

Mikhail Gorbachev meets American Russian-language teachers

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, met at the Central Committee last Friday a group of Russian-language teachers from the United States.

The teachers have been studying at a Russian-language course in Leningrad within the framework of the Agreement on Cultural Links and the Programme of Co-operation and Exchanges for 1986-1988, signed in Geneva during the Soviet leader's meeting with President Reagan in 1985.

The General Secretary said during the conversation that the study of English in the USSR and of Russian in the United States is important for promoting mutual understanding between the peoples of the USSR and the United States, and for broadening direct contacts between Soviet and American people.

The times demand, Mikhail Gorbachev observed, that "we think together how to improve relations. The United States and the Soviet Union constitute a great reality of the present world.

"Our two states, our two peoples bear special and unique responsibility to the whole of human civilisation.

"The world has approached such a line — this applies first and foremost to both the United States and the Soviet Union — that it is time to think how we are going to live next," Mikhail Gorbachev said. "If things go on as previously and nothing changes, then it is difficult to predict where we shall be even in 10, 15, 20 years' time.

"It seems to me that there is mounting concern both among Soviet and American people for the future of our countries and for the future of the whole of civilisation.

"We are not indifferent to the destiny of other peoples either. I shall never agree — whoever tells me it — that the American people are aggressively disposed towards the Soviet Union. I just cannot agree with that. There are people, probably, whom tension, confrontation or keen rivalry between our countries suit. Maybe and for sure some people get something from it. But such a state of affairs does not accord with the big and extensive interests of our peoples."

IN THIS ISSUE

Mikhail Gorbachev meets American Russian-language teachers	289
Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Ramensky Agri-industrial Complex	290
Mikhail Gorbachev sends greetings to Edinburgh International Festival	291
Eduard Shevardnadze's speech at Geneva Soviet-US consultations on banning chemical weapons	292
Central America: the way to peace is open	296

The Soviet leader said that Soviet-American relations are in need of improvement. They have not only "failed to make headway since the mid-1970's", but "much of what was created and done at that time has even been disrupted."

In this connection he emphasised the need for a dialogue at politicians' level. "Unravelling of acute problems should be sought at all negotiations and forums, first of all at the Geneva talks. We devote immense attention to them."

At the same time, Mikhail Gorbachev said that the USSR does not want merely to conduct talks, although it suited some people in America that it was just registered that the talks go on.

"This does not suit us. It is a good thing that the talks go on — but it is essential for the talks to make headway so that there will be progress and we can reach accords, and that eventually our peoples and the whole world will get — through the Geneva accords — a solution to the burning problems which will make it possible to remove the nuclear threat and take the road of disarmament.

"If the Geneva talks are used as a screen to cover up a continuation of all military programmes and the spiralling up of military budgets, then we object, strongly object to that. Such an approach is unacceptable," the Soviet leader stated.

"I am of the opinion that the President and I, notwithstanding all the difficulties, are having a serious dialogue. Sometimes we are dissatisfied with each other and even publicly state this and state it bluntly, but we shall go ahead with our efforts and shall seek co-operation and approaches to resultative talks with any President and Administration the American people choose.

"Nothing will come out of this if someone assumes the role of mentor of other peoples. This won't work. And not only with regard to the Soviet Union and the United States. It already does not work with regard to the smallest country either.

"There are developed capitalist countries and there is the socialist system. There are also modern developed states. There are also scores of countries which have taken the road of independent development in Africa, Asia and Latin America. They want to live in just the same way as you and I, and no worse than that. But they are tormented by hunger and disease. Their resources flow out to developed countries and wind up as the national income of those developed states by means of non-equivalent exchanges. The developing countries do not want to put up with that.

"Both your country and ours have interests, just like other developed countries. The Africans and Asians have got interests also, and maybe still more burning ones."

In this connection Mikhail Gorbachev said that it is impossible to build relationships ignoring the interests of billions of people. "This is just unrealistic in our days."

"That's why we call for thinking in other terms. The time when foreign policy was looked at from imperial positions is over," Mikhail Gorbachev emphasised. "What remains is equitable relationships."

"We proceed from the premise that if we take into account only the Soviet Union's interests and disregard the partner's interests no treaty will come off.

"We urge this on the American side also — to adopt the same attitude towards us. We will allow neither superiority nor infringement of our security. We do not want to damage US security either.

"If both sides share this approach, a breakthrough will be possible in all directions of Soviet-American co-operation," the General Secretary said.

"We do not want to undermine the interests of Americans in the world or to disrupt the existing world economic ties," he observed.

"At the same time we will firmly set out our views and defend them before our people, before the American people, and before the entire world. We challenge the American side to do the same."

Mikhail Gorbachev said that many fences had been built up from the American side obstructing contacts and understanding between the nations. On trade links with the US, he observed that the American side has practically no trade with the Soviet Union.

The purchase of American grain, Gorbachev said, is now more "for maintaining trade relations. Otherwise they would peter out altogether."

"It may happen that we will not have to buy it any longer. Besides, we could have made the purchase elsewhere. Trade in other areas with you is virtually at zero level."

Mikhail Gorbachev mentioned the great number of legal provisions in the US that were directed at preventing bigger trade with the USSR.

"Mutual understanding should normally develop and deepen. It requires, therefore, the development of trade. This would also be normal," the Soviet leader emphasised.

Mikhail Gorbachev welcomed the intensive political dialogue currently under way between the USSR and the United States. Speaking on the forthcoming meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz, he expressed the hope that a serious conversation will be held.

"We are hoping at least for an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles to be signed. We have made new proposals recently on strategic armaments. This affects directly the interests and relations of our two countries.

"Much of what we came close to in Reykjavik needs to be realised. We are prepared to continue this line. We will have enough patience. We will continue to work, both today and tomorrow, towards agreements. We are prepared to co-operate with all political circles in the USA."

On the ongoing restructuring in the country, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that the USSR can advance "without impairing man's social security. Therefore we do not need simply profit or bare productivity. Of course, we need these, but without people being thrown out on to the street. People's employment should be preserved and strengthened."

Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Ramensky Agri-industrial Complex

ON August 5 Mikhail Gorbachev visited the Ramensky Agri-Industrial Complex in Moscow region. Mikhail Gorbachev's conversations with workers in agriculture concentrated on what is now being done in practice to solve the task of providing the country with foodstuffs and what is being done to fulfil the Food Programme.

Questions of the USSR's foreign policy were also raised. The participants in the conversations said that the main thing is the struggle for peace. In this connection Mikhail Gorbachev said: "Not only the Soviet people understands that it is necessary to stop the arms race, to preserve peace. This is understood by the peoples, the working people in all countries. Both in capitalist and developing countries, everywhere they understand this. And this is precisely the base on which the USSR's policy is founded — it is in the interests of our own and all other peoples."

After acquainting himself with the enterprises of the agri-industrial complex Mikhail Gorbachev spoke at a meeting with farm

officials, secretaries of Party committees and workers of the Ramensky Agri-Industrial Complex. He expressed satisfaction with his visit, his meetings and conversations.

Mikhail Gorbachev announced preparations for a plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee "to further elaborate the agrarian policy with account for the new situation and accumulated experience". It is planned, he said, to study social questions, questions of the material base and other questions so that the agri-industrial complex would be correctly integrated economically in the national economy. With due account for changes in wholesale prices and so that all the profits of the collective farms and state farms are not nullified. "Questions of new methods of management are of prime importance," Mikhail Gorbachev stressed.

Our country has approached such a situation when a cardinal restructuring is needed, he stressed. He expressed confidence that Soviet society will fulfil the tasks of the restructuring if it rids itself of the old mentality and old approaches. In this connection he said that everything should be started with the Party, with the leading cadres.

The speaker explained that one should not replace all the personnel in putting the reorganisation into practice. "However, this does not rule out the possibility of changes in the top and middle echelons and on the level of enterprises, which will bring about an influx of new fresh force."

Mikhail Gorbachev described democratisation as the foundation of the reorganisation. He pointed out the role of material incentives in work. "A new mechanism in the countryside, new forms of organisation and new forms of incentives are coming to the fore. They will permit us to combine the interest of society and the individual interest of man."

Emphasising the importance of the solution of social problems, he pointed out that "people appreciate not the pace at which their wages are growing, but the way the village is being changed, the way the production methods, working conditions and the very nature of work are being transformed".

Answering the question on what is needed today for tackling all these problems, Mikhail Gorbachev made special mention of economic initiative, enterprise and independence. □

Meeting of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee

THE Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee at its meeting on August 6 approved the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad and the talks between Vsevolod Murakhovsky, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the head of the Malaysian Government.

It was noted that the exchange of views and the agreements reached facilitated better understanding and co-operation between the two countries.

The Soviet Union's readiness was reaffirmed for the further development of relations with the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) and its member states.

The Political Bureau approved the results of Gorbachev's conversation with Joaquim Alberto

Chissano, Chairman of the Frelimo Party and President of Mozambique, and the outcome of the Soviet-Mozambican talks.

The Soviet Union's invariable solidarity with Mozambique and principled course towards all-round co-operation with that country were stressed.

The Political Bureau considered draft main guidelines for the development of the protection of the population's health and for the reorganisation of Soviet health services in the twelfth five-year-plan period and in the period ending in the year 2000, and the question of first-priority measures to improve health care in the country in 1988-1990.

The documents determine ways for substantially raising the quality of medical aid to the population. Large-scale measures have been planned to enhance the disease-prevention trend in health care, to make the environment healthier, and to improve conditions for the Soviet people's work, life and rest, to draw them

into regular physical training exercises, to increase efforts to overcome drunkenness and alcoholism, and to improve the pattern of the population's diet.

Provision is made for substantially increasing capital investments being channelled into the construction of hospitals and polyclinics as well as funds being allocated for their equipment.

It was decided to publish in the press the draft main guidelines for the development of the protection of the population's health and reorganisation of health services for countrywide discussion.

The Political Bureau supported proposals by the All-Union Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions, the Soviet Women's Committee, ministries and departments on broadening the privileges for working pregnant women and for women with small children, and on the introducing of additions to the existing labour legislation in this connection.

Provision is made, in particular, to establish a part-time working day or week for these categories of working women at their request, to reduce work and service norms for pregnant women, and to ensure their transfer to other, easier jobs. It is also planned to broaden other privileges for working women and to ensure more favourable working conditions for them.

Some other matters of the socio-economic development of the country and of the foreign-policy activities of the Party and the state were also considered at the meeting. □

Changes in the USSR's Chamber of Commerce and Industry

"FROM now on branch ministries, departments and enterprises will have their representatives at the commercial centres of Soviet industrial exhibitions abroad," Yevgeni Pitovranov, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry, says in an interview with the newspaper *Sotsialisticheskaya Industriya*.

Until now it has been representatives of the USSR Foreign Trade Ministry who held talks and signed contracts at exhibitions abroad. Today potential suppliers and customers are establishing direct contacts, the absence of which caused complaints from foreign businessmen in the past, he stresses.

In connection with the restructuring of the Soviet foreign trade system, Pitovranov says, the Chamber is orienting its foreign partners towards expanding co-production, buy-back deals, know-how exchanges and joint ventures.

Yevgeni Pitovranov favours the holding in Moscow of international exhibitions on a constant basis. He says that the World Trade Centre in Moscow has increased the assistance it renders to offices of foreign firms and banks on a commercial basis in establishing business contacts with Soviet partners.

A cost-accounting consultative service is being established, so as to fulfil orders from foreign and Soviet organisations which need help in closing commercial deals, tackling marketing problems and undertaking patent and financial transactions. □

Looking at an Economic Map of the USSR

—covering Industry, Farming, Transport and Science: many maps and photographs.

Price £1. (cheque/PO)

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

Mikhail Gorbachev sends greetings to Edinburgh International Festival

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV has sent a message of greetings to the Edinburgh International Arts Festival which says:

"May I extend my sincere greetings to the organisers, participants and spectators of the Edinburgh International Arts Festival which takes place traditionally at this time in August in the ancient and hospitable land of Scotland.

"In our nuclear-space age, set around with dangers, the consolidation of the potential of world culture and the raising of spiritual values is acquiring new and indispensable importance for the survival and progress of humankind. International cultural forums, where contacts are made through the language of art while still remaining expressive and intelligible to everyone, contribute to this. Among such forums the Edinburgh International Festival is one of the most authoritative.

"May I express the hope that the participation

of representatives of Soviet multinational art in the Edinburgh Festival will contribute to developing the cultural ties between the Soviet Union and Great Britain that now are so necessary for mutual understanding and co-operation among peoples.

"I wish the Festival every success."

Audiences, theatrical critics and the press have welcomed the performances of Soviet musicians and actors at the opening of the 41st Edinburgh International Festival as a tremendous success.

For almost 40 minutes encore followed encore, from an audience packing the Usher Hall to capacity, for the Orchestra of the Bolshoi Theatre of the USSR who performed compositions by Rimsky-Korsakov, Moussorgsky and Tchaikovsky with inspiration and virtuosity.

The press published on Monday the message of greetings addressed by Mikhail Gorbachev to the sponsors, participants and audiences of the Festival. *The Guardian* and the *Glasgow Herald* newspapers greeted it as a goodwill message.

The performance of Leo Tolstoy's *Kholstomer*

by the company of Leningrad's Maxim Gorky Bolshoi Drama Theatre, and of the folk ensemble Siverko from Arkhangelsk have attracted much interest from audiences. Simultaneously, Soviet exhibitions and round-table discussions are being held in Edinburgh with the participation of prominent Soviet literary and cultural figures.

The Soviet visitors have been accorded an exceptionally warm welcome everywhere in Edinburgh. The local press notes that the broadening exchanges between Britain and the USSR meet the interests of the people of both countries and help strengthen peace. □

International Peace Cruise along the Dnieper

THE participants in an international peace cruise along the River Dnieper started their two-day stay in the Black Sea port of Odessa with an anti-war rally at the weekend.

The rally marked the beginning of a week of action for a nuclear ban and solidarity with victims of atomic bombings.

The cruise members include activists of the Soviet peace movement and representatives of more than 60 anti-war organisations and movements from 19 Western European countries, the United States and Canada.

The rally adopted an appeal to the international conference for a nuclear ban, held in Hiroshima.

The appeal emphasised that there is no reasonable alternative to the idea of a nuclear-free and non-violent world. The cruise members voiced their support for all peace proposals advanced in the East and West aimed at curbing the arms race.

The appeal demanded that all governments give a constructive answer to Mikhail Gorbachev's positive initiatives.

"The real chance of ending the reckless arms race should not be missed." □

SOVIET TELEVISION ON HIROSHIMA DAY

HUMANKIND, which has learned to calculate everything, is unable, yet, to calculate the whole price of the crime perpetrated by US imperialism in Hiroshima. This was pointed out in a TV report from Hiroshima's Peace Park shown on the Soviet International Panorama programme on Sunday.

The lists of new victims from the second and third generations of the inhabitants of Hiroshima are put every year into the symbolic grave of 240,000 inhabitants of Hiroshima, who were killed on August 6, 1945. On the latest list there are 4,619 names. How many names are going to be put on the list next year, and in another ten years?

At one time, 1,987 years ago, humanity began to count a new era starting from a certain event. Yet what actually happened 1,945 years later has even more right to serve as the watershed between epochs, since prior to August 6, 1945, despite all the wars and calamities, humanity was immortal. But after Hiroshima it proved to be mortal. Peace has ceased to be just one form of state policy, as was the case in the pre-nuclear epoch. Peace has turned into the sole possible policy. Soviet Television emphasised. □

Latvia: Russian and Lettish language study

THE Commission for National and Inter-nation Relations of the Latvian Communist Party's Central Committee held a regular meeting on Monday. It discussed the state of affairs in the study of the Russian and Lettish languages in Soviet Latvia's general educational and vocational schools.

People of various nationalities have lived for centuries in the territory of what is now Latvia. Therefore not only Letts but also Russians, Jews, Lithuanians, Byelorussians and Poles are indigenous to the republic.

Nevertheless, over the years of bourgeois rule (1920-1940), according to census data, only every seventh local Russian resident knew Lettish.

Current sociological research has shown that more than half the Russian intellectuals living in Latvia speak Lettish fluently, and overall every fourth or fifth non-Lett knows Lettish. At

the same time two-thirds of Lettish people speak fluent Russian.

Despite marked successes in the formation of bilingualism, the Commission identified a number of difficulties in the way of assimilation of Russian by Letts and of Lettish by non-Letts. There is a lack of qualified teachers, good manuals, dictionaries and instructional aids.

The Commission, consisting of Party and state leaders, scientists, writers and members of the public, has worked out a number of measures aimed at developing the teaching of Russian and Lettish in Latvia.

In particular, the training of linguists will gain in scope and the print runs of books and manuals will increase. A school leaving examination in Lettish is being introduced in Russian schools, just as a compulsory examination in Russian is taken in schools where instruction is done in Lettish.

Both languages will be taught from the age of five and in all nursery schools. □

Isaak Prischkolnik, teacher of Yiddish

MY interlocutor lives up to his surname, Prischkolnik, which means "man at the school". Although more than two weeks are left before schools open, he spends all his time at the school preparing for the new academic year — the 50th in his life, reports a TASS correspondent in Birobidzhan.

Issak Prischkolnik has been a director of the school in Valdheim village for half a century. The village can be reached by car in fifteen minutes from Birobidzhan, the administrative centre of the Jewish Autonomous Region in the Soviet Far East. Valdheim means in Yiddish "house in the woods". In the early 30s settlers built the first house in the woods here.

Russians, Byelorussians and Ukrainians started to arrive in the new village, together with Jews from the central regions of the USSR.

New houses sprang up. Then a school was built. Isaak Prischkolnik became its first teacher and principal. From then on he has worked here teaching Yiddish. His great contribution to the upbringing of the younger generation won him the title of Merited Teacher of the Russian Federation. Hundreds of children taught by Prischkolnik "made the grade", in his own words, and work now as operators of farm machinery, workers, engineers, scientists, doctors, writers and artists. However, the teacher believes that the occupation is not the main thing. It is important always to remain a man in the highest sense of this word.

"Jewish families make up the majority in Valdheim but we do not isolate ourselves," Prischkolnik continues. "We are friendly with the Ukrainians and Russians. We all live in one village. The Far East brought us together." □

Eduard Shevardnadze's speech at Geneva

Here follows the full text of the speech made by Eduard Shevardnadze, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Foreign Minister, at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament on August 6:

Mr President,

I am pleased to extend my greetings to you and express the confidence that under your guidance the Conference will be able to achieve positive results.

There are numerous agencies in the world dealing with the misfortunes of the human race, ranging from the torment of hunger to threats to the biosphere. However, those miseries and threats cannot be eliminated unless a solution is found to the main problem — that of destroying the material base for waging war. That is the problem of disarmament, the problem with which you are dealing as the world's only body established for that purpose.

Documents of vital importance for the future of the world were drawn up within these walls — the treaties on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and on Non-emplacement of Nuclear Weapons on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor, the conventions on the Prohibition of Bacteriological Weapons and on the Non-use of Environmental Modification Techniques for Military Purposes. Remarkable in and of themselves as major landmarks in the development of international legal thinking, they have also added a new dimension to our common security.

They are proof of the possibility of a nuclear-free and non-violent world, of an era without wars or weapons, as described by Mikhail Gorbachev in his Statement of January 15 1986. In other words, they were, to some extent, a prelude to the conclusion reached by the Soviet leadership following a thorough analysis of the realities of the nuclear and space age.

We may differ as to the interpretation of particular issues but all your previous activities and the documents adopted on the basis of consensus demonstrate that in the sphere of security states are capable of exercising voluntary self-restraint for the sake of the common good.

We view your activities as a manifestation of new political thinking which must be built into the machinery of interstate relations in the nuclear age.

This thinking starts with a clear understanding of the realities of this age. Not only those realities, but the words themselves — the nuclear age — should make people shudder. However, too many people utter them calmly as if they were absolutely indifferent to the possibility that all the preceding ages — the stone or the bronze age, the Renaissance or the Enlightenment — which offered mankind new and each time increasingly more advanced methods of meeting its intellectual and material needs, would be wiped out by an age which has brought forth the means of mankind's self-annihilation.

Can we remain calm?

Can this be called progress?

Can this be considered fatally inevitable?

To all these questions the only answer is: No.

Great ideas do not grow old, they are just filled with new content. The call of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the great citizen of this city, for "a natural human condition — equality and freedom" can and must be interpreted in the context of our time.

Such condition cannot be attained so long as there are weapons capable of destroying all life on Earth. It is regrettable that the advocates

of so-called nuclear deterrence pass this fact over in silence.

The concept of deterrence is dangerous also because it dooms all states to life in constant fear, making them nuclear hostages.

If they complete the logical chain of arguments, the proponents of nuclear deterrence must admit that it pushes towards total nuclear deterrence — a situation where every state would wish to acquire such weapon systems.

Therefore when we say that a nuclear-free and non-violent world is the only reasonable alternative to the doctrine of deterrence, we hope for a sympathetic response.

Although some have described such a world as fantasy, it is already emerging before our very eyes. A mere two weeks ago, prior to Mikhail Gorbachev's interview to the Indonesian newspaper *Merdeka*, a nuclear-free world was more than 200 warheads farther away from us. And since Reykjavik that distance has become shorter by almost 2000 warheads.

If I am asked why I am referring to this as something that has been accomplished, I will say that for the Soviet Union this is indeed so. For we have done all in our power, we have removed everything that could stand in the way of an agreement based on a "global double zero".

We have dropped the condition concerning the British and French nuclear forces. We consider intermediate-range missiles apart from the problem of strategic and space arms even though we would prefer to discuss them together. We have called for the total elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles in Europe. Finally, we have arrived at the concept of a "global double zero", that is the total removal of two classes of nuclear weapons from Soviet and US arsenals. It is no secret that the Soviet side would have to reduce a significantly greater number of missiles than the US side.

So, what is holding things up now, ladies and gentlemen?

Our partners have found the snags. The main one is the Pershing IA missiles.

We are being asked why we have raised this issue and why we have not raised it earlier.

Let me say this. The question of what the West knew about the Soviet position, and when it knew it, is utterly irrelevant in this particular case. After all, determining what arms are to be eliminated is what negotiations are all about.

What we are discussing in effect is which specific nuclear systems with ranges between 500 and 1,000 kilometres should be subject to elimination. The agreement in principle on that score states that all such systems without exception must be eliminated, which also means Pershing IA's.

If, however, someone has chosen to start a dispute about who those missiles belong to — well then, we are quite prepared to discuss that point too.

We would prefer to discuss it only at the negotiating table, but we are forced into a public debate in which we have to engage so that the truth of the matter and our position should not be distorted.

To begin with, we are negotiating with the United States, and we deal with Soviet and US nuclear weapons only. Therefore we fail to see any reason for the Federal Republic of

Germany to intrude in the Soviet-US negotiations. Why? By what right? Has it not assumed an obligation under the Non-proliferation Treaty not to acquire nuclear weapons?

Let me repeat that it is only with the United States that we are negotiating an agreement which, if reached, will eliminate all nuclear warheads on two classes of arms of the two countries. But if we speak of all warheads that certainly includes those on Pershing IA missiles too. How can it be otherwise?

As to who owns the missile's fuel, the missile's airframe, or, say, the wheels of its transporter, this is of no interest to us. We just proceed from the principle that zeros must be equal for both sides. If, however, the United States does not want a zero option, as is clear from its present "seventy-two equals zero" formula — that would be a different ball game.

We, too, have allies, who are concerned over the fact that a neighbouring country retains shorter-range nuclear missiles which pose a great threat to their security. They could ask for the stationing of similar systems on their territories, and the Soviet Union could meet their request.

But what would a Soviet-US agreement be like as a result of all this? It would be truncated, emasculated and anaemic.

Over the past few days the opponents of the "zero solution" have found another argument to try to bolster their untenable position on the Pershing-IA's. They are now saying that there is an imbalance in conventional and nuclear tactical arms in Europe and that therefore these missiles have to be retained.

But is Bonn not aware that the Soviet leadership has been persistently calling for starting without delay negotiations to reduce conventional and nuclear tactical arms and eliminate any disparities or imbalances where they exist.

Let me say frankly: such tricks leave a dreadful impression. And they do nothing to help create trust in relations with our negotiating partners.

The Conference on Disarmament is not directly involved in dealing with the issue of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, but it does deal, and should deal, with the problem of nuclear disarmament; it acts as a moral repository of the Non-proliferation Treaty. Therefore we believe that the Conference could voice its authoritative opinion on whether the practice of joint ownership of nuclear arms by a nuclear and a non-nuclear state is consistent with that legal instrument.

This has to be done to prevent the Non-proliferation Treaty from being undermined. There can be no nuclear weapons on Earth that are "no one's" weapons. It is extremely dangerous to create such a "legal sham".

If, as some US Administration officials and their West German partners contend, those notorious Pershing-IA's are third-country systems, then the question arises again: why and by what right does that third country, namely the Federal Republic of Germany, possess nuclear weapons? As far as we know, it has neither legal nor moral right to have them.

But if it is deliberately trying to arrogate to itself such rights, if the Federal Republic of Germany has indeed illegally acquired nuclear weapons — then this would certainly cause anger and indignation in the world, and could confront the world with a political crisis.

We believe it is appropriate to ask the

representative of the Federal Republic of Germany at this forum a straightforward question: does his country have nuclear systems in its arsenal?

Equally legitimate is the question that we are addressing to the US delegate: who actually controls the nuclear warheads for the Pershing IA's?

A great deal depends on the answer to these two questions:

- the fate of an agreement on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles;

- the future of the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons;

- the reassessment that the Soviet Union would be forced to make of the overall strategic situation in terms of the threat to its national interests posed by the acquisition of nuclear weapons by a country where even today the insane slogans of revanchism are being heard, trying to drown out the voices of sober-minded political and public figures and mass movements calling for a responsible approach to European and world affairs.

The Soviet Union hopes that the Federal Republic of Germany will duly clarify the situation and remove the concerns now being felt by many European states because of the ambiguity of its position in regard to the Pershing-IA missiles.

We wish to make it perfectly clear that unless this is done, the Soviet Union will find the situation as it exists now unacceptable and will make known its view on that situation in a clear and unambiguous manner. The Soviet people will never acquiesce in West Germany becoming a nuclear power.

Thus, 72 US nuclear warheads stand between us and an agreement on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. According to the US-West German rules of "dual accounting", they are made to weigh more than all the two thousand nuclear warheads that could be de-activated and scrapped starting later this year.

A Soviet-American accord on the total elimination of two categories of nuclear arms is a necessary prologue to solving the main problem—that of eliminating strategic offensive arms and preventing the extension of the arms race to outer space.

Mr President,

It is my privilege to inform you, upon instructions from the Soviet leadership, of the objectives which the Soviet Union is seeking to achieve. They include:

- the conclusion of treaties with the United States and of international agreements on the complete destruction of nuclear weapons worldwide;

- a strict and universal ban on deployment of any arms in outer space;

- the establishment of an international regime under which there will be no chemical weapons or other types of weapons of mass destruction in the world;

- the reduction of conventional weapons to the lowest possible levels required for defence;

- the establishment, on the basis of co-operation among all states in the world, of a comprehensive system of international security, under which the United Nations could, in accordance with its Charter, effectively maintain peace and security.

Allow me to outline to you the sequence of our practical actions to achieve these objectives.

First. At the negotiations on nuclear and space arms the Soviet delegation has been instructed to proceed from the 'global double zero' formula. Agreement has been reached to hold a meeting with the US Secretary of State in mid-September, as a separate event not linked to the session of the UN General Assembly.

Second. At the Geneva negotiations we have submitted a draft treaty on the 50 per cent

reduction in strategic arms and a draft agreement on strengthening the regime of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems. These are compromise drafts taking into account and seeking to accommodate the positions of the other side.

Third. The Soviet side has co-sponsored, together with other socialist countries, and submitted to the Conference on Disarmament for its consideration a document entitled "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Prohibition of Nuclear-Weapon Testing". We have put forward an initiative concerning the establishment of an international verification system to prevent the deployment of any weapons in outer space.

Fourth. A proposal by a group of socialist countries to establish a comprehensive system of international peace and security is being discussed at the United Nations.

I would like to address specifically the question of verification and its fundamental and practical aspects.

The experience of the past few years has shown that there is verification spoken of for propaganda purposes, and there is real, permanent verification.

Now, I would say that the philosophy underlying our approach to the problem of real verification gives a particularly full and clear idea of the evolution of our outlook, which has now developed into a system of unorthodox political views, in other words, into a new political thinking.

Fool-proof, indisputable, reliable and the most strict and rigorous methods providing 100 per cent confidence that weapons are indeed being eliminated, that obligations relating to the remaining weapons and permitted military activities are being complied with and that the bans are not being circumvented—this, and no less than this, is the verification that we envision.

The Soviet Union is proposing an exceptionally wide variety of forms and methods of verification—both national and international. All of them have been set forth in detail in the document, submitted to your forum on June 9, 1987, concerning the prohibition of nuclear weapons testing, and, by the way, some of them have already been and are being used in practice. I would like to remind you that US scientists equipped with appropriate monitoring instruments stayed for a long time in the area of our nuclear test site. The USSR Academy of Sciences has reached a new agreement with American colleagues to station monitoring equipment and exchange relevant data.

It is worth recalling that a short time ago our country made an extraordinary effort to achieve a cessation of nuclear testing. For a long time, we were observing our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, trying to persuade the United States to match our good example.

We ask the Conference on Disarmament to assist in achieving a Soviet-US agreement banning nuclear tests. I wish to emphasise that this is not a plea to take sides but rather an appeal for moral and political assistance in attaining a truly universal objective, which is to make nuclear testing past history.

However, for the time being nuclear testing continues, and you know who is to blame. Nuclear testing is still a fact of life for mankind.

It would be easier to reach agreement at the Soviet-US talks if one could be sure that other states, too, support a ban on nuclear testing and stand ready to become parties to a relevant international treaty. Precisely for this reason we believe that the search for agreement at the Soviet-US negotiations and the preparation of a comprehensive treaty within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament

should be undertaken concurrently.

As a practical step to advance the preparation of such a treaty we propose setting up a special group of scientific experts, which would be assigned the task of submitting to the Conference well-founded and agreed-upon recommendations on the structure and functions of a system of verification for any possible agreement not to conduct nuclear weapons tests.

We believe that there is also a need to establish an international system of global radiation safety monitoring, involving the use of space communication links. Such a system would be useful for more effectively verifying compliance with a ban on nuclear testing, once such a ban is imposed. At the same time it could be used to monitor the extent of pollution of the atmosphere, the soil and ground and oceanic waters on a global and regional scale. It would also provide an additional safeguard in case of any malfunction or, particularly, accident at nuclear power plants.

We establish a strong link between nuclear arms reductions—at this stage, reductions in intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles—and an accord on measures of verification.

They include an exchange of initial data concerning the two sides' missiles and verification of such data through on-site inspections.

We insist on a continuous monitoring of the process of destroying the missiles. The elimination of the relevant production base and infrastructure will also be subject to verification.

The system of verification that we propose is designed to create an atmosphere of absolute confidence that the agreement is not circumvented in any way.

And finally, we believe that there should be mandatory access to Soviet and US military facilities in third countries where missiles could be stationed.

As you can see, we expand the area of confidence to a maximum extent by opening up the territory of the USSR to inspections. However, complete confidence naturally presupposes complete reciprocity. An example and a confirmation of this is Stockholm and the decisions adopted there. This, I would say, is the material expression of the principle of confidence; this is new political thinking in action. Naturally, we would like its geographic scope not to be confined to one continent.

In our opinion, verification will have a particularly important role to play in preventing an arms race in space.

We would be extremely grateful if you took a close look at the proposal for the establishment of an international verification system to make sure that outer space remains peaceful. Is not the idea of inspecting every space launch quite reasonable? There are as yet not that many space-launch centres in the world and the presence of international inspectors there would reliably guarantee that the objects placed in outer space are not weapons and are not equipped with any weapons. But we go even further and propose not merely a presence but a permanent presence of groups of inspectors at all space launch sites. Information about each upcoming launch, including the location of the site, the type of launch vehicle, general information about the object to be launched and the time of launch, would be given in advance to members of the inspectorate.

What doubts can there be about the sincerity of the verification proposals made by a nation which is very actively involved in launching space objects?

All states engaged in space activities would be placed in an absolutely equal position and permanent monitoring by inspectors would

guarantee the reliability of verification. After all, a space launch complex is something that cannot be hidden. In this case the technology itself ensures a relative simplicity of verification and its effectiveness. Furthermore, our proposal provides for the right to conduct an on-site inspection should suspicion arise that a launch was carried out from an undeclared launch site.

And, in the event of a total ban on space-strike arms, the Soviet Union would be willing to extend inspections to storage facilities, industrial plants, laboratories, testing centres, and so on.

If a state has no intention of putting weapons in space, there can be no reason for it to object to international inspections of its space activities.

Space is a common asset of all mankind. It is much more than a training ground for military technocrats who cast away traditional humanistic ideals. It is a sphere for a peaceful application of peaceful efforts. It is this vision of outer space that the Soviet Union intends to pursue most vigorously.

Reflections about space inevitably lead one to think about the roads that humanity has to travel in order to reach its cherished goals. Some of those distances have yet to be covered from beginning to end, others have been covered half of the way, and there are still others where the end of the road is already in sight.

I would like to make a few comments about one of the long-sought goals which is within reach and which the Conference on Disarmament has almost attained.

What we have in mind is an event of great universal significance — a complete ban on chemical weapons and the elimination of their stockpiles. Two-thirds of a century has passed since the first gas attack at Ypres, which marked the beginning of military use of those barbaric weapons of mass annihilation. Ever since, governments of many nations and various international forums have sought to devise legal constraints on the production and use of lethal substances, but it is only now, in our time, that it is becoming possible to adopt a historic convention to that effect.

What could stand in the way of this? Only the attempts to draw up the draft of a future treaty with one hand while assembling canisters of binary chemical weapons with the other.

Need one say how immoral this is, how incompatible with the goal before us?

The Soviet Union will continue to co-operate actively with all the participants in the Conference on Disarmament so that the long-awaited convention can become a reality. We

did not dramatise the debates and differences that emerged in the process. Only one thing was considered absolutely imperative — that the Convention on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and Destruction of their Stockpiles should be adopted, and as early as possible.

I am instructed to inform you that the Soviet delegation at the negotiations on this question will proceed from the need to make legally binding the principle of mandatory challenge inspections without right of refusal. This decision is another vivid manifestation of our commitment to genuine and effective verification, in accordance with the principles of new political thinking.

In order to build an atmosphere of trust and in the interests of an early conclusion of an international convention, the Soviet side invites the participants in the chemical weapons negotiations to the Soviet military facility at Shikhany to see standard items of our chemical weapons and observe the technology of destroying chemical weapons at a mobile facility. We will later invite experts to the specialised plant for the destruction of chemical weapons now being built in the vicinity of the town of Chapayevsk.

I am informing you of this in the hope that the participants in the Conference will duly appreciate our desire to untie the most difficult problem knots that have appeared in the process of working out the convention.

Mr President,

Our external affairs are inseparable from our internal development, and the policy of restructuring, renewal, democratisation and openness moves us to act in a positive manner wherever the Soviet Union is represented, including here at the Conference on Disarmament.

Today, as never before, the most pressing problems of the contemporary world determine the role and importance of the Conference. In fulfilling its mission this representative conference can assert itself more forcefully by practical deeds matching the magnitude of the tasks before it.

There may be a need to consider the possibility of adopting a more intensive schedule of work. We would consider favourably a year-round schedule for the Conference with two or three recesses.

Why not hold an additional session of the Conference this year to complete most of the drafting of the Convention Banning Chemical Weapons?

At present it is impossible for the Conference to work with high efficiency without establishing an optimum balance between bilateral and multi-lateral negotiations on the problems of security. There should be no antagonism here but rather the principle of complementarity and mutually enriching interaction.

The practice of promptly informing the par-

ticipants in the Conference about the status of Soviet-US negotiations, particularly on the questions relating to items on the agenda of your forum, could be a first step in this direction. We intend to discuss this with our American partners and establish an appropriate procedure. We hope to be able to find mutual understanding with them.

Why are we talking about the need to intensify the work of the Conference? Because the negotiating machinery is running at a rate that is significantly slower than the pace of the arms race. A dangerous gap is emerging between political thought and political will, and military technology. This is evident from the records of the Conference, too: it has been fifteen years since the conclusion of the Convention on the Prohibition of Bacteriological Weapons, and the Convention Banning Military Use of Environmental Modification Techniques was worked out in 1977.

The Soviet Union regards improvement in the functioning of the Geneva forum as one way of redressing this disparity. We believe that in time the Conference could become a permanent universal body for disarmament negotiations.

And, of course, the Conference on Disarmament should not get used to the fact that the questions of ending the nuclear arms race, though they appear on its agenda, are actually not discussed here. Indeed, these issues should be made the focus of its activity. Today there is no other way. Nuclear disarmament cannot be the province of just a few powers. No government can stand on the sidelines in this matter, for the nuclear threat is global in its consequences. Those consequences transcend national boundaries and ideological differences. They do not recognise neutrality and they would spare no one.

If that is so, it is unfair to keep non-nuclear states from participating in solving the problems of nuclear disarmament. As Mikhail Gorbachev has repeatedly emphasised, a maximum degree of internationalisation is needed in these efforts. Genuine democratism and humanism in international relations call for precisely such an approach.

Proceeding from this premise, the Soviet Union will act constructively to enhance the prestige of the Conference as the principal nuclear disarmament forum, not just for exchanging views but for adopting the most responsible decisions.

Time is bringing us closer to the moment when word will finally become deed. The time of accomplishments is at hand — the accomplishments of which we have long been dreaming and towards which we have travelled long and difficult roads.

May there be your contribution, too, in these accomplishments. May it be tangible, substantive and significant. □

New York Times on Soviet-American relations

“Kicking the cold war habit” is the title of an editorial article published by the *New York Times* on Monday. The article calls for improving Soviet-US relations.

President Reagan can leave no greater legacy than to put forward new guidelines for managing the transition from cold war to peaceful competition with the USSR, the paper emphasises.

Hostility won't evaporate, of course. But opportunities are currently opening up for the United States to build its relations with the USSR more constructively, with less emphasis on arms and more on diplomacy and co-operation.

The *New York Times* expresses the view that

improvement of relations with the USSR is in the United States' interests. A number of fundamental principles should be abided by to achieve this goal. Arms control should be kept at the top of the negotiating agenda, the article says. Preventing nuclear war remains the overriding common interest.

The United States and the USSR worry about the proliferation of nuclear weapons, terrorism, overpopulation, the environment and scientific challenges. Calmer relations present an opportunity to address these concerns more effectively.

Certainly, there is a long way towards radical changes in US-Soviet relations. Yet the chances of succeeding are better now than ever, the *New York Times* believes. □

Mikhail Gorbachev For a “Common European Home” for a New Way of Thinking Speech at Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Meeting Prague, April 10, 1987

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

Price 30p.

DOCUMENTS of the Meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Member States Berlin, May 28-29, 1987

Price 30p

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

Igor Sinyavin's interview

THE Sinyavin family has returned to Moscow from New York.

In 1976 Igor Sinyavin left the Soviet Union for the West in search, as he put it at that time, of "freedom of creative activity". Eleven years later he has returned home.

Answering a question put by a TASS correspondent as to what the difference is between the Sinyavin who left the country in 1976 and the present one, he said:

"When living in the West I had to reassess very many things. We came to realise the main thing: ours is a great land which brings light to the world. Previously I had been self-centred in judging the situation and the world — what had I not been given and what was I lacking, and 'give me that and there's an end to it'.

"But what did I give to the world? Somehow I did not think about that. When in America I realised that for quite a long time I had sacrificed my energies to inhumanity, immorality and anti-art.

"I developed an understanding that there exist

not only personal questions but also questions to do with the country, and things much more tangible than that, and that we live only due to them. I have already overcome the psychology of endless negation and of the perpetual dissident who sees only bad aspects in life.

"I am an artist and when leaving for the West I hoped to live on the money earned from the sale of my pictures. However, on getting there, I encountered great difficulties. Of course, it would have been possible to put my pictures on display with the emigré artists. Their pictures pass mainly through the Nahamkin gallery. But in order to be connected with him, one has to be of the same political convictions, virtually to be anti-Soviet. All that was alien to me. Therefore I turned out to be on my own. I had to take up various jobs. I began working as a freight handler. Recently I was engaged in repairing apartments and in building work.

"At first, emigré anti-Soviet organisations showed interest in me. However, after I began to write my articles, I became the target of vilifications, slander and insinuations. Then FBI people took interest in me. They expressed

displeasure at my articles, which were at variance with the official American ideology, and suggested that I stop writing in such a spirit — emphasising that I would be subject to deportation from the United States.

"I failed to realise at first how difficult it was to feel torn away from your native land. When you breathe air, you think that it will always be available — for your entire life. Then you find yourself in an airless space, and you realise that what you need most of all is air.

"In the Soviet Union a person is valued for his or her lofty aspirations and for carrying some ethical potential, whereas over there a person is judged only by the size of his bank deposit.

"When you tell someone about some profound spiritual things, he looks at you and thinks how he can make money out of it. If he cannot make any money out of it, then you are of no value to him.

"When looking at Russia from afar, I realised that I could not exist without the native land. Every person, when he breaks away from the native land, loses his or her self as a personality." □

Vechernyaya Moskva on bulletin 'glasnost'

THE so-called bulletin *glasnost*, that has recently made its appearance in Moscow, replaces true values with prodigal demagoguery, the newspaper *Vechernyaya Moskva* writes in an article titled "Babblers on the Roadside".

Declaring in its foreword support for the restructuring course, *glasnost*, however, turns everything topsy-turvy, the article points out. The publishers' attention is focused on phenomena of the past — although the recent past — which have outlived themselves, rather than on the new that is becoming a feature of the country's life.

Vechernyaya Moskva's correspondents met

Sergei Grigoryants, who calls himself an editor of *glasnost*. He argued that the bulletin is not a dissident publication. This is at odds with foreign radio broadcasts in which the bulletin is publicised as a product of a group of dissidents to test the new policy of *glasnost* underway in the Soviet Union.

When the conversation touched on the issue of Grigoryants' past, he turned from a sociable host into a hysterical blackmailer. Explaining what it was that so much agitated him, the correspondents cite facts from case N1144/418 kept in the archives of the Moscow City Court.

These show that the editor of the bulletin *glasnost* — former political prisoner as he calls himself, and current dissident as he is billed abroad — allowed himself criminal "pranks" in the past also.

"In the period from spring 1971 to March 1974,

Sergei Grigoryants was engaged in profiteering in costly works of art and also in trades prohibited by law. . . . All told, Grigoryants cashed in 12,275 roubles from all his listed illicit dealings."

Let that report about a movement of political dissidents in the Soviet Union be left on the conscience of Reuter's News Agency. In actual fact, such a movement is non-existent. What does exist is ordinary low-standard speculation designed to gain political capital from Western anti-Sovieteers, to gain notoriety, and to get the title of "fighter for justice".

There is an expression common with motorists which goes "did not take the bend". It describes when a car skids, goes out of control and runs into a ditch. Doesn't the same lot await Grigoryants and co? It is clear, the article concludes, that they cannot take the bend. □

Soviet fisheries minister on USSR's Antarctic seal expedition

A SOVIET fisheries minister on Monday debunked charges made in Brussels by the international environmentalist organisation Greenpeace that the Soviet Union was "exterminating seals" in the Antarctic.

Nikolai Kudryavtsev, USSR First Deputy Fisheries Minister, explains in a *Pravda* article that in December 1986 and January 1987 a research expedition of two Soviet trapping vessels had conducted seal catches in the area of the D'Urville Sea and the Balleny Islands for scientific purposes.

"The expedition's tasks included studying the state of the stocks of different seal species, their role in the Antarctic ecosystem and possible ways of using Antarctic seals for economic needs," he says.

Apart from researchers collecting scientific

material, the ships' crews had included experienced fisheries inspectors who supervised the sealing operations, Kudryavtsev adds.

The expedition was carried out in keeping with the 1972 international convention on preserving Antarctic seals, whose signatories include the Soviet Union, Poland, New Zealand, Australia, the United States, and other countries.

"Just as envisaged by the convention, the Soviet Union notified all participating countries and the Scientific Council on Antarctic Research, by diplomatic channels, of the planned run," Kudryavtsev says.

"As a result of the expedition, a wide-ranging research programme has been fulfilled and 4,802 seals of different species, which is within the norm, have been trapped," he adds.

"As far as the number of Antarctic seals is concerned, their stocks amount — depending on the species — to millions or hundreds or thousands of animals.

"According to the data of foreign specialists the number of crab eaters, for instance, stands at between 15 and 30 million, Weddell seals at 800,000 and Southern fur-seals at over 900,000," Kudryavtsev continues, pointing also to a trend showing that seal stocks are on the increase — as confirmed by the Antarctic Scientific Research Council's expert group on seals which met in the United States in June 1986.

"Considering these facts, it is unlikely that anybody will have any doubts left about the groundless nature of the charges made by Greenpeace with respect to us," the Soviet Deputy Fisheries Minister adds.

The scientific material gathered in the course of the expedition is currently being processed and the detailed information resulting from the studies will be made available to all parties to the convention as well as to the Scientific Council on Antarctic Research. □

Soviet-US consultations on banning chemical weapons

THE sixth round of Soviet-US consultations in Geneva on banning chemical weapons has come to a close.

The consultations are held in accordance with the understanding reached at the Geneva summit meeting in November 1985.

Key issues, whose solution would promote the conclusion of an international convention on a complete, effective and verifiable ban on chemical weapons and on the elimination of the industrial base for their production, were discussed during the consultations.

The Soviet delegation explained in detail the new initiatives, put forward on August 6 in the speech by Eduard Shevardnadze at the Conference on Disarmament, in the field of banning chemical weapons.

In connection with the proposal on the mandatory nature of inspections on request without a right to deny such inspections, it was emphasised within the context of a future convention that the Soviet Union is in favour of establishing the most rigid system of international control over the observance of obligations by countries parties to the convention.

Practical aspects were discussed of a possible visit by US representatives to a Soviet military facility in the area of the town of Shikhan to become acquainted with standard specimens of chemical munitions and with technology for destroying chemical weapons at a mobile complex.

It was agreed that in October 1987 Soviet representatives will visit a US facility for

the destruction of the stocks of chemical weapons at Thule.

US representatives will be invited to visit a special plant for the destruction of chemical weapons. The plant is under construction in the Soviet Union in the area of the town of Chapayevsk.

The Soviet side emphasised that realisation of the US Administration's plans to unfold the production of binary chemical weapons would seriously complicate the conclusion of a convention banning chemical weapons.

The Soviet delegation at the bilateral Soviet-US consultations was headed by Ambassador Yuri Nazarkin, and the US delegation was led by Ambassador Max Friedersdorf. □

Central America: The way to peace is open

AGREEMENTS reached at the meeting of the Presidents of five Central American states in Guatemala late last week are crucial for establishing peace in the region — such is the unanimous opinion of the Latin American press, politicians and public leaders of the continent.

The Declaration signed in Guatemala received support on Sunday from foreign ministers of the Contadora Group and its support group, who held a meeting in the Brazilian city of Sao Paulo. They issued a joint statement on the instruction of the presidents of Venezuela, Colombia, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay expressing profound satisfaction with the political will for peace expressed by the Central American states.

The plan drafted in Guatemala, the statement stresses, sets the stage for a long-term solution of the Central American problem on the basis of observing the principles of mutual security, self-determination and democracy.

The success of the summit meeting of the

five Central American countries marks a major defeat for the US Administration. On the eve of the meeting in Guatemala, President Reagan put forward his own peace plan for the region which amounted to an attempt to wreck the meeting and cause a split among its participants. However, the heads of the Central American states did not even consider this plan. Moreover, they adopted a Declaration which called on the USA to halt military and economic aid to the 'contras' used by the American Administration to try to topple the legitimate Government of Nicaragua.

The Presidents have agreed on the necessary steps to achieve a ceasefire and prevent the use of their territories for destabilising the governments of other Central American countries. Thus, they unequivocally spoke in favour of a peaceful settlement of the situation in the region, against the US course of fomenting the conflict.

There is one more major outcome of the Guatemala Conference. The Central American leaders proved that they can by themselves, without the participation of Washington, take decisions of vital importance for the destinies of

their peoples. They reaffirmed that a political dialogue rather than confrontation must underlie relations between the countries in the region. Taken together, all this gives ground to believe that the Guatemala decisions are really historic and pave the way to a long-awaited peace in Central America. □

At the USSR Foreign Ministry

Zaire's Charge d'Affaires in Moscow was summoned to the USSR Foreign Ministry on August 8 and a resolute protest was expressed to him in connection with the totally unfounded expulsion of three members of the staff of the USSR Embassy in Kinshasa on July 31.

The Soviet side described the said move by the Zaire authorities as an unfriendly, provocative action vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, the whole responsibility for whose inevitable negative consequences is totally borne by the Zaire side.

The Zaire Charge d'Affaires was told that the Soviet side has found it necessary to demand that Zaire Embassy Counsellor Emani Mata Likambe and two technical workers of the Embassy, Bessimo Bossamba and Ngoi Katende leave the Soviet Union within 48 hours. □

Soviet Television on Central America

THERE is clearly a lack of new thinking, new approaches to crisis situations in the USA, and this is also felt in the US attitude to Central America. This was pointed out in Soviet television's International Panorama programme last Sunday.

On August 6, the programme's introducer recalled, a press conference was given by the US President and Secretary of State on the so-called "Peace Plan for Central America" drawn up in Washington. Of interest are the objectives which have been openly proclaimed by the United States in this connection. First, that there should be no bases belonging to the Soviet Union, Cuba or the other "communist states" in Nicaragua. But there are no such bases there and there have been no plans to build them.

The second objective spelled out by the Americans is that Nicaragua should not be,

as they put it, a base for subversive actions against neighbour states. And this is said about Nicaragua — herself the target of aggression and foreign intervention. The third objective is that Nicaragua should "secure rights" in its own country. But human rights, the introducer said, are violated precisely by the undeclared war waged by the United States against this Central American republic. This is by no means done by the Sandinistas. It is not accidental that when Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega declared his readiness to sit down at the negotiating table with the USA and discuss both the US proposals and those of the Sandinistas, Washington refused pointblank.

The US Administration needs a "Peace Plan for Central America" in order to get a free hand to address new requests to the US Congress about the appropriation of large funds for supporting counter-revolution and for waging an interventionist war against Nicaragua. International Panorama stressed. □

LATVIA:

A Path Chosen Twice

1917-1940

Documentary Account

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

Price 40p.

The Imperative of the Nuclear Age

by *Izvestia* political observer Alexander Bovin — on the new way of political thinking which alone can guide us to a world without nuclear weapons

Price 40p

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