

Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Krasnodar

"IT is important that the restructuring in the USSR should become irreversible and set in motion the forces inherent in the socialist system, in the Soviet people," stated Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), when speaking at Krasnodar on September 19, at a meeting with the Party activists of Krasnodar Territory.

"The process of restructuring is under way," Mikhail Gorbachev emphasised. "Ever broader masses of the working people and our cadres are really joining in the restructuring with every passing day. Changes have pervaded all walks of life in Soviet society."

"Measures to utilise the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution are being taken in the economic sphere, and in-depth restructuring of the management system and methods is being effected to ensure broad and real participation by the working people in managing industrial affairs."

Among the important signs of our times, the General Secretary mentioned an extensive openness and frank discussion of the most burning problems of societal life and of the development of the country. This created an utterly new atmosphere in society.

"In Soviet society", the speaker emphasised, "there is mounting striving for a strict observance of the principles of social justice, against the violation of moral and ethical norms, against unearned incomes, drunkenness and alcoholism and against other negative phenomena."

"Our approach", Mikhail Gorbachev said, "invariably meets with widespread approval in the country."

"Realism, openness and the aspiration to utilise to the full the potential of socialism and human resources, the human factor as we call it, are characteristic of this approach."

The General Secretary observed that the country's public opinion had accepted as its own the course offered. The overwhelming majority of Soviet people did not want to be content with yesterday's accomplishments, did not want to live in the old ways, did not want to put up with shortcomings, with negative phenomena.

Some were pleased with yesterday's life, some were satisfied with having what they had. On the whole, however, society strove for restructuring, for changes for the better.

There were also people who were expressing

fears in connection with the restructuring. The Political Bureau of the Central Committee knew of such fears.

"I will put it frankly," Gorbachev emphasised, "we are neither shocked nor scared by them. Moreover, we would be greatly alarmed, would have great doubts and distrust should everything go smoothly, without a hitch so to speak."

"We would then have to ponder: what is the matter? We have probably failed to reach the core of the matter. Why? It is our objective to implement sweeping changes in all spheres of life. I have described these changes as revolutionary in their essence."

Even now, the speaker went on, the efforts to tap reserves, improve organisation and strengthen discipline—our immediate reserves—were beginning to have a positive effect on the economy.

Labour productivity in industry had grown by 4.8 per cent over the past eight months, with a relatively high annual target of 4.1 per cent. This had made it possible to raise the rate of growth to 5.2 per cent compared with the annual target of 4.3 per cent.

"We are not yet satisfied", Gorbachev stressed, "with our economic development indicators. There are no grounds for that. At the same time we observe that the situation in our large economy is changing for the better, although slowly and maybe even too slowly in some places."

The General Secretary dwelt on the question of further democratisation of Soviet society. "We ought to create such conditions in every work collective, in each republic and in the entire Party

that every Soviet citizen feels that he is master of the country."

"Democracy", Gorbachev continued, "implies not only rights, but also responsibility and duties. This is a question of discipline. Democracy is not all-permissiveness or anarchy. It is materialised in the unity of rights and duties which enable each person to display his civic stand."

At the same time, he went on, democracy provided for everyone's participation through work in attaining the objectives of Soviet society. This aspect of democracy was directed at each and everyone.

Mikhail Gorbachev stressed in his speech the importance of involving Soviet young people in the handling of major state tasks and political issues. "The youth want to be actively involved in the restructuring. We feel this, and it should be welcomed."

The General Secretary pointed to the need for restructuring the activity of Soviet trade unions.

Stressing the leading role of the CPSU in the life of the Soviet State, Gorbachev observed that the Party was working out a political course, implementing personnel policy and guiding the people.

Party bodies should be the first to set the example in the correct understanding of the course towards acceleration, in the correct attitude towards its implementation, towards the restructuring.

Much depended, said the General Secretary, on how fast the CPSU, and all of its elements, would restructure themselves. □

(TASS)

Stockholm Conference closes

THE first stage of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe closed in Stockholm on September 21, reports TASS correspondent Nikolai Vukolov. The conference has adopted a final document directed at strengthening mutual understanding and turning the European continent into a region of lasting peace and co-operation.

As is seen from the accords contained in the final document, a qualitatively new stage has been achieved towards creating an atmosphere of greater confidence and strengthening security. The accord on non-use of force in international relations is aimed at ensuring the exercise by the states of their commitment to refrain from the use of force, including in the most dangerous area—the use of armed force.

Thus another important step has been taken to ensure that the international commitment to refrain from any threat of force, and from its use in mutual relations between countries, becomes an effective and indisputable law of international life.

Agreement has also been reached on a number of mutually-complementary measures to build up

confidence and security in the military field, aimed at lessening the danger of military confrontation and at resolving tasks pertaining to disarmament in Europe. These measures, which are of a politically mandatory character, cover such key issues as notification of military exercises, dispatch and movement of troops, exchange of annual plans of military activity, invitation of observers to attend exercises, and limitation of military activity on the European continent. They are of substantial significance for reducing suspicion and lessening the risk of an armed conflict and use of force.

These measures lay important groundwork for building up confidence and security in Europe. Now a solid foundation, concerning military aspects of European security, has been laid for political aspects of European security. This will ensure great reliability in preserving peace and co-operation in the continent. The way is thus also paved towards broadening and spreading to other continents the package of confidence and security-building measures adopted in Stockholm, so that it should become one of the component parts of the comprehensive international security system.

Special significance attaches now to accords as regards effective and adequate forms of verification, including on-site inspection. Reliable control over the observance of the

(Continued on Page 416)

IN THIS ISSUE

Mikhail Gorbachev's speech in Krasnodar	p. 413
Eduard Shevardnadze's UN statement ..	p. 414
Statement by the USSR permanent representative to the UN	p. 416
Pravda: Soviet-Chinese co-operation ...	p. 418
Politics and Politicking	p. 419
US urged to join Soviet test moratorium	p. 420

Eduard Shevardnadze's UN statement

Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, made a statement on September 23 at the plenary meeting of the 41st session of the United Nations General Assembly. He said:

Mr. President,
Distinguished Guests,

As we come to this high rostrum, we speak of our perception of the world. In this way, collective efforts produce a picture of present-day international realities.

How do we see that picture today?

At first glance, the period since the previous session of the General Assembly has not added bright colours to the panorama of our time. It has been marked by a number of factors which have aggravated old concerns. The arms race has not been halted: it is going ahead in a steep spiral. The danger of the arms race spreading to outer space has become more real. Dangerous hotbeds of armed conflict persist. Misery and poverty in many parts of the world are becoming more acute.

All this being so, we nevertheless believe that the International Year of Peace will go down in history with something more than just its symbols of peace.

Let me draw your attention to the trends which enable us to speak of glimmers of light on the world's horizon.

They should be seen by every one of us, for it strengthens the resolve to act even more vigorously.

They should be seen by all peoples, who are tired of bearing the burden of fears and anxieties.

They should be seen by the world, which is becoming an increasingly interrelated and indivisible whole and which might no longer withstand strains and destructions.

Hope awakens optimism. In the words of Mikhail Gorbachev, "everywhere in the world there is a growing conviction in the minds of the peoples and in political and public circles widely differing in their orientation and outlook that at stake is the survival of humanity and that the time has come for decisive and responsible action."

We see the glimmer of light in the fact that, at this time crucial for mankind, the peoples and an increasing number of governments are becoming aware of the need to adopt a new way of thinking in line with the realities of the nuclear and space age.

The time is coming when considerations of groups, blocs or ideologies are beginning to give way to the understanding that peace is a supreme value. Only if peace is translated from declarations into practical action is there a chance for survival.

The changing way of thinking is bringing this truth to the foreground.

Groups of countries, the Non-Aligned Movement, political parties, public organisations and anti-nuclear forces are putting forward promising ideas for ending the nuclear deadlock.

A favourable background is emerging for developing a dialogue.

An exception to this trend is the policy pursued by the imperialist forces. This contrast, however, only emphasises the general will for action, for concrete practical deeds.

It is becoming a practical reality that vast territories are being declared zones free from nuclear weapons. Democratic majorities take decisions on that through democratic procedures.

Political leaders claiming that they are committed to democracy should become aware of the contradiction between their behaviour and

declared principles. Instead of building up and counting warheads, they should be counting the votes of those who call for the complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

Unfortunately, in some countries the institutions of democracy are superseded by the immoral arithmetic of military superiority. But it is an indisputable fact that the call for action is no longer a voice crying in the wilderness. On the contrary, even in the wilderness of the Nevada desert calls are being heard for an end to nuclear testing. The Nevada explosions are now registered not only by us but also by US scientists with their instruments installed near the Soviet city of Semipalatinsk.

At the same time not a single seismograph in the world is registering nuclear explosions on our territory—not because of any loss of the instruments' sensitivity, but because of the Soviet Union's responsiveness to the will of the world community.

In pursuing the foreign policy course proclaimed by the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union our country is taking specific, practical steps.

Among them, the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions is one of the most substantial. This is precisely the kind of action that proves the sincerity of our intentions and the seriousness of our concern for the future of the world.

For over a year now there has been silence at Soviet test sites. Listen to it, it is very eloquent. If that silence were matched by silence at US test sites, too, this would tell mankind better than any words that real movement is starting towards realising the idea of a nuclear-free world.

Halting the tests means preventing the emergence of new types of nuclear weapons, blocking the way to the development of nuclear space weapons. We urge the United States to join us in this forward movement instead of asking us to go back to carrying out explosions, as it proposed here yesterday. A bilateral moratorium, followed by a multilateral one, is one of the most important links in a series of steps leading towards a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

Determined to make it a reality, the Soviet Union together with other socialist states has submitted for your consideration proposals to that effect. We are convinced that such a system encompassing the political, military, economic and humanitarian areas is in the interests of all states and peoples.

The sponsors of the proposal do not claim to have discovered a hitherto unknown political 'continent'. If there are any blank areas today, they exist mainly in the sphere of concrete, practical deeds. Giving an impulse to and clearing the way for such deeds would be the greatest discovery. The proposed fundamental elements of security are in harmony with the principles of the United Nations Charter and are designed to facilitate their implementation in the specific conditions of our time.

And in this respect we are looking forward to a most democratic and constructive debate, to collective creative efforts of all countries.

The idea of comprehensive security implies above all material guarantees of peace, political and international legal safeguards and the establishment of principles of civilised and respectful relations among states. A safe world is a world of law and order, in which there is strict compliance with the United Nations Charter and respect for all rules of international law, for human rights and freedoms.

Our initiative contains an answer to the question of what should be done to save life on Earth.

As we speak of this, the scenes of abandoned villages in the zone near the Chernobyl nuclear power plant stand before our eyes. For us, that accident has meant more than grief over our losses and compassion for its victims. It has heightened our concern for the future of the Earth. Chernobyl was a tragic error of man working with the peaceful atom. And when the atoms of war are involved, there is certainly no guarantee against error. With 50,000 nuclear weapons existing in the world, we are all living on borrowed time and nobody knows when that time will run out.

So what should be done? Should the game of nuclear roulette continue? But even now it is clear that sooner or later it could push us to collective suicide.

There is only one way out: while there is still time, before it is too late, to stop playing for insane stakes with no prospect of winning for anybody, to end once and for all this fateful deadly nuclear gambling.

The international community, the sole sovereign master of its destiny, is capable of doing this. No single nuclear power has the right to take decisions for all. The USSR forswears such right. In his historic statement of January 15 the Soviet leader proposes a different way—scrapping all nuclear weapons. Here again, practice stands as the criterion.

Political responsibility is the opposite of political arrogance. The problem of nuclear testing puts in sharp focus those two mutually exclusive approaches.

There are other facts as well. Look at what happened to the SALT-1 and SALT-2 treaties. They are being torn into shreds only because they allow no room for equipping the 131st bomber with cruise missiles. One and a half thousand such missiles seemed not to be enough, so it was decided that twenty more were necessary.

The judgement of history is merciless in its verdicts. If political leaders fail to take timely and responsible decisions, history will not forgive them.

History is giving us a chance for laying the foundations of a lasting peace. Of course, this is not a matter of passing yet another resolution. The United Nations must establish a system of values which gives the highest priority to practical actions.

Let me emphasise that this is being stated by a nuclear power. We did not seek to acquire nuclear weapons but ever since the time when we were compelled to develop them we have always been looking for ways to limit, reduce and eliminate them. Although we are not last among the members in the 'nuclear club' we propose that it be disbanded. Let there be no mistake—we are as proud a nation as any other. But we associate the prestige and dignity of a great power with equivalent security for all.

We are motivated by a sense of responsibility both to our own people and to other peoples. That is why we are willing to accept reasonable compromises and make realistic concessions in proposing reductions in strategic offensive arms and medium-range missiles. This reflects the new approach to the realities of the nuclear and space age outlined most fully and comprehensively in Mikhail Gorbachev's report to the 27th Congress of our Party.

The sincerity of our intentions and the integrity of our position are on a par with our resolve to put an end to the dangerous drift of world affairs. We

are putting so much emphasis on the renunciation of nuclear weapon tests because this is the touchstone of the sincerity of declarations.

Yesterday we heard the statement of the President of the United States. It is regrettable that the rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly was used in such a way. To respond point by point to that speech presents no problem. However, to enter into polemics would be to show a lack of respect for our audience. The subject under discussion is too serious to turn it into a grindstone for sharpening political wit. Time is too precious to spend it on refuting misconceptions and prejudices that distort reality and the fact.

Still, there is a need to address one key point, for it is of fundamental importance. I am referring to the attempt to provide a philosophic rationale for the assertion that new sophisticated technology of war is capable of reliably ensuring security. It is precisely such 'philosophy' that caused the tidal wave of armaments, which has been growing year after year and is now threatening to crush the Earth.

There is but one path to security—to destroy existing weapons instead of replacing them with new ones. The technology of destruction must not be allowed to determine policy.

One can imagine the sigh of relief that people would heave on hearing that in this Year of Peace the United States, too, has decided to stop nuclear testing. This is what they had been expecting from the US President.

I have been authorised to state that the Soviet Union is prepared to sign at any time and in any place a treaty on a total prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. We are prepared to do so here at the United Nations, so that the entire world community could become part of this great act and a turning point in history is marked as a sign of respect for its will.

Words not matched by deeds are a false value. But words supported by deeds are a country's gold reserve.

We urge those who make verbal pronouncements in favour of eliminating nuclear weapons to follow up with practical deeds. Otherwise, whatever they say of the inhumanity of nuclear weapons is no more than a rhetorical mirage behind which there looms an altogether different policy.

Its proponents have a favourable argument, which is verification. But that argument increasingly resembles a worn-out curtain. Broadly speaking, there is no longer any problem of verification. Convinced that there is no trust without verification, the Soviet Union is open to any form or method of verification.

In our view, the summit conference of the non-aligned states in Harare has made very valuable recommendations in this respect. The United Nations could support the proposals of the 'Delhi Six'—Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden—on monitoring compliance with the obligation not to carry out nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union will accept recommendations formulated under the auspices of the United Nations.

We agree with those states which believe that the question of whether mankind will live in a nuclear or a non-nuclear world must be decided by the entire world community, not by a small group of nuclear powers.

This fully applies to the future of outer space, for near-Earth space is the common heritage of mankind and should be used for the benefit of all. If, however, weapons should appear there, this heritage would become a threat to all. Just two or three states having the status of military-space powers would dominate the rest of the world.

Is that what we want? Do we want a military-space vassalage to be established? This question is posed by the course of events, which may become tragic for the entire structure of international relations. Therefore we shall

continue to work for protecting outer space from attempts to turn it into a military domain of one or two powers.

Today those designs are being camouflaged with high-sounding pronouncements about a defensive programme, which supposedly would once and for all do away with the threat of attack. One hears stirring and heart-moving stories about a vision which, when implemented, would free mankind from the fear of nuclear death. Evil designs are being passed for good intentions, and a sword for a shield.

Let no one be misled by such talk. It serves to conceal an attack against the main pillar of stability—the ABM Treaty. The intention is to get the treaty out of the way within the timeframe of seven years. Everything is carefully calculated here, for it is precisely in seven years that they plan to prepare space weapons for deployment.

The question is, what for? Would it not be more sensible to work for an agreement on a complete elimination of nuclear missiles, whether strategic, medium-range or any other, as we are proposing?

The answer is simple: whatever is done to conceal it, the so-called defensive space shield is being developed for a first strike. The first strike may become the last one, and not just for the country which is attacked. Space weapons, like nuclear arms, do not recognise national boundaries, they do not choose whom to spare and whom to destroy. And under any circumstances they would threaten not one country or several countries, but the entire world.

Therefore we consider it necessary to warn everyone:

If space is to remain peaceful, everyone must protect it. In this the United Nations, the only legitimate trustee of space peace, should make its voice heard.

We also request the United Nations' help in a matter of extreme importance—the elimination of chemical weapons. Encouraging progress has been achieved at the Geneva conference.

The historic goal of ridding the Earth of chemical weapons is now close to attainment. It could only be frustrated by the position of the United States, which is seeking to develop binary weapons. However, obstacles can be removed if political will is shown. This organisation is quite capable of stimulating it.

A comprehensive system of international security has more than its nuclear, space or chemical dimension. Security implies the non-use of any force, including conventional armaments and armed forces.

The Soviet Union calls for significantly reducing the level of military confrontation, above all between politico-military alliances. Radical proposals to that effect, based on the concept of reasonable sufficiency, have been made by the Warsaw Treaty member-states.

I shall say even more: we would generally not want our troops to be present anywhere beyond our national borders. This question is also open for discussion and it can be resolved in a context of growing confidence and implementation of measures of military detente.

This has already been started at the Stockholm forum. All of us, and not just the Europeans, can congratulate ourselves and each other on this triumph of reason and good will. It has given us something more than just a major agreement; it has demonstrated that when we all really want something we can do it. It has confirmed that the Helsinki process is successfully developing and has taken deep root in the European soil. It is now extremely important that the forthcoming meeting in Vienna should become yet another milestone in Europe's advance towards reliable security and improved co-operation.

The Asian and Pacific region should also be allowed to breathe quietly and steadily. Our ideas in this regard are incorporated in a concrete programme of action outlined in Mikhail Gorbachev's address in Vladivostok. It is

encouraging to us that this programme has proved to be in harmony with the feelings of many states in the region.

We are aware of all the sore spots existing in the region. First of all, there is the Korean peninsula. The people of Korea yearn for an end to the division of their country. There is only one impediment to this, namely, the presence of US troops, which in effect occupy the southern part of the country.

The situation around Kampuchea is another source of tension. Here again the fate of the entire people is being sacrificed to the geopolitical interests of certain states. To serve them, some are trying to consign to oblivion the millions of human lives destroyed by the reactionary anti-national clique.

This must not be allowed to happen.

The constructive proposals of Kampuchea, Laos and Vietnam open the way for resolving the region's problems on a broad political basis and stabilising the situation in South-East Asia.

Untying those and many other 'knots' would undoubtedly contribute to strengthening peace and security in the Asian and Pacific region. We are doing our best to assist in this.

The positive changes now under way in our country's relations with the People's Republic of China are conducive to the improvement of the overall situation.

New and increasingly rich substance is being added to our traditional friendly relations with the people of India and her government.

The Soviet Union values good relations with many Asian states and wishes to discuss with them, in particular with ASEAN countries, ways of upgrading relations where they are as yet below the desired level.

Measures to eliminate regional conflicts would form an organic part of the concept of comprehensive security. Of course, there is not, nor can there be, a uniform model for a political settlement here. Nevertheless, concrete expression must be given to some general principles.

These are, first, unconditional respect for sovereignty, independence and the right of nations themselves to choose their way of development; second, a respectful attitude towards legitimate governments; third, respect for the obligations and agreements concluded between states in full conformity with international law.

Every regional conflict is a difficult test for the United Nations. This is particularly true with regard to those territories where the emblem of the United Nations symbolises special responsibility. Unfortunately, it is all too often darkened by the shadow of unfulfilled hopes.

The time has long come to put to effective use all the powers of this organisation, to exercise all its rights.

This applies above all to the fate of the Namibian people and to the trust territory of Micronesia.

Their problems are as old as the United Nations.

The Middle East problem is somewhat 'younger'. There must be few people present in this hall who participated in adopting the resolution on division of Palestine. Today, we are once again voicing our view that along with the state of Israel, which owes its existence to, among others, the Soviet Union, an Arab Palestine state should become part of the world's political map.

We believe that the United Nations should again take the matter of Middle East settlement into its hands.

As a practical step in that direction, the Soviet Union proposes that a preparatory committee be set up within the framework of the Security Council to do the necessary work for convening an international conference on the Middle East.

(Continued on Page 417)

Statement by the USSR permanent representative to the UN

Here follows the official text of a statement by Alexander Belonogov, the USSR Permanent Representative to the United Nations at a press conference in New York on September 18, 1986:

AS you know from reports in the US press and on television, the US government continues the escalation of its unwarranted actions aimed at reducing the staff of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations.

I can tell you that yesterday morning Mr Walters, the US Ambassador to the United Nations, called on me to convey, on instructions from his government, an oral message, which boils down to a demand that by October 1 of this year the staff of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations be reduced by 25 members.

Before I give our assessment of this latest action, I would like to recall for your benefit certain facts in this connection.

Last March the US Mission handed us a note containing the US Government's demand that the staff of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations be reduced. The Soviet Union at the time strongly protested against that arbitrary and unjustified action. Soviet representatives made detailed and well-argued statements of the Soviet position on this question in the committee on relations with the host country and in other UN bodies. They emphasised that that action constituted a flagrant violation by the United States, as the host country for the United Nations headquarters, of the obligation to provide necessary conditions for the normal functioning of the United Nations and for unimpeded participation of the organisation's member-states in its work. We emphasised that US attempts to arrogate the right to determine the size of a permanent mission could only be regarded as

(Continued from front page)

incompatible with international law and generally established practice. They constitute interference in affairs falling within the exclusive competence of states and their relations with the United Nations.

acords reached is important at all stages in the process of building up confidence and security and ensuring disarmament, not only in Europe, but also all over the world.

Thus the Helsinki Final Act has been further developed in a practical way in the final document of the Stockholm forum, in its important new provisions which stem from the political and military realities existing in Europe at present.

This has become possible due to the consistent efforts of the socialist countries, the neutral and non-aligned states, and all the participants in the conference, who have proved able to display political realism and a sense of responsibility, have overcome many difficulties and embarked on the path of compromise decisions based on the mutually-acceptable balance of security interests of all the participating countries.

"The results of the Stockholm talks have shown that the policy of detente has great reserves, that the logic of confrontation has become outdated, and the trend towards strengthening peace has deep roots and is irreversible in principle," Oleg Grinevsky, head of the USSR delegation and Ambassador-at-large, told the concluding plenary meeting.

The results of the forum constitute good groundwork for a stage-by-stage implementation of further effective and specific actions directed at developing and invigorating the whole all-European process. They are also of great significance for the work of the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on European Security and Co-operation. □

The Soviet side pointed out that nothing in the existing international agreements, including the 1947 agreement on the United Nations headquarters, gave the US Government the right to set numerical limitations on the size of the permanent missions of United Nations member-states, which are accredited not to the US Government but to the United Nations.

As you well know, the missions of UN member-states are not in New York as guests of the US Government. They discharge their functions at the United Nations. The missions are present in New York and work here on the basis of the headquarters agreement which I have referred to and other international agreements. It is those agreements, and not the courtesy of the US Administration, that define their rights and privileges.

All the existing rules of contemporary international law provide that member-states of the United Nations alone have the right to determine the size of personnel required for work in their missions to the United Nations. These rules do not give the host state the right to determine unilaterally, arbitrarily, at its own discretion or, particularly, by way of an ultimatum, the number of staff that should be employed by the missions of United Nations member-states.

In this connection it is appropriate to recall the statement made by the UN legal counsel last March 13 in the committee on relations with the host country (report A/AC/154/264, dated March 14, 1986). To begin with, in that statement he observed that the US action against the Soviet Mission was without precedent. The legal counsel pointed out explicitly that in the history of the organisation "no case had arisen where the host state had called for ceilings on, or reductions in, the size of missions accredited to the United Nations."

In this regard it is also very important to recall the authoritative opinion of the International Law Commission, which is composed, as you know, of highly competent international legal experts. May I quote the relevant part of the commission's commentary made during the drafting of the 1975 Vienna convention: "... unlike the case of bilateral diplomacy, the members of missions to international organisations are not accredited to the host state... in the case of missions to international organisations, the principle of the freedom of the sending state in the composition of this mission and the choice of its members must be recognised in order to ensure the effective functioning of multilateral diplomacy."

In this context it is appropriate to refer to the authoritative statement made on September 17 by the United Nations Secretary-General who justly characterised the above mentioned action as illegal and in conflict with the obligation the United States had assumed before the United Nations.

Thus, the legal aspect of the matter is clear. The United States has no legal grounds to make demands for the reduction of the staff of any mission to the United Nations, including the Soviet Mission. As I have already mentioned it is unjustified and arbitrary.

The latest demand of the US Government that

the size of the staff of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations be reduced by 25 members is a further escalation of the anti-Soviet campaign mounted by the United States. This action is blatantly provocative. Politically, it is intended to aggravate Soviet-American relations. It serves the interests of those circles in the United States who are seeking to exacerbate these relations and it is aimed at thwarting Soviet-American dialogue and a possible summit. There can be no other conclusion or qualification of these actions of the US authorities.

As regards the matter from the UN side—a question arises as to the purposes which the US Administration is pursuing by its actions.

The answer is obvious. The purpose of this attack on the rights of the United Nations member-states is to complicate the activities of the organisation itself. In this particular case, and by taking other measures against a number of missions to the United Nations, the US Administration would like to make it perfectly clear to all countries that the United States intends to take repressive action against the states whose policies are not to Washington's liking; that is to say, the countries which, American pressure notwithstanding, pursue an independent and sovereign policy.

The action in question is also directed against the United Nations as a whole. It reflects the US Administration's negative approach to the activities of a whole number of international organisations. Examples in this regard are well known to you: from blackmailing UNESCO to hostile statements against the United Nations.

I would also like to draw your attention to the attempts made by the United States to cover up this action, which has been timed to coincide with the forthcoming talks in Washington, with reference to its earlier demands for reducing the Soviet Mission's staff down to 218 members by October 1, 1986. In so doing the US authorities pretend to be unaware of the fact that for the past several months now the size of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations has been below that figure. One would think that it is not United States officials but somebody else who issues visas, and registers arrivals and departures of staff members of foreign missions to the United Nations, that it is not the US secret services which keep them under daily surveillance. Furthermore, I would like to stress that the US Mission to the United Nations is also perfectly aware from earlier official contacts with us that the number of the personnel at the USSR Mission to the United Nations is currently below the figure of 218.

As you can see the bad faith of the US side has manifested itself in this fact too.

In closing, I have to express regret that the start of the 41st session of the United Nations General Assembly has been clouded by a flagrant arbitrary act on the part of the United States, which once again has demonstrated its disregard for the rules of international law and for its obligations to the United Nations. This kind of behaviour cannot but evoke condemnation. Nor can it remain without consequences. It is to be hoped, of course, that the US authorities concerned will show common sense and a sense of responsibility, and will find ways and means to rectify the situation brought about by the wrongful action against the personnel of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations □

(TASS)

(Continued from Page 415)

The tragedy of the people of Cyprus has been going on for so many years now. Here as well, there has been no lack of mediation efforts and plans for a settlement. Various options are being tried, but the proposal that the problem of Cyprus be settled at a representative international conference under the auspices of the United Nations is being studiously evaded. Who stands to gain from that? Only those forces which intend to use the island in their military and political plans. Raising the stick of 'neo-globalism' over the Mediterranean, they would like to turn the entire region into a hotbed of tension. Without giving any thought to the consequences, they sometimes use that stick, as was done with barbaric cruelty in Libya.

Since the very beginning of the war between Iraq and Iran, the Soviet Union has been calling for a stop to that senseless mutual extermination. Being sincere friends to both nations, we are making use of the possibilities available to us to convince the parties to the conflict that they should make peace. We shall continue to do so.

It is our conviction that were it not for the racist regime of Pretoria, the black, white and coloured people in South Africa would have long ago found a common language—a language of equality, concord, and racial peace. The dividing line is drawn not by ethnic differences but by the cruel policy of apartheid, which is hostile to everyone, irrespective of the colour of one's skin.

To fail to see that is to encourage, willingly or unwillingly, genocide against the majority of South African people.

The world community has just spoken out unequivocally about the situation in southern Africa, and it is up to the Security Council now to adopt binding decisions, embodying in them the will of the absolute majority of the world's nations.

Recently, a new and ugly phenomenon of 'pre-paid' regional conflicts has appeared in international practice. A graphic example is Nicaragua, into which millions of dollars are being channelled to finance the massacres of peasants and destruction of villages and plantations—only because that small country has dared to choose its own way of development which, in the eyes of the administration of the world's most powerful capitalist nation, appears to pose a threat to its security.

The undeclared wars against the legitimate governments of Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia are paid for in exactly the same way. And quite often the country financing a conflict maintains diplomatic relations or conducts negotiations with the government concerned, while at the same time seeking to overthrow it by any means.

Indeed, it does not mind the cost when black-listing governments and countries which, for some reason or other, it finds inconvenient. Thus, the entire range of reprisals, from direct military to economic and ideological, has been used against the Republic of Cuba for more than a quarter of a century. But surely it is high time to understand that such a policy is bankrupt and that it can only be described as maniacal.

Political wisdom dictates acknowledging the established realities and not seeking to arbitrarily undo them.

Describing gangs of mercenaries as 'freedom fighters', which is attempted in the war against Afghanistan, does not help.

The time has come to learn to call things by their proper names. Speaking of Afghanistan, a national democratic revolution has taken place there. Its social base is constantly becoming broader and stronger; it relies on the support and participation of all social strata and ethnic groups in that country without exception. They have a clear-cut programme for a peaceful settlement of crisis phenomena and all that is needed is not to hamper that positive process. Here again, the Soviet Union is in favour of seeking new solutions

and a fresh approach, unobscured by prejudice, that would help to identify ways of solving the problem with due regard for the legitimate interests of the Afghan people and of its friends and neighbours.

A comprehensive system of international security can give us the keys to many of the most intricate locks.

While outlawing, as most other states do, any form of terrorism, we are prepared to contribute, and are already contributing, to fighting that plague. No sane person can live with it. Terrorism must be mercilessly eradicated, for innocent people suffer and die because of it. But to combat it effectively we should also see its causes. One should not ignore the nature of that abhorrent phenomenon: outbursts of individual and group terror are sometimes engendered by violence against entire peoples. An improvement in the overall international situation would do much to help stamp out terrorism.

An obstacle to an improved international climate is posed by 'neo-globalism'. It entails *diktat* and aggression, it tramples upon the independence of nations. The alternative to it is a comprehensive system of security.

The arms race and regional conflicts inevitably have an adverse effect on the world economic system. And while politicians, futurologists and experts are trying somehow to model a structure of security in a world with or without weapons, no one can even come close to predicting the economic consequences of the situation as it evolves. Yet the explosion with which it is fraught would be no less catastrophic than a possible malfunction in the technologies of war.

Even today militarism is jeopardising not only mankind's physical survival but also its socio-economic progress. The cost of the arms race is becoming comparable to the material damage caused by the past world wars.

All of this is making disarmament an economic imperative as well.

Against the background of uncontrollable crisis phenomena in the world economic structure one can see with particular clarity the expanding process of the pumping out of resources from the national economies of developing countries in Latin America, Africa and other regions.

At the threshold of the 1980s, the developing world, exploited by imperialism, was pushed by it into the vicious circles of development through debt, and it now finds itself in the noose of a trillion dollar debt. This in effect means that regions having the world's greatest concentration of population, resources and future markets are sliding towards an economic catastrophe.

That is why we regard economic security as an integral part of a comprehensive system of international security. When it starts to function it will become possible to set up a fund for assistance to the developing countries and to draw up under the auspices of the United Nations a global programme of scientific and technological co-operation.

For us a comprehensive system of international security is inconceivable without wide-ranging and open co-operation in the humanitarian field.

Being strongly in favour of expanded international co-operation in implementing political, social and individual human rights, we urge everyone to take a fresh, unbiased look at that problem. Specifically, the Soviet Union proposed at the Berne meeting that steps should be taken so that all-states bring their domestic legislation governing the whole range of humanitarian problems in conformity with international norms.

Unfortunately, the Berne meeting has also revealed a different approach, which ignores the consensus among most of the participants in the dialogue: the United States of America torpedoed the accord there.

The path of detente is also the path of greater

openness in societies, of a better level of objective information, of the nations' mutual familiarisation with each other's life and of strengthening the spirit of mutual understanding and accord in relations among them.

Whatever the area of international relations we turn to, everywhere the role of the United Nations is indispensable and its responsibility is great. Today, with the emergence of a new consolidation of the forces of progress and peace, enhancing the authority and prestige of this organisation and the effectiveness of its decisions becomes more than ever before a common concern for all its members. The dedicated work of Mr Perez de Cuellar as the Secretary-General of the United Nations at a difficult time for the organisation evokes deep respect and we would like to thank him cordially.

The United Nations now stands on the threshold of serious changes.

It is impossible to restructure relations among states without taking the changed realities into account. This organisation would only gain if a country that presides in the Non-Aligned Movement participated in one form or another in the work of the Security Council.

Recent events have once again focused attention on a peculiar trend: the country which once offered the location for the headquarters of the United Nations today all too often shows intense hostility toward this organisation. It slams the door refusing to fulfil its obligations, as was the case with UNESCO; or it tries to assert the principle that whoever has more money is right; or it puts spokes in the wheels of the collective machinery in the belief that in this way it can be made to function according to imposed will. The United States has made it a rule to lecture, punish and treat arbitrarily the organisation as a whole and those of its members whom it for some reason dislikes.

Lately the member-states of the United Nations have been increasingly wondering whether the United Nations can function normally in a country whose government shows such undisguised disrespect for them and the organisation itself. Perhaps that question should be heeded.

It might be useful to have a special debate within the United Nations on the numerous accumulated problems of United Nations functioning.

The universality of this organisation implies an onward movement towards rapprochement and towards the elimination of centrifugal forces. In the light of the proposed concept of comprehensive security, the polarity of East and West, of North and South, can and must be expunged from the political vocabulary.

This is what socialism is calling for. Whatever its antagonists say, it is opposed to confrontation and intransigence in mankind's most important pursuit—the construction of a durable and guaranteed peace. We have adopted this system of priorities in our relationship with the United States as well.

This question has been addressed here. Let me say that we are far from regarding our relations with the United States as holding no promise. Lately, encouraging outlines of meaningful agreements have been emerging. A summit meeting is also a realistic possibility. We could move forward rather smoothly, if that is what the US side wants.

We are realists and we do not draw inspiration from utopian ideas. At the end of the last century people envisioned the coming 20th century as the *belle époque*. But reality has dashed their expectations. Today, on the threshold of the 21st century, the objective situation is such that it could become either the golden age of science or the age of nuclear permafrost. The material means already exist for either outcome. The question is which of them will be put to use.

(Continued on next page)

PRAVDA:

Soviet-Chinese co-operation

"THE recent Peking talks and the documents signed there are giving fresh impetus to the development of Soviet-Chinese co-operation.

"Further improving relations between the two countries is an important factor in strengthening peace and socialism on Earth," *Pravda* said on September 17, commenting on the results of the official visit to China by Nikolai Talyzin, an alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and a First Deputy Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers. This was the first visit at this level to China by a Soviet official for the past twenty years.

Meetings between statesmen and political figures in the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China and exchanges of official delegations were becoming ever more common in the practice of bilateral relations between the

neighbouring countries, *Pravda* emphasised.

"The CPSU and the Soviet Government consistently favour a further improvement in Soviet-Chinese ties in all areas. Fresh and concerted efforts and advancement along this path meet the interests not only of the two states, and the Soviet and the Chinese peoples, but also the interests of socialism and promoting peace on Earth.

"A significant improvement has occurred in relations between the Soviet Union and socialist China in recent years. Trade is growing, economic co-operation is expanding. Contacts in sport, science and technology and public contacts are developing."

Pravda observed that bilateral trade had grown more than nine-fold between 1981 and 1985. Its volume exceeded 1.6 billion roubles last year.

The 1986-1990 agreement on trade and payments had provided for raising trade between the

two countries to 12 billion roubles, which, specialists maintained, was not the limit.

"Practice shows that there are ample reserves for broadening mutually beneficial co-operation between the USSR and China in all spheres. Both the Soviet Union and China are handling similar priority tasks of accelerating social and economic development.

"Historical links between the Soviet and the Chinese economies contain great opportunities for developing economic relations, including in the border regions.

"The aspiration to deepen co-operation in implementing their plans in the areas that would clearly benefit both sides is natural, therefore. Some projects and directions in bilateral interaction are literally knocking at the door," *Pravda* pointed out. □

Meeting of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee

AT the meeting of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) on September 18 it was recognised advisable to introduce additional benefits for veterans of the Great Patriotic War and for the families of fallen servicemen.

In this connection it is planned to establish a fifty per cent discount on the cost of fuel bought by disabled war veterans for their apartments, as well as the same discount on the payment of rent, fuel costs and public utility charges for the wives and parents of servicemen who died while defending the motherland, irrespective of the pensions being received by them.

The Political Bureau discussed the results of the work to consider people's written and oral messages addressed to the 27th Congress of the CPSU.

The majority of the questions raised by people had been promptly considered by the leading bodies of the Party. Appropriate decisions had been taken upon them, and the necessary instructions had been issued.

Having discussed a report from Nikolai Talyzin on the results of his visit to the People's Republic of China (PRC) and the meetings and conversations with the leading figures of the PRC, the Political Bureau pointed out that such contacts were becoming increasingly common in the practice of relations between the two countries. They served to stimulate mutually beneficial co-operation between them in various fields, both on the basis of perfecting forms which had already justified themselves and through a search for new and most promising ones.

It was emphasised that, in accordance with the course determined by the 27th Congress of the CPSU, the Soviet Union would continue to do everything depending on it to ensure that Soviet-Chinese relations acquired the character of strong good-neighbourliness, for the benefit of the two peoples and in the interests of strengthening the cause of peace and socialism.

The Political Bureau also considered other matters aimed at implementing the decisions of the 27th Congress of the Party and the CPSU Central Committee's guidelines for the major directions of the country's economic and social development, and at putting the foreign policy course into practice. □

(TASS)

USSR's attitude to GATT

THE Soviet Union is one of the biggest trade powers. Foreign economic links are bound to play a major role of their own in implementing our national economic plans outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress for the 12th five-year period and up to the year 2000, writes TASS news analyst Ivan Ivanov.

The pattern of these links will also change towards noticeable industrialisation of Soviet exports. Therefore our country is definitely interested in consistent and regulated development of both our own foreign trade and world trade as a whole. Along with bilateral trade agreements, we are striving to attain these aims

(Continued from previous page)

The danger for civilisation is more than evident. Hence, the need for responsible concerted action to prevent the looming catastrophe. We have made our choice. The Soviet Union, and I quote Mikhail Gorbachev, will "continue to use every opportunity for productive dialogue, for progress towards arms limitation and reduction, as well as towards the settlement of regional conflicts and the development of international co-operation in all areas of importance."

We think that in our deliberations it is very important never to lose sight of the real scale of time and of the world. The language that some politicians like to use makes that scale disappear in the fog of nebulous abstract concepts. As if what is involved is not the Earth but some other, remote planet. Yet it is the Earth that we see before us in the images of our children and grandchildren, fathers and mothers, sisters and brothers, of all those who are close and dear to us and with whom each of us identifies the concepts of nation, country and mankind.

This is the only acceptable yardstick. And one should not set his political telescopes as if his sole interest is whether there is life on Mars. All of us will have to answer one question, equally important to everyone: whether there will be life on Earth.

We would very much like to answer confidently—yes, there will be! □

on a multilateral basis. Hence our course of establishing closer relations with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

A step in this process was our application to participate in the latest round of trade negotiations under the aegis of GATT which opened in Punta del Este (Uruguay) on September 15 this year. In the application it was said that the aims of the USSR's participation in the round were its striving to promote the expansion of international trade exchange and its trade with the GATT countries, and the building up of confidence measures in world economic affairs. All this organically stems from our vision of the present-day world as an interdependent whole, from the concept of international economic security advanced at the 27th CPSU Congress.

Certainly we do not shut our eyes to the shortcomings in GATT's activities. That agreement was unable to efficiently oppose the wave of protectionism in the West in the 1970s and 1980s. It does not always take into account the specific interests of the developing countries. Multilateral negotiations are sometimes reduced to a duel between the USA, the EEC and Japan.

But these days GATT is the biggest international trade agreement, accounting for 80 per cent of world trade, and affiliating 92 countries. Therefore the Soviet Union deems it expedient to establish relations with GATT. This will be largely promoted by the current restructuring of the management of the USSR's foreign economic relations which gives many Soviet ministries and enterprises direct access to foreign markets. It does away with the notion that the trade system of the USSR and the GATT rules are allegedly incompatible.

It is not accidental therefore that the absolute majority of the GATT member-countries favourably received the Soviet application. In participating in the round at Punta del Este our country will be able to acquire the necessary experience of participation in GATT and come directly into the circle of the parties to the agreement. The Soviet Union views its participation in the round not as an end in itself but rather as the first step in establishing relations with GATT that can in the future open the way to solving the question of the USSR's fully fledged membership of GATT on agreed-upon terms.

The hope in the Soviet Union is that GATT's decision on the Soviet application will be positive. □

POLITICS AND POLITICKING

By Valentin Falin

FOR a year and two months there has been complete silence at the Soviet nuclear testing grounds. In that year and two months there have been many explosions at the American nuclear testing grounds. The US Administration refuses to join in the Soviet "propaganda"—this is how it qualifies the nuclear test moratorium which the Soviet Union introduced in the summer of 1985 and has extended four times since. The nuclear test ban is being slandered and branded "a lie" designed to distract attention from more important things, while the American efforts in the field of nuclear testing for military purposes is being presented as "a contribution" towards curbing the arms race.

Absurd, you may say. Absurd, indeed. It is impossible to prove what cannot be proved without crucifying the truth. So they are raping the truth. A habitual occupation for Washington.

Let us recall the reaction of the US leaders to the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium in 1958. Moscow is engaged in propaganda, they said then. The "treacherous Russians" decided to put the West at a disadvantage and trap it. And while they said this, they tested with unprecedented intensity new types of nuclear weapons. At that time the Americans conducted more than 50 unnecessary explosions. Among the arguments against an interim or termless test ban proposed by the Soviet Union were, "the absence of trust", "difficulty of verification" and "asymmetry" in the composition of armaments of the sides. Like it or not, Washington kept telling the public, the United States and its allies consider nuclear weapons the basis of their military strategy and should therefore take care of their modernisation and combat readiness.

In short, Washington is now staging a show similar to the one played out almost 30 years ago. One might think the past decades have flown by the United States without trace and have not compelled its leaders simply to ask themselves: what's the use of making new mistakes and persisting in old preconceptions? The testing of the late 1950s and the early 1960s led to nuclear rivalry under water, pushed the missile race onto its present level and paved the way for development of the many other weapons systems that have made peace on Earth so fragile. It made everyone anxious and added nothing to US security.

Renunciation of experimental nuclear explosions was for President Eisenhower tantamount to renunciation of intercontinental weapons and the policy of ensuring American military superiority. The President-general was not prepared to rise above the people who surrounded him and those sick with nuclear fever. He could only give them the name military-industrial complex. What has the present head of the US Administration on his mind? What are the visions which he cannot or does not want to part with? Considering "unpredictability" his trump card, Ronald Reagan is in no hurry to open the brackets. He may say one thing today and quite another tomorrow, depending on the prevalent mood in the Pentagon. The man will hardly give you a dull moment.

It's no fun, however, when the policy of a whole country, not just an individual, becomes "unpredictable." Political "unpredictability" is akin to wilfulness and arbitrary rule. How can one negotiate anything with the "unpredictable"

United States if it can renege on commitments all of a sudden under some pretext or without any pretext at all? Without batting an eyelid, the Americans would tell you that you should take them as they are. You don't like them? Nobody is keeping you. The United States can do without friends and partners.

A glaring anachronism. Yet, it is quite consonant with the logic of neo-globalism. Friends are a nuisance for those who want to lord it over the world. Such people need servants, a retinue, a clique. They stick to the obsolete meaning of the word "policy", which Vladimir Dal defined in his famous "Dictionary" in this way: "plans, intentions and aims of a sovereign, known to a few, and his actions, which often conceal these plans, intentions and aims." In order to be able always to have full freedom of action.

What the President passes over in silence, his advisers and cabinet secretaries blurt out. They do not attempt to conceal that the references to control, to the need to explode from time to time a weapon gone stale in storage just for a try-out, or to catch up with the Soviet Union, are mere subterfuges to squeeze ever more money out of the taxpayer. The man-in-the-street can find his bearings in the sea of misinformation no better than in a smog: at least that is what the misinformation is intended for.

What exactly are they up to over there? Minutes of Congressional proceedings have recorded Pentagon representatives' recognitions that the United States does not lag behind the Soviet Union in the least. What they are after is not to catch up with us but to leave us behind.

And again, the Congress is not a confessional for tycoons from the military-industrial complex. They are really outspoken only among their own—for instance, when it gets down to dividing budget allocations. Only then do they recognise that it is not weapons of old makes that are being checked at the Nevada testing grounds but at least half a dozen hyper-new ones. The possibilities of using energy radiated by explosions for qualitatively new weaponry are also being studied.

Laser weaponry is just one alley—but an essential one—of SDI research. The 'Strategic Defense Initiative' is expected to be a failure if the laser effort is not a success. Hence the weighty "no" to the nuclear test moratorium: one can't develop a nuclear-pumped laser without making test explosions. Nuclear-laser technology is still in its cradle. Much water will flow under the bridge, and many nuclear tests will shake the soil before it becomes clear whether the idea is at all practicable. The number of tests planned is unknown: the figures cited fluctuate between a few dozen and hundreds.

Mikhail Gorbachev called special attention to the fact that the weaponry being tested is fit for actual nuclear warfare. Information has become public that means of communication, homing devices and detonators are undergoing tests for survival capacity in actual warfare. Another object of underground tests is to check whether the accepted standards of passive defence and the means of counteracting it fit in with the latest scientific information. Much is being done to make nuclear charges smaller and lighter for the sake of more accurate homing and longer range, with the same explosive power and the same means of delivery. Last but not least, opportunities are being sought for military use of transuranium-powered devices.

According to statements by workers at US nuclear laboratories, the catalogue of models for military use of the atom is as inexhaustible as the atom itself. It's just a question of orders and the amount of government-allocated funds. A phase

shift in billionths of a second turns one nuclear process into quite another. Instead of a shock wave the weapon emits neutrons or other elementary particles. A truly boundless scope for the search for a greater evil, as if those already found were insufficient.

Even a review-like, schematic acquaintance with the agenda of current and scheduled experiments in Nevada leaves no two opinions—they are not merely preparing for war there. They are at pains to forge and nurture a weapon which, for the second time in half a century, is to make a revolution in military art. The USA miscalculated in its first attempt at world domination. The nuclear monopoly proved to be a venture with a short half-life. As a result, superpower led Washington into a dead-end. Now they are inventing an "absolute weapon" which must also give them absolute power, even if for an instant; but an instant long enough to accomplish their schemes.

It is not only weapons that are being tested in Nevada. The latest US military doctrines are also undergoing checks and fine-tuning on the range. These explosions test people's patience and their determination to resist the imperial longings of Washington.

Consequently, termination of tests is a military-technological problem, which is in many ways decisive for the solution of the broader task of nuclear disarmament as set out in concrete terms by Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15, 1986. But it is also a political, legal and moral problem.

Political because mankind cannot and must not be a hostage to anyone's "unpredictability". International relations are not a continuation of intra-American twists and turns or of the factional struggle among US monopolies. People have the right to demand clarity. They are fed up with declarations. They need peace actions.

Terminating tests is a legal problem, above all in the sense that the USA, the USSR and Britain have a treaty obligation to work for a ban on test nuclear explosions and to reduce, rather than increase, nuclear rivalry. The day is drawing near when Washington and London will have to answer to more than 100 states for undermining the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Moral because the planet has long been groaning under the burden of already-accumulated weapons. There will soon be no room left in Europe and some other regions for the erection of additional mountains of armaments and military equipment. It is time to stop before the irreparable happens, to realise that each new system and unit of weaponry takes from the peoples a part of their security and hope.

It is the duty of politics today to turn the possible into the real, the hopes of peoples into actuality. This is diametrically opposed to the schemes of the intriguers who put a gloss on evil. It is all too serious to allow anybody to throw the Earth into an uncalculated orbit. Common sense should prompt to each honest man his place at this crucial moment. □

(Pravda, September 16. In full)

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE —Stellar Delusions

The US threat of space militarisation.
By Gennadi Gerasimov, now head of the
USSR Foreign Ministry's Information
Department

Price 35p
Available from Soviet Booklets (SN),
3 Rosary Gardens, LONDON, SW7 4NW.

US urged to join Soviet test moratorium

"A favourable atmosphere has now emerged for the development of comprehensive East-West contacts," said the English author Graham Greene in an interview with the newspaper *Sovetskaya Kultura* on September 20. "Every precondition exists for the development of constructive co-operation, so let us use every opportunity to get to know each other better."

Graham Greene is visiting the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Writer's Union. He declared that he welcomed the Soviet Union's moratorium on nuclear testing and described Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on the extension of the moratorium as the voice of reason. There was no rhetoric in the stand of the Soviet leadership, only an appeal to common sense. It was a bold step to give up nuclear testing without any guarantee from the United States. He said that the position of President Reagan, wrecking the disarmament process, was regrettable.

"The overwhelming majority of British scientists and computer experts believe that President Reagan's 'Strategic Defense Initiative'—in other words the 'Star Wars' programme—is a dangerous and provocative undertaking."

This was stated by Clive Jenkins, General Secretary of the Association of Scientific, Technical and Managerial Staffs, in an interview last week with *Pravda*. Specialists were sure that, from the practical point of view, the programme was impossible to implement, he said.

As for the moratorium on nuclear tests, he and his colleagues warmly welcomed the Soviet initiatives. Mr Jenkins said he believed that the main obstacle to reaching agreement was the resistance of the US Administration, which was more interested in pushing through its militarist programmes.

The supporters of these programmes were having to come up with more and more pretexts for not joining the Soviet moratorium: they were inventing explanations.

Rear-Admiral (Rtd) Gene Larocque, who heads the Washington-based Center for Defense Information, has emphasised that the Soviet peace initiatives advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev, especially those for ending nuclear tests and scrapping nuclear weapons, should be accepted by the United States.

Speaking on Soviet television on Sunday, he said these initiatives represented a new and bold step, a step towards peace, not war. Americans were realising this, although it took a little time for everyone to see how well-thought out, mutually beneficial and feasible they were.

Stopping tests of nuclear weapons, stopping piling them up and ultimately ridding ourselves of them completely was the only way forward. "We should rid ourselves of nuclear weapons by the end of the century and end nuclear explosions today, not in five years. These are concrete proposals which have definite time-frames," Larocque declared.

He emphasised that the struggle for peace required courage. "We are doing our best to warn the world about the danger to it from nuclear weapons," he said. "Preparations for war have turned into big business in the United States, and profits spur on the arms race."

"We hold that there are methods for settling conflicts among states without resorting to war," Larocque noted. "We are worried by the fact that the Soviet Union has now begun to be

regarded as an enemy. This is not true. We military men do not believe that the Soviet Union is an enemy. We will compete, but there is no need for us to use military force," the Rear Admiral emphasised.

Medical organisations in Canada have also welcomed the Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing. Thomas Perry, a doctor of medicine and member of Canadian Physicians for Social Responsibility, told TASS on Monday that the recent extension was an extremely important step. It showed the USSR's consistency in this matter.

Dr Perry said that, together with many reasonably-minded people, he denounced the US Administration for not so far following the Soviet Union's example in discontinuing all nuclear tests. On the contrary, the US was stepping up tests, because it was using them to develop the 'Star Wars' programme.

He emphasised that the members of his organisation were very enthusiastic about the Soviet moratorium; they saw it as the first step to ending the arms race.

Dr Dean Bates of McGill University, Montreal, described the repeated Soviet extensions of the test moratorium as events of paramount significance: for it took time for the public generally to grasp the great meaning and aims of this initiative and so start bringing greater and greater pressure on the opposite side. That was why persistent attempts by the Soviet Union to achieve a mutual moratorium were so important.

Dr Bates, a member of Canadian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, said that, while any cut in nuclear weapons would be an important event, without a test moratorium and an all-embracing treaty on nuclear testing the production of mass destruction weapons could be resumed at any time.

He went on to say that his organisation believed that the Canadian Government should openly declare in support of the Soviet moratorium, and demand from the USA a constructive response to Mikhail Gorbachev's initiatives.

The secretary-general of the Japanese Council of Scientists has described the extension of the Soviet moratorium as "of exceptionally great significance for resolving today's most burning problem—eliminating the thermo-nuclear threat."

Professor Minoru Kitamura of Waseda University, speaking in a TASS interview on Monday, declared that the main problem was the stand of the US Administration, which refused to follow the Soviet example; this was evidence that Washington did not intend to give up its militaristic programmes.

Under these conditions, Professor Kitamura stressed it was most important to continue to step up demands that the US join the test moratorium. The international public, sane politicians and scientists should pool their efforts to make Washington take practical steps.

The unanimous opinion of the board of the Social Democratic Party of Finland is that the Soviet moratorium is an effective step towards halting all nuclear testing, and halting the development of more types of nuclear weapons.

In an interview with *Pravda* in Helsinki last week, Erkki Liikanen, the party's general secretary, added that it was obvious that other nuclear powers, primarily the US, should follow

the Soviet example.

Liikanen, who is also chairman of the parliamentary commission for foreign affairs, criticised the negative US reaction to the latest extension of the moratorium; the US had dismissed it as another propaganda exercise and at the same time had gone on with its nuclear tests in Nevada. He pointed out that the moratorium could actually be described as good and effective propaganda, not by words but by deeds, by concrete proposals.

Erkki Liikanen said that advantage should be taken of the offer of the 'Delhi Six' to provide practical assistance in monitoring a bilateral test moratorium and a future complete test ban treaty.

Jens Steffensen, leader of the parliamentary group of the Christian People's Party of Denmark, has described the Soviet Union's extension of its moratorium as yet another act of goodwill by Moscow, an outstretched hand to the West.

Speaking in an interview last week with *Pravda* in Copenhagen, Steffensen stated that any concrete step towards disarmament had to be welcomed and supported in every way.

"Now that the Soviet Union has once again explicitly expressed its stand, we can rightfully hope for a positive US response and for a continuation of the Soviet-US dialogue on this problem."

Bjorn Elmquist, a member of the leadership of Denmark's Venstre (Liberal) Party and its spokesman on foreign affairs, also affirmed last week that his party is an "advocate of an end to nuclear weapons tests. So far there has been no hint of headway in this matter on the part of the White House. Certain difficulties did arise over the problem of verification, but now the USSR is offering an effective system of control we can properly expect progress."

The Mexican Foreign Minister, Bernardo Sepulveda, yesterday (September 23) welcomed both the extended test moratorium and the positive Soviet reply to the recent message from the 'Delhi Six', concerning verification.

The message said that the six had definite proposals as to how they could assist in monitoring a test ban. The 'Delhi Six' put to both the USSR and the USA that a meeting of experts from their respective countries should be held, to discuss this question.

In his reply Mikhail Gorbachev supported the 'Delhi Six' initiative and agreed to send experts to such a meeting.

Governors of states and provinces, mayors of big cities and parliamentarians from Latin American and Caribbean nations ended a major conference in Argentina last week with the adoption of the Sata Fe Declaration.

The Declaration backs the demands for an immediate end to nuclear weapon tests, as a first step towards banning and destroying all nuclear armaments both on Earth and in outer space.

One of the resolutions adopted by the conference proposes sending a letter to the US Congress urging American legislators not to miss this historic chance and adopt in October a law banning new nuclear weapon tests. □

(TASS)