. This is also noticeable in the sphere of economic ties. The clear interest of the influential part of the American business community to co-operate with us faces bans, restrictions and

downright intimidation. Most unfavoured-nation status is applied in the United States with regard to the Soviet Union.

The President and I yesterday had a serious discussion on this subject. I said: why should the dead grip at the coat tails of the living, referring to the Jackson-Vanik amendment. One of them is dead, the other is a political corpse. Why should they hold us back? The amendment was adopted in a totally different situation, decades ago.

I said to the President: we have already proved that we can live without each other economically, now we should prove that we can co-operate, the more so, for we are simply doomed to co-operation. The alternative to that leads to a totally unpredictable situation. One cannot maintain lasting co-operation without it resting on trade, on economic co-operation.

I would even risk raising the question in the following way: the more we depend on each other economically, the more we will be predictable on the political plane.

We see this contradiction in the sphere of propaganda and in the behaviour of officials, especially on issues of human rights. We say yes, we are independent, each people as the right to social choice, relies on its values. Yes, we are different, but that is no reason for confrontation, the more so, for war. It's good that there is diversity. This is ground for comparison, an impetus to thought, to judgement.

We can remain ourselves and live normally, in a civilised world. We have not yet noticed on the part of the Americans a serious wish to orient themselves at new phenomena, to take into account the changes in our society. As Mayakovsky said: if stars light up, does it not mean that somebody needs this? So this must be to somebody's advantage. But I am sure that our peoples have a different view, and this is the decisive factor in shaping the policy. This contradictoriness in American policy, in the conduct of the US Administration, is disappointing to our people.

And still, returning to the overall appraisal of the fourth Soviet-American summit, I would like to say that this is a great event, that the dialogue continues. The continuity has been given an added impulse, Soviet-American relations have advanced. I don't know if by one or by two stages, but, in any case, they were brought to new stages. And this in itself is a remarkable fact in world politics.

**Mikhail Gorbachev then answered journalists' questions.**

The Soviet newspaper *Izvestia* asked Mr Gorbachev whether regular contacts with the next President were possible, and if he thought there could be a meeting to get acquainted with the next President of the USA after he is inaugurated.

**Gorbachev:** I think this is not just possible but necessary, and vitally so.

**CBS:** You have mentioned twice the missed opportunities at the talks on strategic offensive arms. You have also said that politics is the art of the possible. Therefore I would like to ask you if there is an opportunity to conclude a treaty on strategic offensive arms with the current US administration, if the US side continues insisting on preserving the SDI programme?

**Gorbachev:** I am sure there is still an opportunity to conclude the treaty this year. First, I am encouraged in this optimism by the progress that has been achieved over this period between Washington and Moscow and the exchange of opinions that was conducted here almost round-the-clock. It warrants such an optimistic appraisal.

**National Public Radio, USA:** Mr general secretary, you have been asked several times in the past few days if a fifth summit with the President of the United States is possible. You have answered, as a rule, that it is possible, but that everything depends on how matters proceed at the Moscow summit. Has it achieved such progress as would warrant the holding of a fifth summit with President Reagan this fall?

**Gorbachev:** I think that the holding of a summit is possible on one condition — if we have

an opportunity to achieve a treaty on strategic offensive arms reduction, taking into consideration the entire range of questions, including the problems of ABM and sea-based cruise missiles. I do not go into details. All this is in the area of talks and exchange of opinions. Since I state the possibility of achieving a treaty, I believe that the possibility of a fifth summit still remains a reality. It is only with this matter that I link the possibility of a fifth meeting.

**Sana News Agency, Syria:** Mikhail Sergeyevich, Arab countries highly appreciate the just words you have said recently about the Palestinian people who have been waging a courageous struggle against the Israeli occupiers. Tell us please what you have achieved at your meetings with Mr Reagan on the Palestinian question and on the Middle East settlement in general.

**Gorbachev:** We noted that there have appeared real aspects related to a political settlement of the Middle East situation.

First, there exists in the world community, also among the permanent members of the Security Council, the awareness of the need for settlement in the framework of an international conference. It is quite a different matter that the question of its content has not yet been elucidated. Then, there is an awareness that there exist the interests of Syria, there exist the interests of the Palestinian people, the interests of Israel, the interests of other countries of the region who are affected by this conflict.

We stand for a political settlement of all issues, with due account for the interests of all sides concerned and, of course, for the principled provisions of the relevant UN Resolutions.

This implies that the Israeli-occupied lands be returned and the Palestinian people's rights be restored. We said to President Reagan how we view the role of the United States, but we cannot decide for the Arabs in what form the Palestinians will take part in the international conference. Let the Arabs themselves decide, while the Americans and we display respect for their choice.

Furthermore, we ought to recognise the right of Israel to security and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. In what form — let the Palestinians together with their Arab friends decide that. This opens up prospects for active exchanges, for a real process. Anyway, it seems to me that such an opportunity is emerging.

I will disclose one more thing: we said that following the start of a conference — a normal, effective conference, rather than a front for separate talks — a forum which would be inter-related with bilateral, tripartite and other forms of activity, we will be ready to handle the issue of settling diplomatic relations with Israel.

We are thus introducing one more new element. This shows that we firmly stand on the ground of reality, on the ground of recognition of the balance of interests. Naturally, there are principal issues — the return of the lands, the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. I should reiterate: we proceed from the premise that the Israeli people and the state of Israel have the right to their security, because there can be no security of one at the expense of the other. A solution that would untie this very tight knot should be found.

**Trybuna Ludu, Poland:** Comrade general secretary, you said this morning that issues of conventional arms in Europe would be considered today. Now you have said that the West rejects the USSR's proposal in this area. We know that your initiative also comprises proposals put forward by other socialist countries, Poland included. What, in your view, is the future solution of this issue? What can be expected after Vienna? For your programme contains even some replies to the aspirations of Western countries, social democratic and other parties.

**Gorbachev:** To be fully objective, I ought to say the following: The American side does not refuse to consider the subject of the talks on the basis of the accord reached in Geneva at our Foreign Ministers' meeting. It evaded making a

statement and jointly recording the attitude to this question at the Moscow meeting.

That is why I should be absolutely objective so as not to cast any aspersions on the American side when such important matters are dealt with. They argue that they have to consult the other participants. But we say that what we have proposed does not contradict the necessity to consult. It appears that something is being withheld. Nevertheless, I believe that the prospects of defining the mandate of the Vienna conference are real.

I must say that the question of this conference's mandate was being linked to a certain extent by the American side with other CSCE issues, especially with the humanitarian sphere. Going on there too is a live, vigorous process, taking place is a collision of views, their comparison. I am of the opinion that solutions are possible.

We hold that in its foreign policy the Soviet Union should always take into account the opinion of both East and West Europe. That is exactly why we are trying to work together with our allies. Now this is being done better and we have a regular exchange of views. With the West European countries, too, we are trying to conduct matters in such a way that there would be full clarity and understanding. We want to build our common European home together.

**Mr Gorbachev then dealt with the question of the Strategic Defence Initiative:** In order to convince us to support SDI, the American side stated its readiness to share secrets with us when it achieves any real results in this matter. I told the President: Mr President, permit me to disagree with you and put this assurance in doubt. The two sides at present are trying in vain to reach agreement on the verification of the presence of sea-launched cruise missiles on two or three classes of ships. You are not prepared for this and refuse to consent. How can we believe that you will suddenly open all secrets related to SDI? This is not serious, this is beyond the framework of real politics.

Yet, while conducting such a philosophical discussion involving military strategy, we nevertheless agreed to act on the basis of the Washington statement, the more so that it contains several concrete matters.

I will illustrate this: coming out for strict observance of the ABM Treaty and the commitment not to withdraw from it in the course of an agreed-upon period of time, and considering the position taken by the American side, the Soviet side tabled a compromise proposal on this question on which views differ. In particular we proposed to carry out the following.

**First.** To exchange data related to work in the ABM field, to hold meetings of experts, to conduct mutual visits of testing sites where work in this field is being conducted.

**Second.** To exchange information with the aim of avoiding lack of confidence that the commitments adopted by the sides are being observed.

**Third.** To effect verification of compliance with commitments, up to and including inspections at sites giving rise to concern of the sides.

**Fourth.** Holding of consultations to consider situations which, in the opinion of either side, place its highest interests in jeopardy.

In the course of the consultations the sides shall use all possible means to settle the situations on a mutually acceptable basis.

Thereby, the completion of the drafting of the treaty on the 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms in 1988, as you see, will require considerable effort but we remain confident that this is possible.

**The Guardian** asked Mr Gorbachev about his personal views of the process of political perestroika in the Soviet Union as the party conference approaches and what he thought of Mr Yeltsin's call in a TV interview for the resignation of Mr Ligachev.

**Gorbachev:** The course of perestroika and its prospects are fully outlined in the theses of the CPSU central committee on this question. . . . Also taking part in this were all the members of the political bureau, the entire leadership. the

theses express our collective opinion concerning the platform of the forthcoming party conference and the prospects of perestroika. I think that the conference will give a powerful second wind to the entire process of perestroika along all the main directions. We will act resolutely but with circumspection. A huge country, a huge responsibility. We should not put either ourselves, our friends or the world community in a difficult situation. In the course of their personal experience of perestroika our people are changing, just as we ourselves. We have emerged from one stage, analysed it, drawn lessons, drawn up our plans and are searching for paths.

In the main we have found them, but there remain many tactical and practical problems. It is not always, maybe, that things are moving successfully, it is not always that we find the correct solution of some matters. Setbacks occur. But if we are to speak of the main thing — perestroika is picking up speed and the people are for perestroika. Society is in motion, the party is undergoing renewal, all spheres of society are in the process of renewal.

Of course, in our society you can find facts to illustrate any theme and thereby fulfil any assignment that the publishers of your newspapers will give you. Whatever task is set to you you will be confirmed by concrete facts. At this summit there were some attempts to use facts taken out of context. After all, any facts can be selected. The thing is to see the tendency of phenomena in generalised form, their directedness and their perspective.

As to Comrade Yeltsin's interview with the BBC, I am in total ignorance about it.

Yeltsin is a member of the central committee. The things he is speaking about were discussed at last year's October plenary meeting. There were 27 speakers, they spoke without any preparation whatsoever, like here at the press conference. And his speech, too, came as an absolute surprise. Taking place at the plenary meeting was an exchange of views about the report to be made on the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. But Yeltsin took the floor and the exchange of views began immediately. All the 27 comrades were unanimous that comrade Yeltsin's generalisations and conclusions concerning various aspects of the central committee's activity, the situation in the political bureau and the work of the secretariat were wrong. His speech was qualified as politically erroneous. So a discussion had taken place and a decision was passed. In this particular case it might be that comrade Yeltsin disagrees with the decision of the party's central committee. Then we in the central committee should ask comrade Yeltsin what this is about and what he is pressing for.

As to Comrade Ligachev and his resignation, no such problem in the party's central committee, in the political bureau exists. I advise you to proceed from this.

Asked by **NBC** for his personal assessment of what had been achieved to ensure the success of perestroika, **Mr Gorbachev** replied: The most important thing in our perestroika is that through democracy and openness we have already drawn the people into it while, by way of perfecting our political system, we will substantially strengthen this tendency. It may be that there are places and processes that perestroika has not yet influenced, but today it is already present everywhere.

The other day, for instance, there was a debate on Sakhalin Island. As a result of it a plenum of the regional party committee was convened and discussed the opinions of working people and communists. The plenum found their remarks and demands to be just, found it necessary to strengthen the Party leadership in the region and adopted decisions that were needed for the process of democratisation on Sakhalin to gain momentum. So perestroika has reached Sakhalin. But it also is spreading in depth, penetrating all spheres.

In the course of three years nobody has proposed a convincing alternative to the policy of perestroika and I am convinced that no such alternative exists. It is necessary to restructure, to renovate the country on the basis of our prin-

ciples, our ideals, using the tremendous material, spiritual and intellectual potential of society. The Party and the people have the strength to carry out perestroika and accomplish a breakthrough. There is no alternative to perestroika, and perestroika will be victorious. It may have occasional retreats, manoeuvres, even setbacks, but this will not change the main direction of our society's development. We have embarked on the path of irreversible changes.

The Portuguese newspaper *Diario De Noticias* asked for Mr Gorbachev's views on the Angola question.

**Gorbachev:** I must say that we had an interesting, substantive and realistic exchange of views. Both the Americans and we stated the possibility of advancement towards settling that regional conflict, providing, both sides stressed, strict observance of the UN Security Council's relevant resolutions, the exclusion of South Africa's interference in Angolan affairs and the granting of independence to Namibia. We are not involved in that process directly, but we supported the talks conducted by the Angolans, Cubans and South Africans through US mediation. If all the parties believe that the Soviet Union should join in more specifically in addition to expressing its considerations, we are prepared for that, too.

**Izvestia:** In watching the Soviet-American dialogue, we have always felt that initially the difficulties related to verification and inspection originated from our side. Now we think that the accent has moved to the American side. Has the summit confirmed this reorientation?

**Gorbachev:** Your observations are correct. And we discussed that by relying on facts. It has turned out that previous statements were largely bluff. Now, on starting to deal with real processes, we are in a very resolute mood. Verification should be real, effective. In the field of verification, thanks to the experience gained in elaborating the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, we now co-operate constructively. We think the solutions will be found on these issues as well.

**L'Unita:** President Reagan cited a saying, "It was born, it wasn't rushed". Still, what we are witnessing is a resolute turn for the better in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. What is Europe's role in that process, and don't you think that Europe should join this process more actively?

**Gorbachev:** In all the processes so far, Europe was not only present, but actively participated in defining problems that became subjects of discussion at the summit meetings between the US President and the general secretary. Europe, both East and West, is always there, acting and making its dynamic contribution. We will act precisely in this manner. I know that President Reagan stated just that. Moreover, today, when the world is looking for answers to burning and hard questions, I see no way for a successful solution of international problems without Europe, which possesses unique experience — historic, intellectual, diplomatic and political — without the European contribution.

**Literaturnaya Gazeta:** The latest edition of our weekly published a dispatch by our US-based correspondent Iona Andronov regarding 300 Soviet servicemen in Afghanistan who had been forced across the border into Pakistan. The publication was immediately followed by letters to the editorial board with inquiries about their fate. In discussing regional conflicts, has this question been raised during your conversation with President Reagan?

**Gorbachev:** I have also received letters from some mothers of these soldiers. We approached the American side in order to consider this question practically. Such discussions have been held. Specifically, we did not discuss this matter with President Reagan. But it began to be elaborated at working level, at the level of experts. I will add that this problem has also been raised with Pakistan. We will do everything so that our people return home.

**Los Angeles Times:** Presidential elections are held in the United States every four years, no matter whether they are needed or not. But the

President is limited to eight years in office. Your term as general secretary has not been strictly defined. Many Americans would like to know how long you intend to remain in your post.

**Gorbachev:** This does not depend on my intentions, although your notions of our democracy are such as if the people were uninvolved. This is another fact showing that we have wrong notions of each other. Nevertheless, I shall answer your question. This problem related to party and other elective bodies will be referred to the party conference, taking into account what has already been stated briefly in the theses. It will be reflected in the new election law. So all this will be put on a basis of law.

**NHK Japanese TV:** What other regional Asian problems, aside from Kampuchea and Afghanistan, have you discussed with President Reagan? Have you discussed the situation on the Korean Peninsula in connection with the coming Olympic games?

**Gorbachev:** We spoke of Afghanistan, Kampuchea, and the situation on the Korean Peninsula. I gathered the impression — to tell the truth, we did not have enough time to exchange detailed opinions on the latter question — that the American side is aware that some headway in this respect is needed. Our negotiating partners negatively described the stand of North Korea. We, on the contrary, described the stand of the DPRK government to the President as constructive and inviting dialogue and stated that the DPRK's government is prepared, both on a bilateral basis and with the participation of the Americans, to conduct an exchange of views on the present-day state of affairs and on prospects for reunification on principles on the basis of which the nation should reunite. We said that this was exactly the opportunity which had not been used so far.

**Al Hawadis magazine, Lebanon:** Today you did not say anything about the situation in the Persian Gulf area. But today you said that Afghanistan could be used as an example for a settlement of a similar situation in Kampuchea and elsewhere. Could you elaborate?

**Gorbachev:** About the Persian Gulf. This question was discussed rather thoroughly. We adhered to the view that the conflict there is very serious and everything should be done for it not to develop in a dangerous direction. This is why we say: it is essential to use to the full the potential inherent in the first Resolution of the UN Security Council and to enable the UN Secretary-General or his envoy to utilise the potential and to secure cessation of hostilities.

I think we correctly call for restraint and for the display of composure. We are the advocates of a settlement of the conflict. The threat of its spread with dangerous consequences is real. We are calling on the Americans: let us relieve the Persian Gulf of US military presence. Let us better introduce a United Nations force so that the process would not be spurred in a wrong, dangerous direction.

**New York Times:** Mr general secretary, when you were in Washington you told Mr Reagan that the Soviet Union was prepared to discontinue the supply of arms to Nicaragua if the United States stopped funding the Contras. Then, later on, Mr Shevardnadze and George Shultz discussed the question and we are told that the Soviet stand did not change, i.e. if the USA stops deliveries to Central America the Soviet Union will discontinue deliveries to Nicaragua. Could you confirm that this is really so and that you discussed this question within the context of consideration of the state of affairs in Central America?

**Gorbachev:** Today we discussed this problem in a very detailed manner, and made an excursion into history. When we make such excursions we reveal different points of view and explanations. I suggested, nevertheless, that one should proceed from today's realities. There is the Contadora process, there are the Guatemala agreements, there is the truce, and there is movement in the search for a political settlement. And it is essential, by relying on this process, to support it, giving an opportunity to the opposing forces in Nicaragua to decide this question

themselves with the participation of other Latin Americans and representatives of Central America.

I told President Reagan that I was reaffirming what had been said during strolls at the White House: let us limit ourselves to the delivery of police weapons.

In general, this subject will be examined in future as well. We urged the Americans to take it into consideration that the process had reached such a stage when it could be completed positively.

**Soviet Television:** Speaking of foreign policy aspects of perestroika, it has spread far to the East beyond Sakhalin and far to the West beyond Brest. I mean the immense attention of the public, of ordinary people, to what is happening, and the desire to get an insight into the holy of holies of the process. Hundreds of people from among anti-war organisations from all over the world arrived in Moscow and followed the talks. I know that tomorrow you will have a meeting with public and anti-war organisations. Considering all that, what is your opinion about the role of the public and people's diplomacy in the entire process taking place over the past three years?

**Gorbachev:** I have expressed my opinions on that score more than once but, summing up, I can say today: We would have made a great error in politics if we did not pay attention to very deep changes in the sentiments of the world public and ordinary people on Earth. They have got sick and tired of wars, tensions, conflicts, and of vast amounts of information which mar the present day and promise a still worse future. People came to feel that not always their will, word and desire, aspiration and interests find reflection in real politics. They began to act, uniting into appropriate organisations and bringing into use everything they have available. We see among members of the movements both ordinary people and intellectuals — physicians, scientists, former military officers, veterans, young people, and children. I think all this is very serious and if someone thinks that there is anyone's 'hand' in it, I would like to shake that hand because this is a powerful hand which stirred to action vigorous forces.

The world feels that changes are needed. Life itself has raised such questions that people came to feel the need to directly intervene in politics. Only a policy fertilised by the experience of the masses, their sentiments, their will, and using the competence of scientists and enriched by ethics and by the contribution which intellectuals and people of culture can make — only such a policy has a future and only such a policy is adequate to the real processes which are under way and has a right to existence nowadays.

**Associated Press:** Mr general secretary, do you agree with the evaluation of American-Soviet relations of the past period of detente when main attention was devoted to economic co-operation and to the observance of political tolerance. To what extent, in your view, can and must both superpowers be interdependent from the economic point of view?

**Gorbachev:** I think that both today's and tomorrow's realities, if analysed in earnest, bring us to the view that we must co-operate and this would be in the interests of both our two peoples and of the whole world. I visualise a future world in which the American and Soviet peoples would co-operate in the economic sphere, too, and would exchange the fruits of their labour, complementing each other. This is why I conceived an idea about a joint space flight to Mars so as to compete not in who gets ahead in the amount of weapons but in combining our potentials, scientific, economic, intellectual, and setting an example of co-operation in this direction. This would promote progress very much, not to mention that it would give greater scope to our co-operation and would work for building confidence between our two peoples. Yesterday I was pressing the President on these matters in public and he said: "Yes, we shall think it over". And to my mind, his words convey the idea that it is necessary to begin to study the problems.