

Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with Afghan President

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had a meeting in the Kremlin on June 13 with Afghan President Najibullah, who had taken part in the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament.

They exchanged views of the session which was devoted to a major issue of present-day world politics.

President Najibullah shared his impressions of Cuba to which he had paid an official visit and described his friendly discussions with Fidel Castro.

The sides discussed major international problems and reaffirmed the identity of views of the Soviet Union and Afghan leadership and their readiness to facilitate the mounting positive processes in international relations.

Gorbachev and Najibullah continued their discussion on issues relating to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, started in Moscow two weeks previously.

They also considered some most topical questions of Soviet-Afghan co-operation in various spheres.

It was noted that, contrary to the attempts by part of the armed opposition to thwart the implementation of the policy towards national reconciliation in Afghanistan, this course was finding ever greater understanding among the population and those who had first rejected it.

International recognition

This policy is directed at ending the fratricidal armed struggle and creating a mechanism for governing the country in keeping with the traditions and aspirations of the Afghan people with the participation of all forces without exception who are sincerely concerned about the country's fate.

Gorbachev described it as a truly national approach.

"We have no secret plans with regard to Afghanistan," Gorbachev pointed out. "Our policy rests on respect for the Afghan people and

their values, on complete recognition of their independence, sovereignty and non-alignment."

"In this capacity, Afghanistan will be able to regain universal international recognition and establish mutually beneficial economic co-operation with all those prepared for that.

"The Soviet Union, which shares a 2,000 kilometre border with Afghanistan and considers it a loyal neighbour of long standing, is interested precisely in such an approach."

Serious concern was expressed over the violation of the Geneva Accords by the Pakistani Administration.

The Soviet Union and Afghanistan believed that the UN Mission monitoring compliance with the Geneva agreements would adopt, at last, effective measures to curb the practice which, if continued, would make it necessary to undertake most resolute retaliatory steps.

The Soviet and Afghan leaders agreed on a more rational use of Soviet assistance and bilateral co-operation to rehabilitate the Afghan economy, carry out social policies and help resettle the refugees.

The meeting was attended by Eduard Shevardnadze and Anatoli Dobrynin. □

Mikhail Gorbachev receives Vatican Secretary of State

ON June 13 Mikhail Gorbachev together with Eduard Shevardnadze, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, received Cardinal Agostino Casaroli, the Vatican's Secretary of State (the head of government), in the Kremlin.

The cardinal, who is currently in Moscow in connection with the celebration of the millennium of the baptism of Russia, delivered a personal message to Mikhail Gorbachev from Pope John Paul II.

This is history's first meeting of a Soviet leader with such a high-ranking representative of the Catholic church. This very fact reflects the changes taking place in the world and in social consciousness and indicates that realism is becoming increasingly established in world politics and in human relationships both inside countries and across state borders.

The meeting, during which some practical matters were also touched upon, was predominantly of a conceptual nature. The

conversation dealt with the principles of co-operation among all peace forces, the co-operation which is so essential in our days when mankind has encountered unprecedented problems: the nuclear and ecological threats, the danger of disruption of ethical principles of life and of loss of cultural and spiritual values which have been acquired over many centuries.

Common concern

"You and we have different initial philosophical positions," Mikhail Gorbachev said. "But we have wide possibilities for co-operation in our common concern for peace, specifically considering such an immense achievement as the Helsinki Final Act which bears the signatures of our two countries, too."

Cardinal Casaroli highly appreciated the activities of the Soviet leadership that displayed, as he put it, patience and statesmanly wisdom in the search for ways to real disarmament.

Mikhail Gorbachev supported Casaroli's idea that along with disarmament as a peace-building factor, spiritual mutual understanding is essential, and that the state of affairs in the Third World and co-operation in the protection of the cultural legacy of peoples is a common concern of the world community.

"Peace, which we dream of, irrespective of difference in world-outlook approaches, is possible only on the basis of respect for national values. We are all different but the diversity of

the world is not only material and social wealth but spiritual as well. Therefore political struggle for disarmament should be combined with large-scale contacts and exchanges in the spiritual sphere."

"However, Mikhail Gorbachev went on to say, "co-operation can be maintained only under conditions of respect for the social choice of everyone." In this connection he told the cardinal how strongly Soviet people's belief in socialism and their commitment to the socialist way of life manifest themselves during discussions which have now developed in Soviet society over issues concerning its renewal and restructuring.

"Without respect for this reality, there can be no correct relations with the Soviet Union. And in general, respect for the will of every people is an earnest that international relations as a whole will acquire a civilised nature.

"As far as the freedom of religion is concerned, it is sealed in our constitution, and we abide by this principle. Now that Soviet society is being further democratised, this principle is also within the field of our attention. But all this is our internal affair, and the use of any channels whatsoever, including church ones, for interference is, naturally, unacceptable.

"We shall attentively consider the message from the Pope, including the question of giving a regular character to contacts between our states," Mikhail Gorbachev said. "I think that after this meeting — and one may agree that it was of friendly nature — the two sides have ground for reflection. Both you and we need to think everything over. As it has turned out, there exists a basis for establishment of a dialogue." □

IN THIS ISSUE

Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with Afghan President	p. 213
Eduard Shevardnadze's statement at UN General Assembly	p. 214
Soviet Foreign Minister's message to UN Secretary General	p. 218
Andrei Gromyko addresses participants in church celebrations	p. 219

Eduard Shevardnadze's statement at UN General Assembly

Here follows the statement made by Eduard Shevardnadze, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Foreign Minister of the USSR, in the general debate of the third special session of the United Nations General Assembly on Disarmament:

Comrade President,
Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and
Gentlemen,

In just a few days the first clusters of intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles will be destroyed.

The treaty eliminating those missiles entered into force at the Moscow summit meeting.

As Mikhail Gorbachev has said, the era of nuclear disarmament begins.

Destiny has willed that this coincides with the special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The Soviet Union invites the United Nations Secretary-General, representatives of the members of the Security Council, the representative of Zimbabwe as the current Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, and delegates to the Conference on Disarmament to attend one of the first missile-elimination procedures.

This, of course, is not the Bolshoi Theatre, but a major premier nonetheless, a momentous historic event.

It has been made possible by the Moscow summit. This alone gives the summit an extremely important political dimension. But it has also made possible many other things, which enhances its significance even more, again in the context of disarmament.

It has achieved certain progress toward an agreement on 50 per cent reductions in strategic offensive arms while observing the ABM Treaty.

It has brought us closer to a convention banning chemical weapons.

A step has been taken toward limiting and subsequently ceasing nuclear explosions.

Important additional confidence-building measures in the military field have been agreed.

Principles of comprehensive control and verification have been reaffirmed and further developed.

A contribution has been made toward putting on a practical plane the problem of reducing troops and conventional armaments in Europe.

The Moscow meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and US President Ronald Reagan has signalled a further advance in the conceptual view of the nature of disarmament itself. It has shown that despite their profound differences the Soviet Union and the United States can co-operate in this sphere. We are in full agreement with those speaking here who believe that dialogue between the leaders of the two major nuclear powers is of fundamental importance for strengthening international security in the interest of all nations of our planet.

And, of course, we share the opinion of Mr Perez de Cuellar that this historic event confirms the importance of this forum.

At the risk of overusing the words "for the first time" and "new" I would like to focus your attention on the first measure of real disarmament, which — precisely here and now — has to emerge before us in all its true significance.

A reality hitherto unknown to mankind has come into being, a new condition of the world, which in terms of its significance is similar to overcoming the gravity of the Earth. The

anti-gravitational forces which, once they gain momentum, could eventually check the global pulling power of weapons and put an end to the centuries-old dependence on them have finally been unleashed.

This is only a beginning but it ushers in a phase so qualitatively new as to require a collective effort to grasp its meaning.

It is our duty to learn the lessons of the first treaty on nuclear disarmament so that we can pass on together to a higher level of civilisation.

In our view, those lessons indicate that disarmament, which is a universal human concept, can become, and in fact has become, a universal human goal which can indeed be attained.

Here, without any way digressing from thoughts about the future, we must pay grateful tribute to those whose idea of a world without weapons for too long a time seemed to be a utopia.

Well, as a great man once said, utopias often turn out to be truths spoken before their time.

Nothing is more powerful than a truth whose time has come. For us, Lenin's dictum, "disarmament is socialism's ideal", has always been such a truth.

It could not become a reality immediately after our revolution. Even now some might say that we are still far from that ideal. Indeed, the Soviet Union, just like the United States and some other countries, has lots and lots of weapons.

Glasnost is indivisible, it transcends national boundaries. Here are the figures: the Soviet Union's strategic offensive arms at present comprise 2494 delivery vehicles and about 10,000 warheads, including those on sea-launched cruise missiles.

But the world must know that in addition to vast arsenals of weapons the Soviet Union has an even greater reserve of political will for disarmament.

It equals our ability to analyse in a self-critical way our own past and the mistakes made then. In the process of the renewal of our society new political thinking displaces old thinking, establishing new, higher standards of glasnost, openness and democratism.

This tendency of totally honest self-assessment, which is inherent in perestroika, is concisely expressed in the Theses of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for the 19th National Party Conference.

As we speak of the dogmatic and subjectivist approaches which left an imprint on our foreign policy, we have every reason to expect others to be equally self-critical.

In this we see the courage of new political thinking which challenges outdated stereotypes and standards.

In this we see a desire for an open dialogue with the world, which has been initiated, stimulated and inspired by our perestroika and revitalisation.

In this we see a policy of democratising international relations, which presupposes not only dialogue on an equal footing but also equal responsibility.

For us the idea of a socialist legal state is inseparable from the principle of the primacy of law in international relations. It is only on

this basis that new political thinking can implement a set of major ideas, such as:

— A step-by-step elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000;

— A system of comprehensive security;

— A common European and a common global home;

— Defensive sufficiency and a non-offensive strategy;

— National reconciliation and regional security;

— Mutual cessation of the presence of foreign troops and bases on foreign territories.

The Soviet Union is submitting to this forum a number of proposals which could constitute elements of a new platform of disarmament in the years following the start of the physical elimination of nuclear weapons.

Earlier in this statement I have used the word "destiny". It is hard to disagree with Immanuel Kant, who said that destiny is the reason "compelling people to achieve concord through discord even when against their will".

Faced with the threats of this century, the world is one and it shares one destiny. Redeeming concord among countries and nations is making its way through a multitude of discords.

The treaty on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is an embodiment of this concord.

Today the world community sees a realistic prospect of the removal of 13,000 nuclear warheads from weapons arsenals. We are confident that an agreement on 50 per cent reductions in strategic offensive arms while observing the ABM Treaty will be concluded.

Seeking and devising other, political methods, whose purpose is to build a nuclear-free world, is now the order of the day.

If the objective were merely to increase man's chances for survival, the current session could even now declare its full success, for today those chances are better than ten years ago. Indeed, much better, as demonstrated by the number of missiles that the Soviet Union and the United States will soon destroy.

Yet today this can no longer satisfy us. For the goal of our quest and our efforts is not a situation in which mankind is threatened with ten deaths instead of twenty, but a world in which it is no longer threatened by death because of a conflict of war.

We have before us two strategic objectives.

The first is to expand and intensify the process of disarmament without losing momentum.

The second is to build security on a different qualitative level.

Having initiated the process of disarmament, we are now confronted with the fundamental problem of how to disarm ourselves without diminishing either our own or global security, without dividing it into two mutually exclusive types — one for ourselves and the other for all the rest.

We are not saying that nuclear weapons can be eliminated easily or regardless of other elements of security. But the first and perhaps the hardest thing to do is to abandon the myth of nuclear weapons as the guarantor of peace.

For if they were, then why eliminate them at all?

Because this "guarantor" is capable of incinerating all life on this planet.

Because so long as those weapons exist mankind lives in constant fear.

Yet for all this, nuclear weapons do not end but stimulate the race in all other kinds of weapons.

For, if nuclear war is impossible — and it is indeed impossible — then elementary logic prompts one to acquire other, non-nuclear weapons, making them more sophisticated and powerful.

In fact, "nuclear deterrence" cannot exist without the ever-growing arsenals of conventional weapons.

In fact, "nuclear deterrence" does not rule out, but clearly implies a "conventional war", which is always capable of escalating into a world war.

The nuclear component of strategy is the most aggressive catalyst of the arms race, which is why it has to be scrapped.

The Soviet Union is convinced that ensuring security by non-nuclear means is possible. It is possible on the basis of sufficiency.

Sufficiency is not just a certain level of armaments, but above all a certain frame of mind, a psychological and political disposition toward ever smaller arsenals — sufficient for defence but not for attack.

Sufficiency is something that was unthinkable in the years of the cold war, which forced us and others to keep arming ourselves again and again.

Sufficiency is something that can and must be seen today as the only possible road toward peace for all nations.

Sufficiency is a concept of security as deriving from collective actions of states. Peace and legal order can no longer be maintained by two or three even of the most powerful countries. This is a function of special institutions and mechanisms which are capable of combining the efforts of many into a single will.

We have such institutions. They are the United Nations, the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee, which was conceived as a special body to assist the Security Council in formulating plans for putting in place a system that would regulate arms in the world.

For a long time, conditions for that did not exist. Such conditions are taking shape now.

As we see it, one of the central tasks for the international community, and specifically for the disarmament forums within the United Nations system, is to devise a concept of disarmament which must be based on the idea of integrity and interdependence of today's world.

We want to see the same integrity in the process of disarmament and accordingly, in the system of control.

It turns out that common sense embodied in verification and inspection arrangements can be much more powerful than the mystical horror of the open door of the nuclear arsenal.

Having provided the maximum opportunities for verification, the Soviet Union has contributed to the establishment of new forms of coexistence on Earth, to a truly revolutionary change in the traditional views of the limits of openness in relations among states.

This revolution, of which we are rightly proud, should be extended to other areas of disarmament, and to regional conflicts, too, here verification is the central question, question number one. For if it is absent even the movement toward a settlement is being questioned.

We make no secret of the address of our concern. It is Afghanistan.

When one party observes its obligations under the Geneva agreements while the other party is violating them, this naturally causes one to have doubts about one's partner and to refuse to trust him. I will say more: the violating party undermines confidence in the possibility of settling other regional conflicts, for which

Afghanistan is a ray of hope and an example of solution.

We believe that the world community should not condone this.

Dialogue on disarmament can and must be a part of a wide-ranging multilateral process of ensuring comprehensive security on a genuinely international basis.

This presupposes that all countries, and primarily all nuclear powers, will define their attitude toward real disarmament and state how they intend to participate in this process.

Indeed, participate in disarmament — rather than avoid it, worshipping with too much zeal the idols of "nuclear deterrence"; contribute to disarmament rather than engage here in statistical evaluation of Soviet military power while somehow forgetting to cite similar data on one's own country and its allies. I mean, of course, yesterday's address by British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe.

An in-depth exchange of views has started at the United Nations around the idea of a group of socialist countries concerning the establishment of a comprehensive system of international peace and security based on the United Nations Charter. At the current session they have submitted a memorandum entitled "security through disarmament", which gives concrete expression to the central idea of that concept.

We believe that the way to implement it is to develop a new understanding of a reasonable combination and harmonisation of national and global security interests. It should be based on the idea of a transition to non-military guarantees of security, of the states adopting a defensive strategy and, accordingly, reorienting their military structures exclusively to the objectives of non-offensive defence.

The member countries of the Warsaw Treaty have made their position quite clear in a document on military doctrine. It codifies the strictly defensive nature of their politico-military alliance and contains an appeal to the member countries of NATO to undertake a comparison and a joint discussion of military doctrines. The goal is to bring military theory and practice in conformity with the requirements of defensive strategy and with the principle of sufficiency for defence.

Will this appeal be heard? We very much hope so, because very serious issues are involved here.

Defensive strategy and military sufficiency will require not only arms reductions but also a radical overhaul of force structures and postures and changes in the very nature of military activities and in the development of armed forces.

In this respect, talks on conventional armed forces and armaments, above all in Europe, are a matter of priority for the Soviet Union.

We propose that reductions in conventional armaments start with eliminating the existing imbalances and asymmetries on the basis of a reciprocal exchange of data. Apparently, a lot of such information is being bandied about all over the world. However, those figures are not produced by governments, which deprive them of the necessary legal force and credibility. That is why we insist on a formal exchange of official data.

As proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev at the Moscow summit, this could be done even before the negotiations begin. Once they get under way, it is proposed that on-site inspections be conducted to check the baseline data and thus to remove differences in assessments. At that stage, ways of eliminating imbalances and asymmetries could be identified and first practical steps taken to that effect, and methods of carrying out reductions in the armed forces and armaments under the most stringent control could also be devised.

The second stage in the negotiations would

deal with cutbacks in the armed forces of both sides by approximately 500,000 men each.

At the third stage, further reductions would be made in the armed forces and conventional armaments, the armed forces on both sides would be given a defensive character, and their offensive nucleus would be dismantled.

At all those stages of the negotiations we are ready for reciprocal reductions in offensive arms of all types including tactical nuclear weapons, attack aircraft and tanks.

Parallel to that discussions could be held on measures for the disengagement of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO forces and the establishment of corridors and zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons. In that regard, extremely interesting suggestions have been made by socialist countries — let me just mention the proposals of the GDR, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, the Jaruzelski Plan, and the Jakes Plan.

Another task is to place limits on the development of the ever more destructive types and systems of conventional weapons.

Worthy of consideration in this regard is the proposal of states members of the Non-Aligned Movement on the cessation and prohibition of the use of scientific and technological achievements for developing and producing new generations and kinds of weapons of mass destruction, and of new kinds and systems of conventional arms.

We regard as very interesting the idea of conducting a systematic assessment of scientific and technological achievements for a timely elaboration of recommendations on preventing the use of new technologies for weapons development and on establishing to that end a committee of prominent scientists under the auspices of the United Nations. This should be done in the first place with respect to laser, genetic and electromagnetic systems.

We note the importance of Sweden's proposal to ban the use of battlefield laser weapons for blinding personnel.

One of the obstacles impeding settlement of regional conflicts is the intensive transfusion of weapons into zones of increased confrontation. Therefore the Soviet Union favours restrictions on the sales and supplies of conventional arms.

Arms supplies are not the underlying cause of conflicts. Sometimes they are so deeply rooted that they may appear to defy solution. But now that the idea of national reconciliation has crystallized, everyone sees that it opens good prospects.

There is, of course, no single prescription, and there can be none, but solutions could be sought along those lines. Contributing to them are the initiatives of many countries, including Kampuchea, Vietnam, Laos, Angola, Ethiopia, Cuba, and Nicaragua which are working out in very difficult conditions a future-oriented policy of regional settlement.

Asian security is becoming an important area in its own right. Here, too, a number of countries are trying to make a contribution to ensuring peace and stability in the region. In particular, the proposals of great India, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, the Mongolian People's Republic, and the initiatives by countries in Latin America, Africa and other regions deserve consideration, of course.

Following the concept of an integral process of disarmament, it is inadmissible to leave naval forces outside the framework of negotiations. This is a major global problem, but its resolution can and must be started at regional levels. Here again we would like to call attention to the initiatives set forth in Mikhail Gorbachev's statements in Vladivostok, Murmansk and Belgrade, which contain detailed proposals for restricting naval activities in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, the northern seas, and the Mediterranean.

From the standpoint of disarmament naval forces still remain an "off-limits area". Some states which are ready to include even kitchen trailers in the military balance on the side of their opponents, get nervous when they are invited just to talk about, for instance, aircraft-carriers. And here a question arises on the level of an arithmetic textbook: what is the number of, say, tanks that would be equal to the fire-power of this floating armada?

Let us try to begin with confidence-building measures in the naval sphere, such as advance notifications of transfers and manoeuvres of naval and associated air forces; limitation of the number, scope and area of exercises; invitation of observers there and exchanges of information.

To enhance confidence, it would be useful to compare data on naval potentials, to discuss the principles of the use of naval forces and to compare the goals of exercises and manoeuvres at sea. We have got the unique experience of the Stockholm Conference — why not use it?

All have an equal stake in a reliable security of sea communications. This would be facilitated by establishing, in the areas of major international ocean lanes, zones of lower density of armaments and enhanced confidence and by withdrawing offensive forces and systems from such zones.

Here, too, we have to be guided by the concepts of non-offensive defence. At sea, too, we are in favour of finally precluding the possibility of launching a surprise attack or large-scale offensive operations.

Recent events once again prove to us that it is desirable to create United Nations naval forces. The permanent members of the Security Council could announce in advance which elements they would be prepared to assign to such forces. In the near future a joint trial activity could be conducted in which the fleets of the permanent members of the Security Council would practise maintaining freedom of navigation by United Nations forces.

An agreement on limiting the number of ships equipped with tactical nuclear weapons would be consistent with present-day trends.

On the basis of reciprocity with the United States and other nuclear powers, the USSR is ready to announce the presence of absence of nuclear weapons aboard its naval ships calling at foreign ports. There is an attractive idea of collective efforts by countries concerned to develop technical means of verifying the absence of nuclear weapons aboard naval ships.

We propose that all these questions should be discussed in the United Nations at a multilateral meeting of military experts.

The question of military bases in other countries' territories and foreign military presence lies at the junction of the most urgent politico-military problems. It is the political pole where the meridians of international security and sovereignty, independence and national dignity of the peoples and countries converge.

The USSR proposes the goal of eliminating foreign military presence and military bases in foreign territories by the year 2000. This goal should be pursued gradually with regard for specific regional characteristics and for the real needs of security and defence. The United Nations could be invited to participate in verifying the withdrawal of troops from foreign territories.

Where the presence of foreign troops is needed to maintain peace they should be provided by the United Nations.

It would be very good if states gave the United Nations Secretary-General information on their military presence abroad and on foreign military presence on their territories.

As the process of disarmament will encompass an increasing number of countries, international verification arrangements will probably be required.

This is likely to put on the agenda the establishment of an international monitoring and verification agency under the auspices of the United Nations. The multilateral verification body could coordinate and, where appropriate, monitor the fulfilment of obligations under multilateral arms limitation and reduction agreements, verify compliances with agreements on lessening international tensions and monitor the military situation in areas of conflict.

Fully aware of the difficulties involved in implementing this idea, we assume that the process which would eventually lead to the establishment of an international monitoring and verification agency would be based on taking decisions by consensus. We do not rule out that a mechanism of control could be set up on a case-by-case, for specific situations.

It would be desirable to establish, under the United Nations Secretary-General, a multilateral centre to assist in verification. It could, in our view, perform such functions as promptly sending, on instructions from the Secretary-General, missions to areas of international conflicts and rendering assistance in verification matters to the parties to bilateral and regional agreements. On the basis of the missions' reports, the Secretary-General could hold consultations with concerned states and use his right of recourse to the Security Council.

Finally, may I once again draw your attention to what we regard as the most important task in the area of disarmament, namely preventing the introduction of weapons into outer space.

One of the ways to achieve this goal is to make space a sphere of expanding peaceful co-operation of states whose benefits could be enjoyed by all the peoples on Earth.

We see a joint mission of Soviet cosmonauts and American astronauts to Mars, as an example of such co-operation. Other states' participation is not ruled out. This project would undoubtedly give a powerful impetus to developing new technologies and speeding up scientific and technological progress.

Speaking from this rostrum in 1985, we favoured the establishment of a world space organisation. Today such an organisation would be even more relevant. We envisage it as a focal point of the practical development of a universal model of international outer space exploration.

Even today an urgent need has emerged to explore the possibilities for co-operation among states on the basis of agreed rules and procedures to prevent pollution in outer space.

Building on the idea put forward by France, a start could be made in establishing an international space monitoring agency.

The first special session of the United Nations General Assembly called for a complete ban on all types of chemical weapons. By now that call has been translated into an extensive draft convention with detailed annexes and with most of the texts free from brackets.

Finalising the convention in the near future is a realistic possibility.

It is, however, jeopardised by the spread of chemical weapons. This exceptionally grave problem is of great concern to us. The Soviet Union strongly condemns any use of chemical weapons or any transfer of such weapons to others.

We all must regard the danger of chemical weapons proliferation as yet another argument for an early agreement completely banning them, not as a pretext to avoid it. The sooner we conclude a comprehensive convention the more effective will be the measures against the spread of chemical weapons.

Some words about nuclear testing. Our monologue on a nuclear test ban that lasted so long is finally promising to become a dialogue.

By now, the two sides at the Soviet-US talks are close to attaining the goal, for the first stage, namely working out improved

measures to verify compliance with the 1974 and 1975 treaties, which will make it possible to move on to the next phase, at which limitations on the number and yield of test explosions will be discussed. As you know, an agreement on conducting a joint verification experiment was signed during the Moscow summit.

Soviet-US negotiations are only a part of our efforts to achieve a total ban on nuclear testing. Serious work has to be done at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Proposals by the Group of Six, the socialist countries and several Western nations have laid good groundwork for that. If for some reason it is difficult to proceed immediately to drafting the text of a total test ban treaty, here, too, a step-by-step consideration of a system of verification could begin. But failure to move is by no means acceptable.

For without limiting and banning nuclear tests, it is difficult and even impossible to prevent the global spread of nuclear weapons. Action in this area could be reinforced by the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world. It is only serious work and complementary efforts on a multilateral and bilateral level that will lead to the ultimate goal. All this said, our invariable position of principle on a nuclear testing moratorium is still valid: on the basis of reciprocity with the United States we are ready to reintroduce and to observe it, this time not for a year and a half but for all times.

Concluding my remarks on nuclear weapons, I consider it necessary to state: if the United Nations General Assembly adopts an appeal to the USSR and the United States not to use for military purposes the materials released as a result of nuclear disarmament agreements, we shall respond to it positively.

I wish to return once again to a subject whose tremendous importance has become particularly evident following the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles.

The subject is disarmament and development.

Even those measures of concrete disarmament that we have already taken have released significant resources for the development of our country's social sphere. This experience provides incentive for our persistent efforts in promoting the idea of disarmament in order to increase assistance to the developing countries.

In this context, the establishment of a disarmament for development fund appears to be particularly relevant.

We reaffirm our willingness to participate in such a fund.

The Soviet Union also intends to proceed to a thorough examination of the problem of converting military industries to civilian purposes and of preparing relevant plans on the national and local levels.

All those issues could be included in the agenda of a meeting of the top leaders of the member states of the United Nations Security Council, which has been proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev

Ladies and Gentlemen,

If there were no areas where the interests of all converge no society whatsoever would be able to exist.

This session and our dialogue are the best possible confirmation of this thought of a great philosopher. Disarmament is the point where the interests of nations converge, and it is this fact that makes the world community more conscious of itself as a single whole. In the words of Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet Union regards itself as part of an integral civilisation, believes in the primacy of universal human values and views the preservation of peace as the highest priority.

This provides a reference point for our foreign
(Continued on Page 218)

Eduard Shevardnadze's New York press conference

EDUARD SHEVARDNADZE held a press conference at the USSR Mission at the United Nations on June 10. He said:

Ladies and Gentlemen, Dear Comrades,

Let me welcome you cordially to our Mission and express gratitude to you for the participation in our press conference. I am going to make a statement that will last 15 minutes. I hope you will have patience to listen to me, and then there will be answers to questions.

The US press has widely covered the Moscow summit recently. The meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan evoked great interest. We judge this by the large journalists' corps which covered the Moscow dialogue and by the number of publications about it. In connection with the summit, there were many other items about the Soviet Union, about our people, about the process of democratisation and renewal taking place in our country, about the speedy social and economic development of our motherland.

In this connection we had some hesitations and doubts whether this press conference should be held.

We have decided that it should since, we believe, there is a need to point out that the area of disarmament is an area of extreme importance which requires constant attention.

We would think the special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament, a major event in world politics, would attract the close attention of the world press. However, as far as I can judge by the information I have, and I am supplied with voluminous information, this major event has not yet been given broad coverage by the press.

These are not complaints levelled at those present in this hall, but to other members of the media.

Why was the coverage so scant?

This phenomenon should be looked into.

One gets the impression that disarmament might fall victim to its first truly historic success. The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has gone into effect. There are prospects for the conclusion of an agreement on cutting by half strategic offensive arms in conditions of the observance of the ABM Treaty, and there are prospects for concluding such an agreement precisely with the current administration, and this should also be mentioned.

We have rolled back the arms race and lessened the nuclear menace somewhat. But we cannot say that the idea of disarmament has triumphed. Hardly had the ink with which the protocol on the exchange of the instruments of ratification had been signed had dried than talk started if disarmament has not gone too far. Calls are made for caution and even vigilance against a new threat, so to say, "the threat of disarmament".

If anyone should be vigilant and at the same time persistent in the striving toward the goal, it is supporters of disarmament, for disarmament will not become a steady dominant tendency unless we make it comprehensive, if it marks time instead of being advanced on and on by the efforts of all states, of the entire world community.

In its address to the special session of the United Nations General Assembly the Soviet delegation tried to set out both philosophical views, the roads of the advance toward a secure

world, and also practical considerations on this matter. It is not for us to judge how convincingly we have managed to do this.

But, frankly speaking, it is somewhat surprising that some professional political commentators do not go deeper than the surface of events, "news", so to say, and that they take a somewhat simplistic view of most complex problems of disarmament. They seem to be waiting for some magic word, after which a miracle, or, bluntly speaking, a sensation, will happen.

But there can be no miracles in politics and changes are achieved slowly, as a result of persistent work, I would say, as a result of most persistent struggle, a purposeful quest for a balance of interests and accord about ultimate goals.

If one does not dissemble but is seriously striving for disarmament, one should take the present-day reality as it is and on its basis determine how a transition is to be made to a different state: from the arms race and a risk of conflict to a durable peace with the lowest level of armaments.

This will actually mean a new quality of life on our planet and a new level of world civilisation. Some politicians think at times that it is they who choose the direction and speed of movement. But huge changes quite often take place without them. History has a logic all of its own and its own deeply motivated course.

For instance, there existed overseas colonies of a certain power, and this seemed to be the immutable state of things. But the time came and the American Revolution took place.

The autocracy was regarded to be eternal, but our revolution put an end to it.

Nuclear weapons were regarded as immune, but we now start to destroy them.

The world is changing according to the laws of its development, and whereas war was proclaimed yesterday to be the indispensable part of the living, weapons, particularly weapons of mass destruction, now become as unacceptable to humanity as industrial wastes that destroy the environment.

Concerned wisdom and surprising thoughtlessness are strangely combined in contemporary life.

We are concerned about the preservation of the ozone layer enveloping the globe and at the same time we create the things that can destroy the globe in a matter of minutes.

This can hardly continue indefinitely. There is a limit to the burdens of arms, just as to ecological resources. But if the risk is high, the resolve to eliminate it is as great.

How do we propose to act? I wish to recall something said at the special session.

First. The process of the elimination of nuclear arms should be continued. Chemical weapons should be banned and their elimination should be started. These are quite feasible tasks facing humanity.

Second. Deep cuts in forces and conventional armaments should be started, above all in Europe where they exist in particularly large and inordinate volumes. We have set out our concept on this matter and we are prepared to discuss this concept with any representatives of any states, public organisations, scientists and so on.

Third. I would ask you to take particular note of this provision. It is necessary to disarm across the board, without any exceptions. Armaments are armaments whether they exist on

Earth, underground, at sea or in the ocean depths, in the air or in outer space.

Fourth. It is necessary to recognise the inacceptability of the deployment of troops and armaments in the territories of other countries, to recall them within national borders and eliminate all military bases from lands of others. This question is ripe, too. And there should be no abuse of the hospitality of other countries, other states. They have a right to know if ships calling at their ports have nuclear weapons on board.

Fifth. One's own security and the security of others should not be separated, let alone opposed. The interests of partners and the entire world community should be taken into consideration. National egoism should be abandoned, and mutually-acceptable solutions should be sought in any case.

Sixth. The system of control, verifications and inspections should be developed to make them absolutely reliable in preventing violations of agreements and obligations assumed. There should be the utmost openness in the military area.

Seventh. Proceeding from the fact of integrity of the world and indivisibility of its security, matters should be carried to the transfer of peace-keeping functions and maintenance of international security to the universal international organisation — the United Nations, to the institutions and mechanisms created under its auspices in accordance with the charter of the United Nations Organisation.

Such are the fundamental principles and cardinal roads which should be taken to preserve and save our civilisation.

Guided by the realistic view of perspectives based on new political thinking, the Soviet leadership has thoroughly prepared for the special session on disarmament and gave particular attention to the working out of ideas and proposals which were submitted for the consideration of the world community.

We do not regard our considerations to be the ultimate truth. They only outline a range of problems and possible ways of their solution.

We are prepared to listen attentively to the opinion of other countries, other governments, representatives of the public, public organisations and the press and to work together with them to draft a global concept of disarmament.

The Soviet Union views the special session of the United Nations General Assembly as an important stage in this truly vast work.

We would like to inform you of our view of the special session of the General Assembly. Thank you for accepting our invitation.

Eduard Shevardnadze then answered questions from journalists. □

THE FREEDOM TO BE HOMELESS

The story of a man from Fifth Avenue (New York) by Joseph MAURI

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

Price 50p.

Soviet Foreign Minister's message to UN Secretary-General

EDUARD SHEVARDNADZE, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, has addressed a message to Perez de Cuellar, Secretary-General of the United Nations Organisation. It says:

Mr Secretary-General,

I am forced by circumstances to address you on a very urgent matter, which brooks no delay. The point is the practical implementation of the Geneva Accords on Afghanistan, which were signed in your presence on April 14, 1988.

These accords, which came into force as of May 15, 1988, provide for a package of commitments by all the sides signatories to the accords, whose main content is non-interference in Afghanistan's home affairs and withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country and their mutual balance.

You, certainly, know that the Soviet and Afghan sides have strictly abided by their commitments and that the Soviet troops are being pulled out in conformity with the Geneva Accords. The UN control mechanism in Afghanistan has every opportunity to ensure that no questions arise on that score. At the same time, unfortunately, there is more and more evidence that the Pakistani side has from the very first day of entry of the Geneva Accords into force embarked on crude violation of its commitments under the documents signed by it.

We have already cited in public a whole number of irrefutable facts on that score. Such facts continue to be reported every day. They are evidence, in particular, of large-scale shipment of arms from Pakistan's territory into Afghanistan. Big consignments of these weapons are carried from depots in Islamabad and Karachi to the Afghan opposition bases in Chitral, Landikotal, Parachinar, Terimangal and Chaman, and from there are supplied into the territory of the Republic of Afghanistan. Particularly many weapons are shipped into Afghanistan from the

depots and bases in Kurram agency. On May 17, 1988, fifteen trucks delivered weapons to the Hekmatyar group in Afghanistan from Pakistan's populated locality of Want. According to a report of the Pakistani newspaper *Muslim* of May 30, 1988, more than 200 trucks with weapons and ammunition came on May 24 into Afghanistan's populated localities of Aliheland Jaji Maidan via Pakistani border posts at Paiwar and Terimangal in Kurram agency.

To deliver weapons, ammunition and military equipment to Afghanistan use is made of the routes running to the Afghan border via Chitral and Armand, Parachinar and Terimangal, Mattasangiar, Want, Quetta and Chaman.

Apart from that, according to the available data the so-called Islamic regiments which are a replacement for opposition armed forces in Afghanistan continue to be stationed, as before, in Pakistan's territory. These regiments are deployed in Chitral, Warsak, Landikotal, Terimangal, Parachinar and Quetta. According to the Pakistani press itself (newspaper *Frontier Post* of May 31, 1988) a council of 25 representatives of Afghan opposition leaders has been set up in Peshawar to guide operations for the capture of Jalalabad.

There are also instances of penetration of Afghanistan across the Pakistani border by foreign instructors for the training of rebels in the tactics of combat operations and the handling of advanced weapons, in particular "Stinger"

missiles. Late in May, for example, one American and one French instructor arrived in Hojand Dale of Marmal district in Balkh province where the group Islamic Society of Afghanistan operates. Eight Americans and three Pakistani instructors penetrated Afghanistan from the area of Totki and Parachinar to give assistance to the "Bakht" group (Sayef's "Islamic Union").

All these facts are in clear conflict with the provisions of article 2 of the Afghan-Pakistani agreement on the principles of mutual relations, in particular non-interference and renunciation of intervention.

It is through the fault of the Pakistani side that the procedure for examining complaints by the sides envisaged by the Geneva Accords has, as a matter of fact, not been put into effect.

Thus if Pakistan's actions are not brought into strict correspondence with its commitments under the accords, a situation may arise that would undermine the efforts made for reaching the Geneva Accords, including by the UN.

I would wish to say once again that the Geneva Accords stand above all for the balance of mutual commitments and it is impossible to withdraw from it any single element so that the whole mechanism of Geneva be not left upset.

I am expressing hope that you Mr Secretary-General will use the whole of your authority and influence to prevent such an undesirable course of developments. □

(Moscow, June 9.)

Shevardnadze-Shamir meeting

THE Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, who is in New York to attend the UN General Assembly's third special session on disarmament, made a request to meet Eduard Shevardnadze the Soviet Foreign Minister who heads the USSR delegation. The meeting was held on June 9.

It was stated to the Israeli Prime Minister that the USSR was seriously concerned about the development of the situation in the Middle East, which, if it continued, is fraught with disastrous consequences for all peoples and states in that region and poses a threat to international peace and security. It is necessary that the inertia of confrontation be decisively overcome in the Middle East as in other regions rent by regional conflicts, and a transition be made to constructive quests for peace in the spirit of responsibility and realism.

Shevardnadze said straight out that Israel's obstructionist stance was the main hurdle to starting the practical work to unblock the Middle East conflict. He emphasised that a real settlement between the Arabs and Israel could not be attained by insisting on retaining Israeli control over Arab lands, by denying the Palestinian people the right to self-determination and ignoring their lawful representatives.

An approach based on scrupulous adherence to the principle of the balance of interests of all parties — the Arabs, including the Palestinians, and Israel — will make it possible to disentangle the chronic Middle East knot, assuring free development and secure existence of all states and peoples in the region.

The world community has developed a firm understanding that the convocation of an international conference involving all parties

concerned, including Israel and the PLO, and also the permanent member states of the UN Security Council is the sole reliable and realistic way to achieve a comprehensive Middle East settlement, Shevardnadze noted. He called upon the Israeli Government to embark on the course of political settlement with Arabs and give consent to the participation in an international conference.

As for the issue of restoring diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel, which Shamir touched on, it was said for the Soviet part that with the beginning of the work of an effective international conference the Soviet Union will be ready to get down to its solution. □

(Continued from Page 216)

policy activities. The three years of perestroika have augmented its peace-making energy. In the view of the Soviet leadership, today the immediate threat of war involving major powers has receded. The world situation has become more stable and predictable. The prospect of curbing the arms race is now more real.

In a few days, when the first public execution of weapons in human history takes place no one is likely to cry or weep. It will herald an end to a lot of tears, misfortunes and grief. The chimeras of violence and war will begin to burn at the bottom of the pit where missiles will be detonated.

But having dug a grave for weapons of mass destruction mankind must now build the foundation of a nuclear-free and non-violent world.

May our forum place its faith and resolve in that foundation.

May the results of the session reflect the will of the world public which has its numerous representatives here.

Meeting and talking with them it is obvious that during these days we have been joined here by a genuine people's assembly on disarmament — the best representatives of people's diplomacy. Its proximity and its involvement lend our activities the human dimension which is the only yardstick of efforts for the sake of a world without wars and weapons. □

(New York, June 8)

NEW BOOKLETS FROM THE USSR

The October Revolution and Perestroika 40p

Disarmament: Chemical Weapons the view from Moscow 40p

Zionism: Preaching and Practice 40p

available from
Soviet Books (SN),
3, Rosary Gardens,
London SW7 4NW.

Andrei Gromyko addresses participants in church celebrations

ANDREI GROMYKO, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on June 11 received in the Kremlin a large group of participants in the jubilee celebrations marking the millennium of the baptism of Russia.

Greeting the representatives of the country's clergy and numerous foreign guests, Andrei Gromyko pointed out the importance of the introduction of Christianity to Russia as a significant event in the history of world, European, and, of course, Russian culture.

Having highly appreciated the role of the Russian Orthodox Church in the history of the country, Andrei Gromyko drew attention to the fact that even in those distant times "the Russian who ardently loved his native land and was ready to give his life in defence of it was well aware that it was essential to respect a foreigner if the latter came with good intentions".

The valuable seeds of internationalist consciousness planted long ago "produced fertile shoots after the revolution in Russia", he went on to say. "This awareness became the historical need of all the peoples of the Soviet Union. It promotes mutual enrichment of the cultures of our multi-ethnic socialist motherland".

Turning to the problems of the present-day

world, Andrei Gromyko said the "political aspirations of the Soviet Union and its people are epitomised in one short word 'Peace'. We are for a world without nuclear and space weapons. We are for a world without weapons of mass destruction. We are for a world without weapons altogether and it means that it should be a world in which there would be no wars and should be no violence. We are for peace for all people".

"In our days man's sacred right to life has acquired a truly global content. The high humanistic ideals have been achieved through man's suffering throughout his entire history. What was once advocated only by the foremost minds, nowadays has become the vital concern of the peoples, and this increasingly tells on international relations. These are the ideals of peace, freedom and the value of each human life. It is precisely these ideals that underlie all the initiatives of our country in the international arena," he stated.

Andrei Gromyko expressed his respect for the Russian Orthodox Church and religious organisations of foreign countries for their "work in defence of peaceful life."

"Your work in this respect form a vivifying stream which, along with the other currents of peace campaigners, promotes the unity of people

who advance to the common goal: to preserve human life," he said.

"To restrain militarism and to eliminate weapons of mass destruction is the high road on which many global problems can be solved," Andrei Gromyko went on to say. "The danger of an ecological disaster makes all of us ponder over the search for new ways to ensure security. An outburst of contradictions leading to armed clashes in individual regions of the world makes one seek again and again to implement the principles of the new thinking in the sphere of real political practice."

Andrei Gromyko assessed the recent Soviet-US summit meeting as a practical step along the way. "The agreement on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, the agreement which has entered into force and the implementation of which is getting under way inspires our hearts with hope and strengthens belief in a peaceful future of mankind. The Moscow summit was a major step on the way to a safe peace but nevertheless this is only the beginning of the road", he stated.

Addressing those present, the President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet expressed confidence that "we are united in our striving for peace and happiness on Earth." □

State commission on Crimean Tatars — Communiqué —

THE state commission formed to examine questions that have been raised in their appeals by Crimean Tatars, on June 9 issued the following communiqué on its work:

Numerous meetings and conversations with representatives of the Crimean Tatars have been held at the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and at Party committees and state agencies at local level.

A large group of representatives of this nationality has been received by Andrei Gromyko, Chairman of the State Commission.

Localities inhabited predominantly by Crimean Tatars have been visited by senior officials of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

Advisory groups of Crimean Tatars as well as heads of republican and regional Party committees and governing councils have been involved in the commission's work on a regular basis.

The commission has been carefully examining incoming requests, complaints and proposals.

The relevant authorities have taken decisions lifting all the restrictions that infringed upon the rights of Crimean Tatars in one way or another, guaranteeing their complete equality with other Soviet citizens in all matters, including the choice of a place of residence, job placement, and study.

Since the middle of 1987, some 2,500 Crimean Tatars have been granted residence permits and fixed up with jobs in the Crimea.

State-operated farms and other economic organisations are being established to increase employment opportunities. They are being allocated farm machinery, prefabricated homes and building materials.

Measures have been adopted to meet the Crimean Tatars' social and cultural requirements to a fuller extent.

Extra conditions have been created to develop their national culture and opportunities broadened to study their native language at schools in Uzbekistan, the Krasnodar territory, the Crimean region and other areas. The circulation and size of newspapers and radio and television broadcasts in this language have been increased.

The commission continues to work in this direction, exercising strict control over the realisation of the planned measures, which have been met by the Crimean Tatars and all Soviet people with understanding.

The vast majority of Crimean Tatars work calmly and conscientiously in all sectors of the national economy.

At the same time, individual groups of Crimean Tatars are out to hamper the implementation of positive measures in this or other way, insisting that the issue of creating a Crimean autonomy be resolved in the first place.

They ignore the fact that the present administrative-territorial division of the country, which came into existence many decades ago and

has been sealed in the Constitution of the USSR, makes it possible successfully to accomplish the tasks of economic and social development of all the ethnic groups in the country.

Over the post-war period significant demographic and social changes have taken place in the Crimea. Its population has grown to nearly 2.5 million from 780,000, or trebled.

It has a multinational make-up, with an overwhelming predominance of Russians and Ukrainians.

A resolution passed by the USSR Council of Ministers has clearly defined procedures concerning residence and the issuance of residence permits to citizens, regardless of their nationalities, in the Crimea and other health resorts in the country.

Taking into account all these circumstances, the commission has reached the conclusion that there are no grounds for establishing a Crimean autonomy.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, pursuing a Leninist nationalities policy, proceeds in its practical activities from all-round regard for the interests of every ethnic group and of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a whole. □

Soviet Books

- Perestroika. Views and Opinions** 45p
Renewal. Changes in the Soviet Union through the Eyes of foreign Journalists 45p
Openness Democracy Responsibility. Discussions by Soviet scientists and journalists 45p

The above Novosti booklets are available from Soviet Books
 3 Rosary Gardens
 London SW7 4NW

Metropolitan David of the Georgian Orthodox Church — Live for the Sake of Peace and Justice

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

Price 50p.

Meeting of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee

THE Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at its meeting on June 6 considered issues connected with the preparation and holding of the 19th National Party Conference.

It was pointed out that Party organisations and worker collectives have begun actively debating the Central Committee's Theses for the conference. Approving the Party's perestroika (restructuring) policy and supporting the Central Committee's platform as set out in the Theses, communists and working people in general have been making many proposals for increasing the role of the Party, continuing to democratise Party and public affairs, and broadening glasnost (openness).

The Political Bureau instructed Party committees and various departments of the CPSU Central Committee to generalise incoming proposals from the grass roots to make sure that they will be taken into account when the conference discusses the issues on its agenda and be reflected in its decisions.

The meeting also reviewed the results of the nation's social and economic development in the first five months of the year.

The Political Bureau expressed complete approval for the work done by Mikhail Gorbachev during US President Ronald Reagan's official visit to the USSR and the results of the Soviet-American summit talks.

The Moscow summit has been a major event in international life. Its principal result has been deepened political dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States, which now covers all the key problems of bilateral relations and world politics. Laying down a constructive basis for the long-term development of relations between the two countries, the Soviet-American

dialogue helps shift them to a normal, healthy footing and make them more stable and predictable.

The results of the talks in Moscow have borne out the correctness of the choice of policy on the international scene, which has been made by the USSR on the basis of realism and new political thinking after the April 1985 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and been consolidated by the decisions of the 27th Party Congress.

As a result of persistent and purposeful efforts, it has proved possible to secure further progress in the field of arms limitation and reduction. The exchange of instruments of ratification that has taken place in Moscow has given legal force to the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, which was signed last December to become the first international agreement in history to provide for the abolition of two classes of Soviet and US nuclear arms, marking a practical start to efforts to build a nuclear-free world.

The summit has registered a bringing closer of positions on a number of aspects of the problem of cutting strategic offensive arms in the context of preserving the ABM Treaty, reducing conventional arms and armed forces in Europe, limiting and terminating nuclear testing, and banning chemical weapons.

The indepth discussion of the problem of settling regional conflicts, which has been held at the summit, has demonstrated that despite persisting serious differences in approaches and assessments, there are real possibilities for practical interaction between the USSR and the United States to find fair settlements by political means and with account taken of the legitimate interests of all sides concerned.

The common desire has been reaffirmed during the talks to contribute to broader mutually

beneficial trade and economic relations and ties, contacts and exchanges in various fields and to open a frank and constructive dialogue on humanitarian problems. This dialogue should naturally be based on a business-like, non-confrontational foundation and be free of attempts to interfere in the domestic affairs of each other.

The meeting expressed the conviction that the Moscow talks have augmented possibilities for improving the overall atmosphere in the Soviet-American relationship and helped foster a favourable political climate in international relations in general.

The Political Bureau also discussed some other issues concerning the home and foreign policies of the Communist Party and the Soviet State. □

Conference at CPSU Central Committee

A CONFERENCE held at the CPSU Central Committee on June 8 discussed a range of questions connected with the solution of topical scientific, technological and national economic problems of the wide utilisation of solar energy, wind-power, tidal energy, the energy of biomass and other alternative sources of energy.

Opening the conference, Yegor Ligachev, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said that these energy sources are ecologically pure, which is very important for the solution of the acute social problem of the purification of the air and water basins. The importance of these energy sources increases also in view of the tendency for the increase in outlays for the extraction of such minerals as oil, gas and coal.

Boris Shcherbin, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, delivered a report on the measures for the wider utilisation of the alternative sources of energy in the national economy.

Vladimir Dolgikh, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, also spoke at the conference. He emphasised that there are vast opportunities in the USSR for the development of alternative sources of energy. According to expert estimates, the reserves of thermal waters make it possible to ensure a heat potential equivalent to 40-45 million tons of reference fuel a year. Great opportunities have been opened for the use of solar energy, wind-power and other renewable sources of energy.

It was noted at the conference that the work to develop energetics with the use of alternative sources proceeds very slowly and the volumes in which organic fuel is replaced are so far insignificant. The main reason for this state of things is lack of discipline of heads of a number of industries and departments, scientific organisations and local bodies in implementing the decisions for the development and utilisation of alternative energy sources.

Dissatisfaction was expressed at the conference with the functioning of the ministries of machine-building which failed to meet targets for the development and supply of special equipment. □

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

Perestroika and the USSR's foreign policy

THE newspaper *Pravda* points out in its June 13 issue in an article by Vadim Zagladin headlined "Following the Course of Wisdom and Humanism" a considerable improvement of the international situation. It examines the foreign policy problems spelled out in the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

Vadim Zagladin quotes the Theses as saying that the "international situation has become more stable and predictable", and notes in that connection:

"A good groundwork has been laid for the future, which is a source of hope for further advancement from confrontation to co-operation. Yet, certainly, this progress has been just started. To advance further towards the desired goal it is necessary to do by far more than has been done so far.

"So far we are working for transition from confrontation to non-confrontation interaction. But our aim, as is pointed out in the CPSU programme, is to build a new international order. An order under which not military power, but good-neighbourliness and co-operation should prevail, an order under which a broad exchange

of the achievements of world technology and cultural values be carried out for the benefit of all peoples.

"The Theses note that perestroika necessitates a maximum mobilisation of our society's intellectual power. This concerns above all the home policy, but in a no smaller measure also the foreign policy, particularly considering its boldness, its truly revolutionary character, its innovatory ideas and methods and its dynamism. A foreign policy of this kind indisputably necessitates firm reliance for support on our Party and scholarly, in broad terms, social thought. It presupposes increasingly greater involvement of the most active sectors of our society in international work, in various areas and at various levels.

"But the true, most reliable source of progress, including in foreign policy," Zagladin emphasises, "is, certainly, the success of perestroika itself. The 19th All-Union Party Conference will give fresh impulses to the development of our own country. But it will be also of tremendous significance for the whole world. In particular, because it will again demonstrate the Party's fidelity to its international policy—that of humanising international relations, of ensuring the triumph of wisdom and humanism in international affairs." □