

## Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Yugoslavia Speech at reception at Federation House

YUGOSLAVIA's Collective Presidency and the Presidium of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia Central Committee gave a reception in honour of Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the Federation House last Tuesday.

In his speech Mikhail Gorbachev said —

Esteemed Comrade Mojsov

Esteemed Comrade Kronic

Dear friends

We began to feel the atmosphere of well-wishing, cordiality and benevolence and the friendliest attitude towards us from the first minutes on Yugoslav soil.

On behalf of my comrades and on my own behalf, I want to extend sincere thanks to the Yugoslav leaders and the residents of Belgrade for hospitality and friendliness and for the expression of good feelings towards the Soviet people.

In our talks at the Collective Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, we had a thorough exchange of views with Yugoslav comrades on the broadest range of issues.

We talked about the history of our relations, the world in which we are living and the prospects and future for our socialist societies.

In short, it was a frank, comradely and businesslike discussion that, we hope, will give a good impetus to all Soviet-Yugoslav relations.

This will undoubtedly be promoted by the declaration we have adopted. It endorses all the major provisions of the historic documents of 1955-1956. At the same time it reflects the rich experience accumulated in the previous decades and the substantial changes that have occurred around the world.

We agree with the Yugoslav leaders that this document creates a good basis for developing Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation for years ahead.

Our common aspiration is to look in a creative way for new sources, extend our mutual ties and

diversify forms for concerted efforts.

Speaking of the economy, it is time that relations resting on the principle of simple goods exchange — you give us, we give you — be replaced with more mature relations based on the summation of efforts, use of each other's strong points and cooperation.

Cooperation is a true symbol of the times. At present, a nation's potential, its stability and ability to brave the changing winds of the world economic situation largely depend on its valency, as chemists would say, on its ability to enter into combination with one another and establish fruitful mutual ties.

In our conversation with the Yugoslav comrades we attached prime attention to the most topical problems of today, problems that touch upon the interests of our states, the way of life of our peoples. I mean the question of imparting new quality to socialist society.

As a matter of fact, the main characteristic trait of the current historical period is that the socialist world is witnessing a process of change and reform designed to give the new social system a second breath and raise it substantially in all areas — economic, political and ideological.

This process, naturally, is diverse. In each country it has its own national specifics and this in and by itself proves how wrong it is to look at socialism as an unvaried society incapable of self-development and renewal.

We firmly believe in socialism's future. Certainly, perestroika started by us in the Soviet Union will take much creative effort by the Party and the people and time. Yet we are convinced that we have opted for the right way which will enable us to improve considerably the conditions of life of the people and lend fresh attractiveness to the very socialist idea.

Comrades, in the talks, naturally, particularly close attention was devoted to the fields of international life, where the interests of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia are in direct contact, in the first place the pressing problems of the struggle for peace and disarmament, of the situation in Europe and the role of nonaligned states in world politics.

This movement has traversed a long and difficult path since the first conference which was held here in Belgrade. It has grown quantitatively many times over and strengthened its international prestige.

Perhaps, its greatest achievement is that the nonaligned states act from common positions on the fundamental issues of today, despite their social and political distinctions. These issues include disarmament and support for the fight of peoples for freedom and independence, restructuring economic relations on principles of justice, establishing a new information order and others.

It is precisely due to such consistency of aim that the movement plays an increasingly noticeable positive role in world affairs, and makes a growing impact on decisions at the U.N. and other international forums.

The Soviet Union has many good friends,

among the nonaligned states. We respect their status and strive to take into account the positions of this movement as a major political force of our time.

In today's interrelated and contradictory world, burdened by acute global problems and stuffed with weapons of mass annihilation, we all have no business more important than erecting a barrier in the way of the threat of war.

Now the first albeit small step has been made in this direction. Yet for it to be followed by other steps, a high political sense of responsibility should be displayed by each and everyone.

We are expressing frankly, without beating about the bush, our negative attitude to the attempts by some political forces in the West to compensate for the disarmament which has started with a new rearmament.

But as soon as we start talking about this the Western press raises a clamour that the Soviet Union is allegedly out to drive a wedge between the USA and NATO, between other members of that bloc. I have already had occasion to say and I will say again — we have never had and do not have such designs. We are only against deepening the split of the continent, for building and furnishing an all-European home that will be truly comfortable for the peoples' life.

First of all, a well-considered, inspiring and at the same time realistic concept is essential for this. The elaboration of such a concept of Europe's future can be, of course, the result of only the creative endeavour of all European countries. Non-Europeans can also make their contribution to it. Our thoughts about the continent's unity are far from the idea of its exclusiveness, from Euro-centrism.

This work does not begin from scratch. Its foundation contains much of what already came into being during the Helsinki process. The question is what is to be done further.

As nowhere else, it is necessary here to reduce first of all the arsenals of nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons. Security can be only equal for all and the strictly defensive character of the military doctrines should become its major condition.

It is very important to create reliable machinery for a peaceful and civilised solution to contentious issues. Life is full of contradictions, and perhaps particularly abounds in them nowadays. While recognising the diversity of state, national and economic interests, it is essential to secure that clashes between them do not assume a destructive character. What is necessary is an honest and effective policy of European good-neighbourliness, a policy from positions based on the new thinking.

The economy, one can say, is the binding element in building international relations. Trade contacts and economic cooperation exist and develop between all European countries, increasing already now a certain unity — even if so far a weak one.

What will, in the final analysis, determine the future: Cocom, the policy of sanctions, isolating

### IN THIS ISSUE

Mikhail Gorbachev in Yugoslavia .....	p. 101
Speech at reception at Federation House .....	p. 101
Visit to Ivo Lola Ribar Amalgamation in Belgrade .....	p. 102
Speech at Yugoslavia's Federal Assembly .....	p. 103
Talks with Bosko Kronic .....	p. 106
Visit to Dubrovnik and Ljubljana .....	p. 107
Soviet-Yugoslav Declaration .....	p. 108

economic alliances and associations; or cooperation and coordination and gradual headway towards a really all-European market? It is needless to say that overcoming the existing barriers in the sphere of the economy, science and technology will be of benefit to everyone.

The same applies to culture. Notwithstanding all the difference and diversity of the cultural life of the European peoples it has many things in common. It is quite within one's power to identify and consolidate this community nowadays, in the age of electronics, informatics and modern communications. Besides, if one thinks about the peaceful future of Europe, it is vitally needed.

Many changes have come about now. Cultural exchanges proceed on a wider scale. Exhibitions, theatrical performances, concerts and tv bridges provide food for mutual familiarisation. Europe's west and east have ceased to shun each other.

This is how we visualise ways towards further building the common European home. If the leaders of Western powers who often talk about the need to overcome division in Europe are really interested in this, there is now emerging in our view an historic chance for movement in this direction.

More contacts and greater respect towards the social choice and historical and cultural traditions of every people, one would like to believe that European and world politics will develop in the coming years precisely in this direction.

The other path is irrational and would go counter to all peoples' interests. Moreover it would be simply ruinous.

Dear friends,

The peoples of our two countries are brought together by very many things — distant history, the combat comradeship-in-arms of the war years, the affinity of cultures and languages,

and the versatile business cooperation over the recent decades.

Here in Yugoslavia one feels these ties in a particularly keen way.

We are yet to see a good deal on the remaining days in the visit. But I can say already now that it is pleasant to see the good fruits of long years of intense work by Yugoslav Communists and working people of the country.

Allow me, comrades, once again to express confidence that as a result of our meetings and talks Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation will develop and grow stronger for the benefit of the peoples of the two countries and in the interests of peace and socialism.

We wish the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the fraternal Yugoslav people successes in all their endeavours and undertakings.

## Visits Ivo Lola Ribar Amalgamation in Belgrade

LAST Tuesday Mikhail Gorbachev visited the Yugoslav machine-building amalgamation named after Ivo Lola Ribar, leader of the League of Communist Youth of Yugoslavia, killed in 1943.

Mikhail Gorbachev inspected the shop manufacturing numerically-controlled machine-tools, machining centres and industrial robots. The managers of the enterprise told the Soviet guest about the system of organisation of industrial planning and marketing of products, about the working conditions of workers and engineers, and the procedure of their participation in making decisions on fundamental matters of production and social matters.

A meeting with representatives of the self-government bodies, managers and sociopolitical organisations of the amalgamations was held.

Greeting the Soviet leader, the general director M. Milojevic emphasised — "Our collective takes pride in the fact that numerous machine-tools and instruments it manufactures have been installed at Soviet plants. And this cooperation is developing. We are not going to rest content with what has been achieved. We highly appreciate the course of perestroika in the Soviet Union as it exerts immediate influence on the advance in our relations."

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke at the meeting. He said:

"Dear Yugoslav friends; first of all, let me thank you with all my heart for the warmth and cordiality shown by the workers of your enterprise.

"We realise what explains this — the friendship between our parties and peoples, between the working class of the two countries is at the basis of any meeting on Yugoslav soil. This is why our contacts are marked by warmth, sincerity and benevolence. I want to assure you that this friendship is treasured by the Soviet people, by communists and non-Party people, young people and the aged alike. They have been doing everything to preserve it and will be doing their utmost to strengthen it. You can be certain of this.

"I am glad to greet you cordially on behalf of our delegation, firstly for the reason that we

know that the Ivo Lola Ribar plant is the firstling of the industry of people's Yugoslavia. The amalgamation shows convincingly the achievements of people's Yugoslavia, the achievements of socialism, and I congratulate you on this. You know how to work. We wish you new great successes.

"The amalgamation also shows how versatile and close the relations between our countries and our peoples have become. The machinery manufactured by your amalgamation has been installed at enterprises in Moscow, Minsk and many other cities. Such is the scope our cooperation has assumed. I think it is useful for you and for us as it enables us to resolve jointly the tasks of advancing forward shoulder-to-shoulder.

"Let us do all that the present-day situation requires us. We are confident that socialism has huge potentials above all for the reason that this is the working people's system that gives scope for the activity of people in the production, political and other areas of life. Relying on this activity and stimulating it we should discharge the present tasks that are not easy. We are equal to these tasks, I am sure.

"The visit confirms the high level of our cooperation. We had yesterday very substantive and prolonged debates, exchange of opinion and information at the Collective Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia with a delegation headed by Comrade Mojsov. We continued the talks today at the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia with the League leadership headed by Comrade Kronic. We are greatly satisfied with these talks. What has been accomplished serves our peoples and countries and is to the benefit of socialism, and what is more it promotes establishing sound relations in the world. But noting all this, we nevertheless devoted our talks above all and chiefly to what should be done so that our cooperation should be expanded and strengthened, become more profound and comprise political dialogue, economic cooperation and cooperation in the sphere of science and culture, at the federal level, at the regional level, at the level of enterprises and at the level of personal contacts.

"To my mind, great awareness of the importance of this cooperation was shown on both sides. I think that we congratulate ourselves upon the fact that our relations have entered the stage of an intensive dialogue, and this should gladden us.

"We have discussed questions of expanding

Party ties, and it was established that a great deal can be done in this area. Of very much importance now is working out a policy suiting the requirements of the times. This is why the exchange of experience and debates on topical questions of socialist construction that help expand the potential of socialism are greatly important for the Communists of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. And this means that Party cooperation will be fruitful and businesslike. Such ties promote developing the friendship between our peoples and suit the interests of world socialism. In view of the fact that the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia play a substantial role in the world and already exert serious impact on the world processes we have given much time to the discussion of the situation in the world. We discussed how we should act in order to promote the disarmament process so that the struggle of the peoples for the elimination of nuclear arms and the reduction of other kinds of armaments — chemical weapons and conventional armaments — should strengthen. We have discussed topical questions connected with the restructuring of the development of ties in the world to improve the situation. Our talk was very serious. It was about burning problems related to our bilateral ties and to problems of the development of present-day socialism and topical international questions.

"We are satisfied with how the talks passed. They were marked by openness and broad coincidence of our views. The atmosphere was candid, cordial and friendly. Please regard this as the first account of what has been accomplished by our delegation and the Yugoslav leadership in less than two days. I think that acting in this way the Soviet delegation and the Yugoslav leadership have done the main thing — expressed the will of the Yugoslav people and of the Soviet people who declare for the consolidation of friendship and for the utmost development of our ties.

"Speaking here to your collective I would like to say a few words about economic cooperation. Yes, we develop cooperation successfully, but it still largely has the nature of trade. And trade alone cannot carry you very far, as our saying goes. Cooperation, rational division of labour, scientific and technical cooperation and supplementing each other's efforts are needed. I think what we are discussing these days will impart precisely this nature to our cooperation. It is not easy to combine economic mechanisms, technological approaches, competence and way of thinking. But it is only by advancing along this road

that we can pick up tempo and keep abreast of advanced countries.

"The Soviet Union is now doing very much to overhaul its economy. I wish to thank you, dear Comrade Milojevic, for the support for our perestroika. This wide-ranging revolutionary work has been launched in our vast country which we love, to which we are dedicated and to which we devote our life and intellectual and physical resources. Perestroika is the policy we have chosen. We need it. But we also realise that our perestroika will be hugely important for the whole world. Therefore we are aware of our responsibility not only in connection with vast tasks we are resolving to impart great dynamism to socialism, to our Soviet society and to put it on a new level and impart new quality to it. We are also aware of the responsibility to our friends in the socialist countries and to the working people all over the world.

"There is no going back. We cannot even afford to stop. We have one choice only. And we shall be confidently making progress, certainly without adventurism, without great leaps, without skipping any stages. We shall be firmly and consistently advancing along the chosen road. And our road can be summed up as the road of democratisation of society to enlist

all resources of the working class, peasantry, intelligentsia, youth and veterans — the entire resources in our society — in perestroika and renewing our socialist society.

"We take the road of a radical economic reform, but the main thing in it is democratisation so that the role of enterprises and of work collectives should grow. And we wish to be achieving this in such a way that, while developing the independence and responsibility of work collectives, of republics and regions, we also preserve the important regulating role of the centre as this is the advantage of socialism. We should establish the correct relationship between democratism and the wide development of the initiative of work collectives in localities, and the centre which is shaping a correct policy, fashioning technological policy and economic policy. This is also very important as this makes it possible to avoid errors that cost dearly when they are made, particularly in such a state as the Soviet Union.

"And, finally, the Soviet Union is a country inhabited by many peoples, more than 100 nationalities, consisting of republics, autonomous regions and national districts. This is the reality in our country. And everything that we

have achieved so that we have reached such a position in the world is the result of the common interest and equality of the peoples. Precisely this approach made it possible to develop all republics and turn them into large complexes of the national economy. But even these tasks have new elements now. All the republics have developed greatly. They are educated peoples. National intelligentsia formed in every republic. The dignity of each people is enhanced. We cannot resolve any matter now without taking into account the situation in the republics, without considering the interest of each nation and each people inhabiting the vast expanses of our country. We are reminded of this wherever we forget it.

"We give much attention to all these questions in the process of perestroika. As a matter of fact, this is all I had to tell you. It could only be added that we declare for all-round cooperation of socialist countries, for interaction with them in all directions and for safeguarding and consolidating world peace. And we do not merely proclaim our wish and striving for peace but manifest it in real politics, in actual initiatives in all directions of the struggle for the improvement of the international situation."

## Speech at Yugoslavia's Federal Assembly

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV made the following speech to Yugoslavia's Federal Assembly on Thursday:

Esteemed Comrade Rozic

Esteemed Delegates to the Federal Assembly

I am sincerely grateful for the invitation to visit the supreme agency of state authority and self-government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and address its people's elected representatives.

I would like first of all to convey heartfelt greetings to you, all working people and all citizens of your country from the Soviet people.

Availing myself of this opportunity to thank you warmly for the hospitality accorded us during these days, I am deeply moved by the warmth and cordiality of the meetings and the sincere expression of feelings of friendship for the Soviet people. I can assure you that Soviet people have the same feelings for the peoples of Yugoslavia.

On days like this it is appropriate to recall many remarkable pages in the history of relations between our countries. On more than one occasion Russian troops and volunteers have come to the aid of Yugoslavs fighting for their freedom. And can one forget about the thousands upon thousands of Yugoslav internationalists who defended the great cause of the October Revolution side by side with the workers and peasants of revolutionary Russia?

The events of the past war have become for ever engraved on the memory of our peoples.

When Hitler's hordes intruded into Soviet territory, when our army and people absorbed the blow of an enormous war-making machine drawing on the manpower and industrial resources of almost the entire continent, and when many European countries, crushed by the Nazi heel and shaken by the outrage committed upon them, were as yet only breeding anger and hatred for the enslavers, struggle against the invaders was already mounting in Yugoslavia's mountains and plains at the call and under the guidance of the communists and which developed into a popular war.

The defenders of my fatherland were supported and warmed by the awareness that they were not alone, that in the south of Europe, thousands of

kilometres from the Soviet-German front, our Yugoslav brothers were fighting as well.

Conversely, news from the gigantic, unprecedented battle raging across thousands of kilometres from the White Sea to the Black Sea, a battle whose outcome has, without any exaggeration, determined the destiny of Europe, and perhaps that of all human civilisation as well for decades ahead, was, of course, of vital significance to the troops of the popular liberation army of Yugoslavia.

Our people and our army held out and, relying on the backing of their allies and the resistance movement of European peoples, which turned into a formidable force, routed fascism. Together with Marshal Tito's troops Soviet liberator soldiers entered jubilant Belgrade in the autumn of 1944.

Let us pay a tribute to the exploit of those people and bow to the memory of those who fell fighting for freedom, independence, honour and dignity of our peoples.

After fascism was smashed, a new era was begun in human history. It was one of the wonderful periods when peoples had the opportunity as if to arrange their states anew and decide which laws to live by and which principles and morals to follow. It was a time of wrecking and building, with much of what humanity is rightly proud of today as well as many acute outstanding current problems all rooted in it.

It was a time of forming new contacts in the international community and signing various agreements. The Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Post-War Cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, signed in 1945, came as the logical follow-on to the sworn brotherhood in battle.

Unfortunately the good relations between our countries were soon disrupted, the treaty ruptured. Baseless charges were made against the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. The resultant conflict inflicted much damage both to Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, and to the cause of socialism.

I found it necessary to speak about this today so as to leave no place for wariness, suspiciousness, mistrust and hurt which, as history shows, so easily originate in relations between peoples and are subsequently overcome with such difficulty.

It should be spoken about so as to stress the significance of the conclusions drawn from the lessons of the past. So as to be able to build relations firmly and unflinchingly on the basis of complete equality, independence and mutual respect.

Only when the past is truthfully and honestly interpreted is it possible to realise and appreciate in full measure what has been done by our two parties to get over the alienation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Three decades on, we can see the unfading significance of the Soviet-Yugoslav documents of 1955-56.

The principles formulated in them have stood the test of time and formed the dependable political foundation for stable relations between our countries and peoples. They have also evoked a broad international response and made modern political culture. And we do justice to the acumen of the leaders who stood at the sources of those documents.

Looking at how Soviet-Yugoslav relations have developed over the years, one can see that from one stage to another, economic co-operation has kept increasing, the scope of political interaction has got broader and cultural contacts between our peoples has grown richer in content. Practically every several years the process has been stimulated by summits and the signing of programmatic documents. The last such meeting was with a delegation from the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, led by Comrade Renovica, in Moscow in December 1986, which is memorable to all.

We view our current visit as a direct follow-up on a good tradition. The talks we've held with comrades Mojsov, Kronic and other Yugoslav leaders have shown a mutual desire to elevate our interstate and interparty relations to a new high and lend them a new quality. This has by mutual agreement been sealed in the Soviet-Yugoslav declaration we have adopted.

Along with practical matters, Yugoslav comrades and we have also had a useful exchange of opinions on the fate and problems of socialism, including those that were the subject of arguments in the past.

We are most satisfied with the fruitful discussion of these questions at the meeting in the central committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

The socialist system everywhere has common features and first of all these are power of the working people, public ownership and absence of exploitation.

But commonality does not rule out diversity. The strength of socialism is in its being multicoloured and in its rich international experience. This is why we set great store by — and regard as a sign of maturity in relations between

socialist countries — the organic blend of the independence of every party and state with respect for the mutual interests, views and experience of one another.

As we near the end of the 20th Century, world socialism is living, one can say, through a period of reconstruction and reform. We also all feel the need for updating the machinery of interaction between socialist nations and making it more efficient. Our common intentions to extend Soviet-Yugoslav co-operation to cover the entire field of social affairs and step up contacts at government, parliament, party and grassroots levels in the areas of science, culture, education, sport, tourism and youth organisations are quite in line with this trend.

It is only understandable that both sides expect much from developing economic ties. For more than ten years now the Soviet Union has been Yugoslavia's biggest trading partner. Your country, for its part, is seen in my country as a good, long-term economic partner. So our mutual interest is obvious.

But to maintain the amount and dynamics of trade, we should not only look for extra raw material and community resources. The main thing is to reshape the pattern of economic relations, by launching specialised and co-operative production arrangements on a wide scale, forming direct ties between enterprises, setting up mixed-capital firms and associations, and ensuring joint operations in the markets of third countries.

Both sides are prepared to act in this direction. The tasks facing us are challenging, but feasible. It is also plain that the economic reform pursued in my country and the novelties in the economic machinery of Yugoslavia are creating favourable prerequisite conditions for co-operative arrangements.

Comrades, we know that the communists and working people of Yugoslavia are demonstrating a lively interest in what is happening in the Soviet Union, in our perestroika.

When three years ago we were standing at its fountainhead, the overriding question was how to advance to a higher level of development and which forces to activate. We first had to take a new look around and see what's what in our society — which things in it meet the basic values of socialism, which are of a transient nature as they shaped under emergency conditions, and which, finally, must be discarded as a result of mistakes and deformities.

We see perestroika as a revolutionary breakthrough into the future and at the same time as a return to the permanent values corresponding to Lenin's concept of socialism. We are well aware that the moral climate in society is largely determined by how honest and principled a policy is and by how words are matched by deeds. This is why we objectively assess our past and candidly talk about the problems and difficulties of today.

I think that those of you who have visited the Soviet Union have been able to feel how vibrant our social life has become and in what a bold and off-beat manner people have begun to think.

Perestroika is a new effort, but it already has its history, or more precisely its pre-history. We have left behind analysing the situation in an all-round way and evolving development strategy. We are now entering the period of thorough-going and sweeping change.

With the law on state enterprises now in force, the rights of worker collectives have been broadened dramatically and the electivity of managers is becoming a norm. The pay-your-own-way system is being phased in, along with new forms of organising and motivating labour. People are learning to live in conditions where one cannot remain on the sidelines and reserve one's opinion to oneself and where everyone has to assume responsibility for the job in hand and share in decision-making. Conditions are being created for developing co-op and individual enterprise projects.

The scope of the processes involved in economic reform can be seen, for example, from the fact that factories responsible for some 60 percent of industrial output have adopted the new system, in-

cluding the principles of independence, repayment, self-financing and self-government.

Are there any difficulties? There are, and quite a few of them. One group of problems is due to the transitional period itself, when the new economic machinery is not yet fully in place everywhere. Others stem from faltering social psychology and the misconception of socialism as a society of general egalitarianism in supplies. We have now set the task of making sure that the socialist principle of distribution be effected everywhere, that the personal contribution by everyone to public wealth be taken into account as accurately as possible, and that conscientious, dedicated-work, talent and inspiration be really esteemed.

Perestroika has also put revamping the political system as a pressing problem on the order of the day. We plan to discuss this issue thoroughly at the national party conference due in summer.

We are thinking how to delimit the functions of state and party agencies better, rid them of formalism, breathe new life into the soviets of people's deputies, improve the election system, furnish the essential prerequisites — legal, economic, moral and political — for socialist self-government by the people, and strengthen law and order.

We will have to ponder in real earnest the issue of upgrading inter-ethnic relations. It is one of the more important and delicate issues of life in such a multinational state as the Soviet Union. Our starting positions here are solid. Recently, when the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution was celebrated in Moscow, we spoke with justified content about the results of the Leninist nationalities policy and about how much has been done in the country for the economic advancement and cultural flourishing of the numerous peoples inhabiting our fatherland and for their living in friendship and accord.

Take any union or autonomous republic or any region you like, and you'll see that it is now connected with all the other parts of the country by thousands of links and is part and parcel of the integral national economic and political complex that has taken shape over the years of Soviet government.

But it would, of course, be wrong to treat the issues of nationalities and inter-ethnic relations as matters that have been resolved once and for all. In their development there are difficulties which we have inherited from the past and there are problems engendered by the passage of time and by changes in the economic life of society, in social relations and in public mentality.

We think it essential to ensure their democratic resolution in line with the interests of both each individual ethnic group in the Soviet family and of our socialist society as a whole.

I would like to stress that the changes in our society are solidly linked with the activities of the communist party. The CPSU has initiated perestroika and at the current, watershed, juncture in the development of Soviet society its role as the political vanguard of the people is especially great. And it is our conviction that the party can perform the crucial tasks confronting it, not by way of commands and injunctions, but by leading the popular drive for a revolutionary renewal of society and consolidating the two-way contact with the working class, farmers, intellectuals and all sections of the population.

We pursue our perestroika, proceeding, naturally enough, from the conditions and requirements of our own country, and are by no means going to pass it off for a universal model and a prescription suiting all.

But we see its international aspect clearly as well. For both the fate of the new social system and the future of civilisation itself depend on the updating of the theory and practices of socialism and on the ability of communists to take full account of the changes taking place in the world under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution.

Our party and the Soviet people are determined to carry perestroika through to the end and thereby to make a contribution of their own to per-

forming the historic task that has come to face the communist movement and all advocates of socialism.

And now, comrades, let me share with you some considerations on international affairs.

Over the past few decades the world has known periods of tension and temporary relaxation, flare-ups of the 'cold war' and relative thaws in the international climate. But one thing remained unchanged: the level of arms, most notably nuclear ones, kept rising, while that of general security kept declining.

And now, for the first time ever, it has proved possible to start moving in the opposite direction — not to an arms build-up and not even to a mere arms freeze, but to cuts in nuclear arsenals.

Although the treaty signed in Washington is still before the Soviet and American law-makers, humanity has at last got hope.

It takes more than one gulp to quench a thirst, of course. The Washington treaty provides for abolishing just four to five percent of the deadly weapons. But it is no less, and even more, important that this is the first step to a nuclear-free world and in general to stopping the arms race. It creates a kind of initial infrastructure for disarmament and is connected with the mastering of various instruments, forms and methods without which this process cannot make further headway. I mean first of all an effective monitoring system to check the nuclear missiles' destruction and a package of confidence-building and verification measures in general.

Officially, the treaty has been signed by two countries, namely the Soviet Union and the United States, but in fact there are all grounds for considering it a collective creation of international reason, the result of an effort involving dozens of states, both those belonging to the two military-political groups and neutral, non-aligned ones.

At every phase in its preparation, starting from its conception, we have discussed all related issues constantly and in detail with our Warsaw Treaty allies, taken counsel with other socialist nations, including, naturally, Yugoslavia, and consulted practically all European, and not only European, countries.

So it can safely be said that the technology of preparing agreements of this kind has in the main been mastered. It only remains to use it effectively, making the necessary adjustments and changes, of course, since along with nuclear ones, other kinds of weapons — chemical and conventional ones — will be covered as well.

Are there chances for success in the near future?

I believe that one can answer this question with guarded optimism: there certainly are such chances, but quite a few serious hurdles are yet to be cleared in order to finally halt the arms race and throw the door to a nuclear-free and non-violent world wide open for humanity.

Good groundwork has been laid in Washington and it has been agreed to continue vigorous work on an agreement for halving the strategic offensive arms of both sides on condition that the ABM Treaty is preserved, as signed in 1972. After the meeting in the United States, it has already proved possible to achieve certain results during the visit of US Secretary of State George Shultz to the USSR. It is of immense significance that the strategic nuclear arms reduction talks are taking place amid keen and well-willing attention on the part of the entire world community. I'll tell you this: I have to meet with politicians, including conservatively-minded ones, often and not one of them has voiced doubts about the need to further the Soviet-American dialogue on disarmament.

It is another matter that heated debates are now in progress on both sides of the Atlantic on exactly what the agreements now on the agenda should be like.

We consider this to be quite normal. For each country the interests of its security are important and it stands to reason that when discussing these questions political circles and the public at large express differing points of view. In the process clearly exaggerated demands are also being set forth. But in the long run the art of politics, the

art of talks is precisely in bringing the different viewpoints to a common denominator by way of a reasonable compromise, in finding a balance of interests.

It is from these positions that we evaluate the results of the recent meeting of the leaders of Nato countries. The impression is a dual one. At first glance views were expressed in support of continuing efforts to scale down the race in nuclear and other weapons and developing the Helsinki process.

But one can only be alerted by the fact that formulas of quite a different sort have sounded there much more frequently. Some leaders of the North Atlantic Alliance obviously tried to combine what cannot be combined: approval of the INF Treaty with demands to compensate for it by building up other armaments, in particular on Nato's southern flank; and recognition of the need to reduce conventional armaments, to remove imbalances, with a stubborn defence of the doctrine of 'nuclear deterrence'.

These obvious contradictions, if not to say absurdities, have quite definite political causes. Those who have ossified perceptions that were dominant before the meeting in Reykjavik and before the Washington accords are frightened by the very thought of parting with nuclear arms which they view as a symbol of power and an instrument of genuinely influencing the course of international events. But since it is awkward to admit this openly they continue to insist on the purported existence of a threat posed by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty and try to salvage at least something of the 'enemy image' that is now being eroded by the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

All the thoughts and actions of the Soviet Union and our socialist allies are directed at finally pulling out the roots of the cold war which are embedded in economic relations, politics, diplomacy, culture, and the consciousness and mentality of people.

We are working tirelessly for this.

Undoubtedly disarmament, first of all nuclear disarmament, is the main task.

Everybody agrees that the reduction of armed forces and armaments of the entire continent — from the Atlantic to the Urals — is the main avenue of strengthening peace in Europe.

Systems of so called dual designation, that is, capable of carrying nuclear warheads, are no exception here. We are for serious, really businesslike, no-nonsense talks on the entire range of these issues with the participation of all European countries.

Like Yugoslavia the Soviet Union is a consistent champion of developing the Helsinki process. It comes out for greater trust between its participants, for strengthening all-European co-operation and security.

This would be particularly promoted by the implementation of various proposals to create zones of reduced concentration of armaments. There are valuable relevant initiatives from the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary concerning the centre of Europe.

In Murmansk we outlined our views on possible steps along the same direction as applied to the Baltic and the north of the continent. And I believe the idea to turn the Balkan peninsula into a nuclear-free zone is one of the oldest such projects.

The first ever meeting of foreign ministers of the six Balkan states was held recently here in Belgrade. It showed that despite the existing differences here it is possible to find ground for co-operation in the sphere of politics, economy, ecology and culture. And this is a valuable regional contribution to improving the situation in Europe.

On our side it has been stated more than once, and I would like reiterate it, the Soviet Union is fully in favour of developing co-operation in the Balkans. We support the latest initiatives of Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia and Greece directed at reducing military activity here; we come out for the withdrawal of all foreign troops and military bases from the peninsula; we will give all

the necessary guarantees should it be decided to create a zone free of nuclear and chemical weapons in the Balkans.

My country is ready to interact with the Balkan states in environmental protection as well. Belonging here also is the bigger problem of protecting the great vital artery of southern Europe — the Danube. Joint measures along this direction should be linked with vigorous actions against the further pollution of the Black Sea. This is a common interest not only for European but also for a number of Asian states.

Yugoslavia is simultaneously a Balkan and a Mediterranean country. I would like to dwell particularly on the situation in this area.

The Mediterranean is regarded with full right as the cradle of European civilisation. It is a crossroads of world routes, a field of the synthesis of cultures, a space populated by tens of peoples who are making a big and unique contribution to the development of Europe and the entire world community.

But alas there is also another aspect to it. Today the Mediterranean is one of the most explosive regions of the world, a tight knot of contradictory interests filled with huge arsenals which, moreover, continue to grow. Also, in no other landlocked expanse of water is there such a concentration of naval forces.

For us the Mediterranean basin is not some remote and distant area. It is close to our southern border and passing through it is the only sea lane linking our southern ports with the world ocean.

Naturally, we are interested in seeing lanes of peace and not routes of war passing here.

In this connection I would like to state first of all that we fully support the programme of measures to ensure security set out at the Brioni meeting of Mediterranean members of the Non-Aligned Movement. This is a good basis for an extensive and productive dialogue on the region's problems.

Along with the proposals to reduce military potentials in the Mediterranean area, made by the Soviet Union earlier, we would like to submit additional proposals for consideration by the international community.

First. Confirming our readiness for the withdrawal of the navies of the USSR and the United States from the Mediterranean, we propose not to put this off, and as the first step, beginning from July 1 of this year, to freeze the number of ships and the potential of the naval forces of both countries stationed there. And then to establish ceilings for them.

Second. Even before agreement on joint confidence-building measures in the spirit of the Stockholm accords, the Soviet Union and the United States could notify each other and all Mediterranean countries in time about the sending of naval ships and military exercises, and to invite observers to them.

Third. The development, by Mediterranean and other interested countries, of principles and methods of ensuring the safety of lanes of intensive shipping, especially in international straits, will have our every support.

As we express these considerations we realise that there also exist many other initiatives that merit attention and were set forth in recent years by many states, first of all Mediterranean ones. It would be useful now to put all these proposals together, bring them to a system, and determine the rational sequence and order of their implementation.

I believe this task could be taken up by a conference of representatives of Mediterranean states and other interested countries. We, and not only us, have expressed this idea in the past and it is acquiring growing relevance.

The Mediterranean Sea has an amazing distinctiveness — it serves as a link of continents and offers broad access to lands beyond Europe. In the south its waters wash the coast of Africa, in the east, Asia. While the west, from which the caravels of Columbus sailed out five hundred years ago, retains lively ties with Latin America.

And I believe that nowhere else is the common

nature of the destiny of peoples, the interdependence and integrity of the contemporary world, felt with such intensity as here.

There can be no real calm in Europe while violence reigns in Palestine, while the seat of war remains in the Middle East, while the South African racists perpetrate with impunity aggression against Angola, Mozambique and other frontline African states, while the Iran-Iraq war continues.

The so called local conflicts are sometimes called 'low intensity wars'. But this lulling term is deceptive. For the peoples drawn into the armed clashes their intensity is measured by the price of big losses. Besides, these conflicts have long acquired an international character. The flames raging there can spread to other areas and become a direct or indirect cause of a global conflagration.

That is why the settlement of existing conflict situations and, as far as possible, the prevention of new ones is one of the most pressing world problems. A serious and effective role here can and should belong to the United Nations Organisation and the Security Council.

The practice of past decades shows the entire balefulness and barrenness of attempts to find military solutions to conflicts. It shows that the search for a political solution is the only correct approach.

In other words, the creation of such a situation determined by international law around the seat of conflict which, firstly, would prevent the delivery of combustible material from the outside, secondly, would guarantee it would not spread to other countries and regions and, thirdly, would ensure to the people themselves, and only to them, a possibility of a socio-political choice without outside interference.

As a matter of fact, exactly such an approach was put in the foundation of the far-reaching proposals to settle the situation around Afghanistan.

We are prepared to fulfil the commitments which we undertook on arrangement with the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan given, of course, that all the other interested sides will consistently observe the agreed-upon terms. If matters develop in that direction this example will help advance the settlement of other regional conflicts as well, eliminate hotbeds of the danger of war.

Esteemed comrades, slightly more than ten years remain before the end of a century which has changed mankind's life more than all the preceding centuries taken together. It has radically deepened the entire system of our knowledge, imparted speed and scope to social processes and brought about an unprecedented advance of science and technology. Yet at the same time it has created the possibility of mankind's self-annihilation.

But the march of time is increasing its pace. It can be said that we are physically feeling the steps of history.

What has the future in store for mankind? Nuclear devastation, a gigantic ecological cataclysm, the turning of humans into robots bereft of criteria of morality and goodness? It would be unforgivable to shrug off these dangers. They are real.

But just as real is the alternative to them. An alternative rejecting war and violence. The road of progress and co-operation making it possible to preserve civilisation and save life on earth will illuminate still brighter man's creative predestination.

Mankind is duty bound to reach new frontiers of progress. But this can be done only by the concerted efforts of all states united by a spirit of responsibility and mutual understanding, equality and trust.

The democratisation of international relations is a condition of embarking on this road. Herein lies an imperative of our time. The nuclear sword can be stopped only by peoples which have united for the sake of saving the world.

First of all democratisation requires an unconditional recognition by the international community of the right of each people to shape its destiny, its right to dispose of its own resources.

This is a universal, general right, it cannot

belong to some 'chosen' peoples and the more so be measured by the economic or military potential of states. Each country has its own voice in the common choir of the community of nations, each people has its interests that are not subordinated to the interests of other states but are conjugated with them.

Democratisation also means the inclusion of all states in the solution of the most important problems of our time. The time has passed when a handful of great powers decided for the whole world, divided it into spheres of influence according to the principle of 'might is right'. Now nobody, be it in London or Washington, Paris or Moscow, can solve any major international issues whatsoever without heeding the multivoiced world, without taking into account the views of other countries, without identifying with one's political radar their aspirations and hopes.

The democratisation of world politics and international relations is long ripe and urgent. The 20th Century which has generated unprecedented social revolutions, the revolutionary restructuring of the old, unjust international system, the scientific and technological revolution is now giving

birth also to a new political consciousness.

The consciousness which will absorb the entire preceding experience of mankind, which, and we have faith in this, will draw correct, sensible, humane conclusions for the future. And one such conclusion is the unbreakable link today of the very existence of humankind with the right of every people to socio-economic choice, with man's right to life.

It is not by chance that the concluding quarter of our stormy century has bound together, combined in world politics such key problems as disarmament and development, a just world economic order and a just world information order, the rights of man and the rights of peoples. These problems are seen in such an interconnection by the majority of states that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the United Nations. I stress here with satisfaction the coincidence of the principled approaches also of our two countries — the USSR and Yugoslavia.

Last but not least, international relations are increasingly becoming the business not only of professional diplomats, leaders of states but also of the public in general.

## Talks with Bosko Kronic

TALKS were continued on Wednesday at the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (SKJ) Central Committee between Mikhail Gorbachev and Yugoslav leaders.

Addressing Mikhail Gorbachev, Bosko Kronic, Chairman of the Presidium of the SKJ Central Committee, said the communists and all working people of Yugoslavia have been following with special attention the historic turn in the life of the Soviet Union and its peace initiatives on the international scene.

"We wish the fraternal Soviet people success with their perestroika effort which will make it possible to bring out fully the creative possibilities and the moral and spiritual potential of society. This will be of tremendous significance to increasing the prestige and appeal of socialism," he emphasised.

Expressing gratitude for the warm words and the cordial welcome on Yugoslav soil, Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out that the talks with the Yugoslav comrades have borne out the mutual desire to develop all-round cooperation and raise it to an even higher level.

"Our relations at one time went through difficult trials," he added. "We have drawn lessons from them and formulated the principles on the basis of which Soviet-Yugoslav co-operation has grown closer and acquired new quality. The declaration that has been hammered out will enable us to act on an even wider scale."

Mikhail Gorbachev emphasised that despite the two countries' different sizes and their distinct national features and specific conditions, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia are tackling what are effectively similar tasks. And one of the key tasks among them is that of resolving

the range of issues connected with the functioning of the political system.

What is meant is not, of course, replacing the available institutions but giving them, so to say, a second wind and increasing the role and influence of the Soviets which are the most broadly-based socio-political organisations, he pointed out.

Without reorganising their activities, one can hardly imagine how red tape can be finally rooted out and public affairs and social processes dynamised. This is most directly connected with giving ever greater prominence to the human factor.

Much in this area, Mikhail Gorbachev continued, depends on the Party, on policy- and theory-making, and on success with creating a solid legal basis.

It is important at this stage in socialist development to take a new look at the functions of the Party and update its methods of work, he pointed out. He stressed the unfading significance of Lenin's interpretation of the Party as the political vanguard and as a factor uniting all sections of the working people and all ethnic groups in a country.

Life is making new demands on inter-Party cooperation. While noting that dialogue at the political level is dynamic and regular, Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the time has come to think how to make it even more purposeful, substantive and mutually enriching.

"We are interested in wide-ranging dialogue and in it being lively and businesslike rather than done as a rite," Mikhail Gorbachev emphasised. "We should act more boldly to expand cooperation between the parties' scientific centres and together address theoretical problems and generalise experience."

The Yugoslav leader agreed with this view of the state of cooperation between the CPSU and the SKJ and the possibilities of broadening it. He reaffirmed readiness to continue developing inter-Party contacts on a stable basis and on the principles recorded in joint documents, including the Soviet-Yugoslav Declaration.

Bosko Kronic stressed the importance of dialogue, including on such issues of world politics as North-South relations and the problems of developing nations' foreign debt and their technological dependence.

Elaborating on the subject, Mikhail Gorbachev, for his part, said the socialist nations are facing the vital need to pool their efforts for a technological breakthrough, for

The isolation of society from world politics, the conduct of world politics in studies and lobbies, I would say the bureaucratic manner of conducting world politics, were a source of many calamities for which the popular masses had to pay. Such a practice is impermissible today when mankind's very existence is at stake.

Using Lenin's words it can be said that today the peoples should know everything and judge everything consciously. Their voice is not only a backdrop for the activity of politicians and not just an expression of support or rejection of these or those international actions. Their voice stands also for new impulses, ideas and initiatives.

I want to wish the communists and the working people of socialist Yugoslavia success in solving the tasks facing the country and in raising their motherland to new heights of progress.

May Soviet-Yugoslav co-operation develop and our friendship strengthen.

I wish you peace and prosperity, dear friends.

The deputies of the Federal Assembly, and all Yugoslav comrades present here, I want to thank you again for your attention. Thank you.

delivering themselves from so-called import plague and for advancing to the forward edge in science and engineering.

Bosko Kronic spoke in detail about the complex problems which Yugoslav society is confronting and grappling with today. He said that their sharpness does not put a question mark over the promotion of socialist self-management as the highway of development.

He also briefed Mikhail Gorbachev on the issues to be discussed at the forthcoming SKJ Conference. Besides, a lively exchange of opinions, marked by mutual understanding, was held on the correlation of centralism and decentralisation. It was found important to hold an in-depth joint analysis of the problems arising in this field.

Significant attention was devoted at the meeting to exchanging opinions on cooperation among all peace forces. It was noted that the Moscow meeting of representatives of parties and movements was a turning point in this respect.

The Soviet and Yugoslav leaders agreed that it confirmed the ever keener desire of progressive forces for joint action on the key problems of the times — firstly in efforts against the arms race and the danger of war and for the survival of humanity.

They noted at the same time that the process has not been developing smoothly and that it is required to comprehend the new realities profoundly and realise the priority of the interests of humanity as a whole.

Both sides voiced satisfaction with the truly Party-style atmosphere of candour and openness which was characteristic of the talks. Mikhail Gorbachev and Bosko Kronic reiterated readiness to intensify free dialogue and conduct extensive exchanges of experience regarding various issues of building socialism.

### Soviet Books

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

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

### Mikhail Gorbachev Realities and Guarantees for a Secure World

The above pamphlet is available from Soviet Books, 3 Rosary Gardens, London SW7 4NW.

Price 30p.

## Speech in Dubrovnik

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV made the following speech at a supper given for him in Dubrovnik on Thursday:

Esteemed Comrade Kronic  
Esteemed Comrade Mojsov  
Esteemed Comrades

Thanks to the courteous suggestion of Yugoslav friends we are holding our final meetings on the soil of ancient Dubrovnik. In this wonderful city, where every stone is part of history, one does have a special feeling. One thousand times was Bernard Shaw right when he said that whoever was looking for paradise on Earth should visit Dubrovnik.

In my country Dubrovnik is sometimes called the Adriatic Novgorod. This is just not only because the two cities are invaluable monuments of medieval architecture, culture and history. They were both, besides, city-republics with what for those times was broad democracy and self-government. In both Novgorod and Dubrovnik popular assemblies helped the city fathers to find wise solutions on more than one occasion. On the threshold of the 21st century we know incomparably more than our ancestors did. But the lessons of the past are of use today as well.

The motto inscribed over the gate of one of Dubrovnik's fortresses says — "Freedom cannot be exchanged for any riches." These are fine words. It is in freedom's name that our peoples fought together against nazism and won.

While in Dubrovnik we are thereby visiting the Socialist Republic of Croatia. I have been supplied with the following interesting data — a third of this republic's exports go to the USSR and 90% of all Soviet orders for repairing and building ships in Yugoslavia are filled by Croatia's shipyards. This republic maintains extensive links with the Ukraine, and Zagreb has formed a twinned relationship with Leningrad. Split with Odessa and Rieka with Yalta. This

kind of cooperation can only be hailed and encouraged in every way.

The hospitality of comrades in Croatia is infinite, but pressed for time, alas, we have not been able to take full advantage of it.

Comrades, our visit is drawing to a close. The hour of parting is nearing.

Addressing you, communists and all working people of socialist Yugoslavia, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for the exceptionally warm welcome, for the attention lavished on us, for the warm and sincere feelings shown to us and for the talks marked with frankness and trust.

We are profoundly satisfied with the exchange of views with the Yugoslav leaders, which has been thorough and frank as befits comrades, on the entire range of issues concerning bilateral relations, international affairs and the communist and working class movement. It is only in this language of mutual understanding that communists and associates really interested in one another's success maintain their dialogue.

The visit has offered a valuable opportunity to make a better acquaintance with your country and get a fuller idea of the life and affairs of the fraternal Yugoslav peoples. Do not mistake my words for the mere courtesy of a guest in relation to the hospitable hosts. We have been very impressed by your achievement in industry, agriculture, the social sphere, science, culture and socio-political development.

You have problems, and fairly sharp ones as well. Leaving aside the issue of their origins and ways of tackling them, as this is a matter wholly for the Yugoslav comrades themselves to take care of, I would like to stress only that the Soviet people are far from sharing the negative judgements on the situation in your country and outlook for its development, which at that often have the nature of ill-intended speculation. We do not doubt that the working people of Yugoslavia, updating their social system and bringing it into line with the requirements of the times, will keep marching forward, resolving their problems and disappointing those who predict that they

are going nowhere.

The Soviet leadership, communists and all working people of my country, sincerely wish to see Yugoslav a strong, united and prosperous socialist state.

During the visit we have become even more firmly convinced that the efforts of both parties to bring out the material and spiritual potential of socialism more fully are creating favourable conditions for giving our cooperation a new quality.

The talks with comrades Mojsov and Kronic and with other Yugoslav leaders and the numerous meetings and heart-to-heart conversations with workers, farmers, scientists and cultural workers representing practically all ethnic groups that inhabit Yugoslavia have borne out that there is the mutual political will, supported and approved nationwide, in both countries to enrich their mutually advantageous cooperation in every field.

As far as we are concerned, we are prepared in this respect to go as far as our Yugoslav friends will wish.

The impression we have gained from the conversations is that there are prerequisites for strengthening our interaction in international affairs as well. A broad prejudice-free approach to it will be in the interests of not only the Soviet and Yugoslav peoples, but also of all Europe and the world community. There is no task more important today than to work for pooling efforts in the search for ways and means of real disarmament and for solutions to other pressing issues of the times.

In short, we are leaving fraternal Yugoslavia in the firm conviction that the entire package of Soviet-Yugoslav relations is rising to a new level. This is precisely what has been the aim of the visit.

May Soviet-Yugoslav friendship and co-operation grow stronger and closer in the interest of peace and socialism.

On behalf of our Party and all Soviet people, I wish success and prosperity to the fraternal Yugoslav peoples and well-being and happiness to each and every family.

## Visit to Ljubljana

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV had a meeting with the leadership of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia in Ljubljana on Thursday. Taking part in the meeting were France Popit, President of the Presidium of Slovenia, and Milan Kucan, Chairman of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia, and other leaders of the republic.

Vadim Medvedev, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other Soviet officials were present.

Some matters of Soviet-Yugoslav relations, including those concerning the development of economic and cultural cooperation with Slovenia and its direct inter-republican contacts with Byelorussia, were touched upon during the conversation which was held in a friendly atmosphere.

The Presidium of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia and the Presidium of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia gave a dinner in Mikhail Gorbachev's honour

"Comrade Gorbachev, your visit to Yugoslavia the successful talks which you had with the top leaders of our country and the League

of Communists of Yugoslavia as well as the impressions you gained in the socialist republics." France Popit said, "will undoubtedly have an effect on deepening successful and all-round cooperation between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union."

He voiced hope that the goals of social transformation in the USSR will be successfully attained. "Your successes will also contribute to further enhancing the prestige of socialism and the cause of peace throughout the world."

In a reply speech Mikhail Gorbachev thanked the leaders of Slovenia for the hospitality and for the expression of kind sentiments towards the CPSU and the Soviet people.

"Unfortunately," he said, "our stay in Slovenia is brief but what we have managed to see is illustrative of big achievements in economic development on the basis of advanced equipment and technology, and is indicative of high qualifications of workers, specialists and economic managers. Such impression was produced by the visit to the Iskra enterprise. This is a high-standard enterprise. It is precisely such Iskras (sparks) that kindle a flame of new life."

"Slovenia is one of the most developed republics of Yugoslavia, and, of course, its successes are inseparable from the achievements of the country as a whole. On these days we

have come to realise still more vividly how diverse are the history and national traditions of your republics and the peculiarities of their economic and social development. We realise still better that the earnest of prosperity of present-day Yugoslavia is in its unity and in the striving of all its peoples to continue to proceed along the common road and jointly to build their socialist motherland."

"Relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, including economic ones, are a big integrated whole. It is very useful to supplement, figuratively speaking, the main channel with streams and brooks of contacts between our individual republics, territories and cities. I know that Slovenia has established good contacts with Byelorussia. These enrich our cooperation."

"This does not mean that economic organisations of Slovenia should limit themselves only to contacts with Byelorussia and not to do business with other possible Soviet partners. Ljubljana, for example, cooperates with Tbilisi. We are for a wide initiative in these matters. The removal of barriers and far-fetched restrictions in our economic machinery opens up ample opportunities for this. The point is actively to utilise them."

In conclusion Mikhail Gorbachev wished success, prosperity and happiness to all people in the republic.

# Soviet-Yugoslav Declaration

HERE follows the text of the Soviet-Yugoslav Declaration:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, proceeding from the long-term interests of the Soviet and Yugoslav peoples, declare their constant desire to upgrade co-operation, enrich its contents, stimulate the continued development of friendly relations between the two socialist countries and effectively contribute to the creation of a safer and fairer world, and have decided to reaffirm in this Declaration the principles and goals of bilateral relations and to set forth their views on the main problems of present-day international relations and on ways of creating a non-violent and nuclear-free world where any use or threats of using force would be out of the question and all disputes will be settled exclusively by political means in the spirit of equality and in the name of strengthening international peace, security and progress.

## I

1. The USSR and Yugoslavia stress the historic role and unfading value of the universal principles recorded in the Belgrade (1955) and Moscow (1956) declarations, namely: mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, equality, and non-interference in domestic affairs under any pretext. Their consistent application has played a key role in normalising inter-state relations and launching all-round and stable co-operation. The sides will continue to abide by these principles.

The USSR and Yugoslavia base and upgrade their relations proceeding from unconditional respect for the distinctive ways and forms of their socialist development and differences in the international position.

2. The friendly relations of the two countries have long-standing traditions. They grew especially close in the joint struggle against fascism in the years of the Second World War. Soviet-Yugoslav relations also underwent severe trials. The crust and burden of the past have been removed thanks to unflinching compliance with the mutually endorsed principles.

The sides see the main direction of their activities in further strengthening trust and interaction in every field, in improving the quality and increasing the amount of equitable and mutually beneficial co-operation, and in enriching each other with the experience of economic, social and cultural development with a view to raising the entire package of bilateral relations to a new high.

They will continue paying special attention to political dialogue at every level and stimulating direct businesslike co-operation between political and social organisations and between Soviet and Yugoslav republics, territories, cities and worker collectives, and reciprocal contacts between citizens.

3. The successful and all-round development of stable and mutually advantageous economic co-operation is of primary significance to the entire package of relations. Relying on substantial achievements in this field, and being aware of the mutual responsibility for consolidating and

augmenting them, the USSR and Yugoslavia will seek to adopt modern forms of co-operation on a wider scale, promote specialised and co-operative production arrangements on a long-term basis, make joint efforts to improve the pattern of trade, and ensure stable and balanced goods exchanges and economic ties in general as the material basis for co-operation. These goals are served also by the long-term programme for economic co-operation, which covers the period up to the year 2000, and the participation of the two countries' organisations in fulfilling projects under the comprehensive programme for scientific and technological progress within the CMEA frameworks.

The sides will continue facilitating the continuous expansion of their links in the fields of culture, science, education and information, and other contacts helping a better acquaintance with all the aspects of life of the two countries and unimpeded exchanges of spiritual values. They believe that the provision of objective information to the public about the achievements, problems and policies of each country serves better mutual understanding and stronger trust between their peoples.

## II

1. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia think highly of the level of bilateral relations attained and regard them as an important factor for stable and all-round Soviet-Yugoslav co-operation and stronger friendship between the peoples of the two countries.

They reiterate readiness to continue developing and enriching the contents of their relations, proceeding from the principles of independence, equality and non-interference, the responsibility of each party before the working class and people of its country, and mutual respect for the different ways of building socialism and their international positions. They will upgrade voluntary and mutually beneficial co-operation and constructive and comradely dialogue on this basis.

Consistent respect for the independence of parties and socialist countries in determining ways of their development has made it possible to remove the causes that led to a conflict between the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) and the Information Bureau in 1948. This is of high significance not only to bilateral relations between the CPSU and the SKJ, but also to developing and affirming socialism as a world process.

Proceeding from the conviction that no-one has a monopoly on truth, the sides declare that they have no claims to imposing their notions about social development on anyone. The success of any way to socialism is tested by socio-political practice and confirmed by concrete results.

The CPSU and the SKJ will seek to enrich co-operation and pay constant attention to political dialogue with a view to maintaining thorough exchanges of opinions and experience as regards the pressing issues of building socialism in the two countries, and of socialism as a world process, as well as the global problems of peace and social progress, of equitable international co-operation and of strengthening trust among peoples. They will broaden and consolidate contacts between their representatives at different levels, attaching special significance to summit meetings.

The sides consider it a matter of priority importance to upgrade socialist self-government as applied to the specific conditions of each country. It ensures the real power of the people and the freedom of the individual, and is a dependable guarantee against dogmatism, voluntarism and administrative-bureaucratic distortions of socialism.

The experience of Yugoslavia gained in develop-

ing the political system of socialist self-government and the policy of consistently implementing the principles of socialist self-government by the people in the Soviet Union offer new possibilities for the mutual enrichment of knowledge about its modern forms and ways of functioning.

2. The CPSU and the SKJ reaffirm the universal significance of democratic principles in relations between the communist, workers', socialist, socio-democratic, revolutionary-democratic and other progressive parties and movements, which are based on their inalienable right independently to choose ways of social development. The CPSU and the SKJ are for the broadest equitable co-operation between parties and movements, regardless of their ideological differences. This co-operation is a requirement of the times and is of tremendous significance to efforts to solve acute international political and economic problems and for ensuring the interests of the working class and for democracy and social progress.

A contribution to promoting dialogue and mutual understanding has been made by the meeting of parties and movements in Moscow on the occasion of the 70th Anniversary of the October Revolution, at which a constructive exchange of opinions on the more important issues of the times was held in a new democratic atmosphere. This was a manifestation of their awareness of their historical responsibility before the living and succeeding generations for ensuring general peace, co-operation, security and social progress.

Communist, workers', socialist, social-democratic, revolutionary-democratic and other parties and movements will be able to confirm their transforming role in the measure to which they will facilitate peace, disarmament and development, the struggle for freedom and independence, national and social liberation, assertion of the principles of vigorous peaceful coexistence as a universal value in relations between states and peoples.

3. Socialism is at a watershed stage, on the threshold of a fuller demonstration of its material and spiritual potential, and the deepening of its humanistic mainstays. The processes of reforms and radical transformations in socialist countries confirm the viability of socialism and its readiness to respond to the challenge of the times.

Today mankind faces a decisive choice: it can advance along the road of either common progress or aggravation of existing contradictions. The road it will take will depend largely on the ability of all progressive, democratic forces to offer convincing prospects of improving the world, to provide answers to the many new questions that confront man as an individual and the society in which he lives.

## III

The problems of unprecedented scope facing mankind require awareness of the integrity and interdependence of the world community, a new political approach and practice, and an enhanced sense of responsibility which would accord with present-day realities.

1. The USSR and the SFRY confirm their adherence to the policy of peace and independence of peoples and countries, their equality, equal security of all countries irrespective of their size and potentials or socio-political systems, ideas to which they adhere, the form and character of their associations with other states and geographic location.

They emphasise the importance of a consistent implementation of the principles and policy of active peaceful coexistence between all states, relaxation of tension and resolution of disputes arising between states exclusively by peaceful methods, equal co-operation and strengthening of the atmosphere of trust and dialogue, creation of conditions for the accelerated development of all countries, especially developing ones.



The sides attach special importance to the undeviating observance of the universal obligatory principles of the United Nations Charter, the Helsinki Final Act and other fundamental documents of international law which ban aggression, violation of borders, seizure of foreign territories, all forms of threat and the use of force, or interference in the internal affairs of other countries, regardless of pretext.

2. The democratisation of international life is a precondition and inalienable part of the process of creating more equitable relations in the world providing for the equal participation of all states in discussing and solving all international problems, especially those affecting their direct interests.

The USSR and the SFRY come out for strengthening the United Nations Organisation as a universal international forum of equal and sovereign states. They declare for enhancing the role and increasing the contribution of the United Nations Organisation in the solution of pressing problems of our time, in the interests of all countries and the world community as a whole.

3. In the world of today, burdened as it is by numerous problems, a prominent role is played by the policy of non-alignment, the aim of which is peace and security for all, equality and mutual understanding; overcoming of existing disunity; consistent respect for the political and economic independence and dignity of all countries and peoples, their right to a sovereign determination of the roads of their development, and just economic relations.

The policy of non-alignment is directed against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, apartheid, all forms of aggression, interference, violence, superiority, hegemony and discrimination in political and economic relations, restriction of international co-operation to the narrow frameworks of existing groupings. The activity of the movement of non-aligned countries as an independent, non-bloc global factor is oriented at expanding international co-operation, overcoming and removing existing barriers, rivalry, exclusiveness and prejudices.

The growing role of the movement and the policy of non-alignment in world affairs accords with the demands of the time and the interests of the world community.

4. The USSR and the SFRY confirm their faith that a world without weapons, without threat of force, in which fear and violence will give way to trust, stable security and tranquillity for all nations and people, is attainable. In the contemporary interdependent world the security of any country is reliable if it is based on the security of all. The

ending of the arms race and the beginning of the irrevocable process of nuclear and conventional disarmament, with the aim of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, is the first and decisive step towards attaining these aspirations.

The supreme and urgent aim of all peoples is to genuinely remove the danger of nuclear catastrophe on the basis of the general and complete elimination of nuclear arms. The beginning of this process was started by the treaty between the USSR and the USA on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles which has strengthened mankind's hopes of a secure future. The increased faith in the attainability of the ideals of disarmament can become a factor of historic significance.

It is necessary and possible to start without delay the drafting and conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests under the strictest verification measures in this field, to prevent the militarisation of outer space which belongs to mankind as a whole, and also ban and liquidate all types of weapons of mass destruction.

The attainment of these aims requires a contribution by all states, including at multilateral talks. The means and possibilities thus released — scientific, technological and material — should be directed at aims of development, first of all of the developing countries. This would be an historic breakthrough in the interests of all countries and the whole of mankind.

5. The USSR and the SFRY confirm adherence to the spirit and aims of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and come out for the development and deepening of the CSCE process, for a balanced and consistent implementation of all the provisions of the Final Act and other documents adopted by CSCE participant countries, this playing an important role in establishing trust and cooperation in the European continent.

They stress the particular importance of observing the provision on the inviolability of borders existing in Europe.

The growing positive processes in Europe should be spread also to the Mediterranean area whose security is closely connected with security in Europe, so as to turn it into a zone of stable peace and co-operation.

6. The sides believe that the seats of tension existing on various continents are a permanent source of danger of expanding conflicts, of a threat to peace and security and also to the independence and sovereign rights of the countries and peoples in these regions. The speediest settlement of regional conflicts on the basis of elimination of the causes that brought them about should be effected by political means, on the basis of the principles of the United Nations Charter, with effective use made of this organisation's possibilities and with observance of the lawful interests of all states and peoples, their right to determine their destiny in a sovereign manner.

7. The sides attach much importance to the observance of human rights and come out for their full and consistent implementation throughout the world. The rights of man and his basic freedoms are inalienable, inseparable and interdependent. Of special importance are those of them which give the individual an opportunity to take part in shaping the conditions of life, using the results of his work and directly influence socio-political processes in his country.

8. The USSR and the SFRY are convinced that the interests of the stable economic development of each country, and the world community as a whole, demand a fundamental change in the sphere of international economic relations. They stress that the speediest and cardinal solution of the urgent problems lying at the root of the crisis of these relations would be in the interests of stability and progress in the world.

This is particularly true of the problem of the huge foreign debt of most developing countries, the discrimination against them in trade and the restriction of their access to technical and technological achievements. They hold that a stable economic development of each country and the world community as a whole is possible only in conditions of an active and free participation of all countries in economic co-operation, in the solution of acute problems of the world economy and international economic relations.

The creation of a new international economic order accords with the interests of all countries and requires a contribution by each of them.

9. The protection and improvement of the natural environment and also the protection of nature and rational utilisation of natural resources is one of the key conditions of improving the quality of life and economic development. All this requires an extensive interaction of states. The USSR and the SFRY state that they will make their contribution to the development of co-operation in this field.

World civilisation is entering a new stage of its development. Never before has mankind been confronted so forcefully with the problems of survival, protection of the natural habitat and creation of material and spiritual conditions for a worthy life of all peoples in the world.

Humankind is capable of reaching new frontiers of development through the concerted efforts of all states irrespective of their social system, ideological and political orientation.

It is in the interests of all to pave the road to a world in which the freedom, independence and dignity of peoples and every individual, just as life itself, creativity and the all-round development of man would be the greatest value. To a world in which there is progress — economic, cultural, etc. — of all peoples and in which the awareness prevails that we all, inhabitants of a single planet, share a common destiny and strive for universal flourishing.

This places on all peoples and states a responsibility to the present and future generations, to history. This demands of all new approaches, good will, a new political philosophy based on the understanding that the world is indivisible and interdependent; that the progress of some is possible as part of the progress of all; that the material and spiritual wealth and the achievements of science and technology open up new vistas for overcoming disunity, for the development of all peoples.

In the pursuance of these ideals, in the attainment of these lofty aims, the USSR and the SFRY, the CPSU and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia will co-operate between themselves and with all other countries and political forces that are aware of their responsibility for the cause of peace, universal security and progress.

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

Price 40p (Cheque/PO)

**The Prospects for our Co-operation Are Good**

**Vyacheslav Sychev,**  
Secretary of the CMEA

Price 40p

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

**Expert Opinion**

- Nature Knows No Borders. Igor PETRYANOV-SOKOLOV** ..... 40p
- Make the Economy Responsive to Innovations Abel AGANBEGIAN** 40p
- Science Will Help Speed Production Guri MARCHUK** ..... 40p
- Books promote an understanding of the restructuring process Mikhail NENASHEV** ..... 40p

The above Novosti brochures in this series are available from Soviet Books 3 Rosary Gardens London SW7 4NW

# USSR Defence Minister's Statement

A press conference by USSR Defence Minister and General of the Army Dmitri Yazov was held in Berne on Thursday on completion of the meeting between the USSR Defence Minister and the U.S. Defence Secretary.

General Yazov made the following statement. The meeting between the U.S. Secretary of Defence and the USSR Minister of Defence has ended here today. It lasted less than two full days. Despite being short, it was pithy in terms of substance. The meeting between the USSR Minister of Defence and the U.S. Secretary of Defence became possible as a result of the Soviet-American dialogue conducted between the leaders of our countries. We saw the main objective of the meeting in contributing towards improving mutual understanding on the military aspects of Soviet-American relations and the resolution of the most important problem of the present — preventing nuclear war and putting an end to the arms race.

The Soviet leadership is firmly pursuing the policy of improving Soviet-American relations. In this matter, naturally, it does not entertain any illusions, but bases itself on life, being well aware of the whole complexity of the real contradictions and problems. This is precisely the basis of the Soviet concept of eliminating the threat of war, above all nuclear war, and building a safe world. We have been guided by this concept in the course of talks with the U.S. Secretary of Defence.

The agenda, on which preliminary agreement was reached with the U.S. Secretary of Defence Mr. Frank Carlucci, was fully implemented. The talks give us reason to say that by meeting each other half way and reckoning with the mutual security interests, we can come to a positive resolution of very complex military problems.

To be more specific, we discussed questions connected with the character of our states' military doctrines and reduction and limitation of arms.

In so doing, in the field of arms control we did not set ourselves the aim of substituting for the official talks between the delegations, and the dialogue on this problem between the USSR Foreign Affairs Minister and the U.S. Secretary of State. Our objective is less ambitious — to contribute towards resolving the most acute and urgent questions as regards the strategic offensive weapons and compliance with the ABM Treaty, preparation for talks on conventional weapons in Europe, on an end to nuclear tests, and on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. Besides we discussed questions in connection with the military activities of the armed forces of the USSR and the USA and developing contacts along military lines.

As we talked, we strove to find points of contact between our stands. Both sides proceeded from the understanding that military rivalries between the USSR and the USA contain a threat to all. We declared for greater predictability and stability in the Soviet-American military equilibrium.

We strove to understand better the logic and meaning of U.S. actions in the military field. At the same time we wanted the American side to understand us correctly. When we say that we need no war we invest this with a profound meaning. We really do not need it. War is alien to our socialist society's nature. In this nuclear age it would threaten humanity with destruction. The 27th Congress of the CPSU has decided that by the year 2000 — i.e., over 15 years while a new generation will not yet have grown up — an economic potential be created roughly equal to that which has been accumulated over the 70 years of Soviet

Government. The Soviet people are confident that this programme will be fulfilled. Hence we need perestroika in all fields of our life, hence we need peace and only peace.

I take the view that we have been able in the course of the frank exchange of opinions to explain to each other our positions on the matters discussed, as a result of which, I think, better mutual understanding has been achieved. And this is very important in relations between the USSR and the USA.

The logic of the Soviet Union's activities in the military field is determined by the defensive nature of our military doctrine which is based on the task of fending off war and on the principle of sufficiency for defence.

Recognising that any conflict between the USSR and the United States would have catastrophic consequences, the leaders of our countries at the meetings in Geneva and Washington have solemnly proclaimed their determination to avert any war between our countries, either nuclear or conventional. It is from this joint decision that we have proceeded in our military development, in our efforts to prevent confrontation, lower its level and facilitate more stable relations between the USSR and the United States of America.

Our understanding of the principle of sufficiency includes, along with the defensive nature of the military doctrine, also parity and equal security, changes in the nature of military activities and in the structure of the armed forces and in their deployment pattern, mandatory cuts in armaments and armed forces, and stringent verification arrangements. All these matters are not simple. But they can be resolved at the negotiating table on an equitable basis.

The treaty signed in Washington on the elimination of Soviet and American intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles is a truly historic step to reducing the nuclear danger. In my country and evidently in the United States as well much is being done in preparation for fulfilling the commitments we have made under the treaty. It will be for the first time in history that two whole classes of newest missiles will be removed from the arsenals. As has been confirmed in the debates on the INF treaty at the foreign relations commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, our military specialists and scientists are convinced that the treaty's provisions can be reliably and effectively verified.

The INF treaty paves the way to further, more substantial arms reductions. In keeping with the Washington understandings between Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, priority in the package of Soviet-American relations belongs now to the task of preparing an agreement on 50% cuts in strategic offensive arms in the context of compliance with the ABM treaty, signed in 1972 and non-withdrawal from it for a specified period.

The representatives of the USSR at the talks have instructions from the Soviet leadership to do everything depending on them to prepare a good and dependable treaty on strategic offensive arms and a document concerning ABM systems, so that they can be signed during President Reagan's forthcoming visit to the USSR.

We urged the U.S. Defence Minister to give his assistance with the aim of constructively resolving the problems not yet hammered out at the talks. The conclusion of the strategic offensive arms agreement will appreciably enhance the stability and security both of the USSR and of the U.S. and of the world as a whole.

We stressed once again the Soviet side's desire to press for an early finalising of a convention on a comprehensive prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons under reliable international

control and also to intensify work at full-scale talks between the USSR and the United States on the problem of nuclear testing.

We frankly told the American representatives about the contradiction in the stance of the United States which, while stating its commitment to the total elimination of chemical weapons, has started the production of a new generation of such weapons — binary ones.

In discussing the problem of conventional armaments, we came out in favour of starting all-European talks this year. We reaffirmed our readiness to put on the negotiating table necessary data and start specific discussion of all points, including the question of elimination of imbalance and asymmetry on a mutual basis.

We stand for precluding a unilateral approach, so that claims about the superiority of one side would not be accompanied by forgetfulness about the other side's superiority in other types of weapons.

Talks have sense if the point at issue will be reciprocal and simultaneous reduction, elimination of imbalances and asymmetry. In this case, it is always possible to find ways out.

Our programme of European disarmament, set out in the 1986 Budapest Address by the allied socialist states, is oriented at the radical reduction of the armed forces and armaments in Europe (from the Atlantic to the Urals) and at attaining such a level of military potentials which would provide for defence, but would not make it possible to undertake offensive operations.

It is along this path that we see a possibility through concerted effort to change for the better the military-political situation in Europe, the entire character of Soviet-American and Soviet-Western European relations.

Besides the proposal for a substantial reduction of military confrontation in Europe, we suggest a whole range of confidence-building measures, including those that will preclude a sudden outbreak of war in Europe.

Specifically, the point at issue is reducing the concentration of the armed forces and armaments in the zone of contact between the two military alliances down to the lowest agreed-upon level, the removal from that zone of the most dangerous, offensive types of weapons, and the establishment of a nuclear-free corridor along the line of contact between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO, from which all nuclear weapons will be taken out on a reciprocal basis.

We expect that our partners in the talks will explain to us explicitly what is unacceptable to them in our proposals and why they have not replied to them for years.

The situation in Europe will greatly benefit from the restriction of the navies and their activities in adjoining regions. We told Mr Carlucci that it was high time that the subject of navies be discussed.

The current situation is such that the risk of military confrontation at sea is as big as that on land. On land, that is with respect to the ground forces, serious steps are being undertaken to reduce the level of military confrontation, and their activity is under control in keeping with the Stockholm document, while the confrontation with regard to the navies is not only being preserved, but has a tendency to grow.

The Soviet Union submitted specific proposals for restricting naval activities in the north of Europe and in the Mediterranean. The NATO countries, however, have so far failed to respond to these proposals.

Regrettably, the latest summit session of the NATO Council did not contribute to advancing the start of the talks on disarmament in Europe. A little less than two years ago, the Warsaw

*(continues on next page)*

# Eduard Shevardnadze in Washington

ON his arrival in Washington on March 20, Eduard Shevardnadze, Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and Foreign Minister of the USSR, said the following:

Our visit, the first after the Washington summit, to the capital of the United States has been taken to implement the understanding between Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. You evidently remember that the understanding says that in the period preceding another (this time in Moscow) meeting of the top leaders of our countries, the foreign ministers of the USSR and USA will regularly meet to settle questions pertaining to preparation of this meeting and a new agreement on the next

move in the sphere of nuclear disarmament.

February was the month of the Moscow visit by the Secretary of State of the United States of America, in March our turn came to depart overseas. The March round in its content will logically continue the February one which, in the opinion of the sides, was highly successful. I hope that the Washington meeting, too, will be as fruitful as the previous one. The impetus of the city where the Soviet-American treaty on elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles was concluded, will undoubtedly tell on talks on cutting strategic offensive weapons under the conditions of observing the ABM Treaty. For the sake of this purpose, it is worthwhile increasing the intensity of air traffic between our countries, making monthly shuttles over the ocean. Taking much effort and energy,

they have become for me and Mr Shultz the working reality which seemed impossible in Soviet-American relations in a comparatively recent past. The frequency and character of our contacts conform to the importance of issues under discussion among which there will be, this time too, human rights and regional conflicts along with nuclear-space questions.

But, no matter how often we meet in our capitals, every visit to Washington for me and my colleagues is linked with a feeling of agitating novelty. Especially after the unforgettable days of last December when we saw that energy and efforts of our leaders brought a historic result. Thinking of this, we address with even greater sympathy the best of our wishes to Washington residents and all citizens of the United States.

Here follows a full text of the TASS Statement published by Sunday's *Pravda*:

A rather serious deterioration of the situation has been taking place in Central America in the past several days. On the decision of the U.S. Administration additional military units with a strength of over 3,000 were transferred to Honduras. Washington makes no secret of the fact that the main purpose of this step is to exert military pressure on Nicaragua and, as the U.S. administration puts it, to signal to the governments and peoples of Central America the seriousness with which the U.S. government regards the existing situation.

It is not the first time that Washington, which pursues a policy of open pressure on Nicaragua and other Central American countries, resorts to direct military threats under various pretexts. As a rule, it takes place exactly at the time when signs of the lessening of tension appear and real ways of achieving a political settlement are outlined. Such a favourable situation is taking shape today. As a result of the efforts of the Contadora Group and the Support Group, as well as of Central American countries themselves which are actively supported by Latin American and world public opinion, the negotiating process aimed at achieving a mutually acceptable solution to the problems existing in the region was dramatically stepped up. The Guatemala accords and the decisions of Presidents of five Central American countries at a meeting in San Jose met with broad support. The governments of those countries made some steps, although in different degrees, towards the development of co-

## TASS Statement

operation, internal democratisation and the settlement of the problems connected with the bringing down of military tension and the consolidation of security. Measures taken in this sphere by the Government of Nicaragua were especially significant. A trend emerged towards the growth of trust in relations between the countries, towards the growing awareness of their common responsibility for the destiny of their region and of the need for developing good-neighbourly relations.

All these positive factors were met in the world with relief and satisfaction, and are justly regarded as a real opportunity on the way to the elimination of that dangerous seat of regional tension. They were positively received by a considerable part of the American public.

However, judging by all appearances, this turn of events does not suit some people in Washington whose officials still stubbornly refuse to recognise the right of peoples, and, specifically, of the Nicaraguan people, to choose by themselves their way of development. The present dangerous actions of the U.S. Administration are a link in the chain of actions directed against a political settlement process in Central America. These include both the actual opposition to the implementation of the Guatemala accords, the desire to keep other Latin American countries away from the political process, and the continuing attempts to legalise the military assistance to the mercenaries who invaded the Nicaraguan territory and are using methods of terror against the Nicaraguan people. Holding forth about the threat to U.S. security allegedly coming from Nicaragua, Washington at the same time persistently refuses to accept a proposal of the Nicaraguan Government on the resumption without any preliminary conditions

of direct bilateral talks for the purpose of removing mutual concerns. At the same time, under the influence of the U.S. the contras procrastinated or disrupted on more than one occasion the ceasefire talks proposed by the Nicaraguan Government.

Thus, judging by all these indications, Washington is actually doing its utmost for preventing a just peaceful settlement in Central America, for procrastinating and aggravating the conflict despite its eloquent statements in favour of the termination of regional conflicts.

This policy line cannot but be denounced in a most resolute way. The Soviet Union believes that the U.S. Government should stop opposing itself to the striving of Central American nations for peace and to a clearly expressed desire of world public opinion that the conflict in that region be terminated. It should heed the voice of reason and give up its attempts to impose its will on peoples of sovereign countries, its policy of pressure and threats, and promote in action a political settlement with due account for legitimate interests of all the parties concerned.

All those who hold dear the cause of peace and the right of nations to self-determination should redouble their efforts for putting an end to the conflict in Central America, for ensuring to the peoples of that region an opportunity to live a peaceful and normal life.

On its part, the Soviet Union again reiterates its strong support for a political settlement in Central America through the efforts of Latin Americans themselves without outside interference on the basis of the Guatemala Agreements, and is ready to constructively promote their realisation.

(from previous page)

Treaty member-countries put forward in Budapest a specific plan for reducing the armed forces and armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

It has clearly formulated the aims, the subject, stages of reduction and measures of verification. It would be logical to expect the Brussels document to contain NATO's detailed concept to this effect. But the hopes proved unjustified. Moreover, one gets the impression that some persons in the West were even sort of frightened by the prospects of a further easing of international tension and real disarmament. They voice the doubt whether further advance along this road should be made and are concerned least disarmament should gain such a momentum as to become impossible to arrest.

It is apparently for this reason that intentions are ever more persistently expressed to put

blocks in the road of real disarmament. We, specifically, cannot overlook the continued discussion in NATO countries of various kinds of 'compensation' for the intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles being eliminated. The implementation of such intentions would contradict the spirit of the Washington treaty, and would considerably worsen the prospects for the lowering of military confrontation in Europe.

The talk about some compensatory measures strikingly contrasts to the fact that the USSR, even before the ratification of the treaty, unilaterally withdrew from the territories of the GDR and Czechoslovakia its shorter-range missiles deployed there in answer to the deployment of U.S. Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles in Western Europe.

This step of goodwill by the USSR and its allies can serve as an example of real striving to confidence building and mutual understanding that are so much needed for the advance of the

process of disarmament in Europe started by the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

The discussion with the U.S. Defence Secretary of the matters related to the activity of the armed forces of the two countries has shown that mutually acceptable decisions aimed at greater predictability of the actions of the sides, at the consolidation of stability can be made in this area through debating and talks.

The conversations held with Mr Carlucci strengthen our conviction that the heads of the military establishments of the two countries should promote ever more vigorously the development of Soviet-American relations in the spirit of the decisions taken by the top leaders of our countries, and promote a more profound discussion and solution of military-political and military-technical matters connected with disarmament and security.

# A few days in Nagorny Karabakh

I ARRIVED in Stepanakert, a quiet and agreeable town lying in the midst of snow-capped ridges, the centre of Nagorny Karabakh, a week after the local Soviet of People's Deputies met in extraordinary session and passed a decision to appeal for the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region (NKAR) of Azerbaijan to be incorporated into Armenia.

This act had no precedent in the practice of national relations and was not accompanied by any preliminary explanatory work or publicly expressed motivations. The CPSU Central Committee found that the actions and demands aimed at reconsidering the existing national-territorial set-up were at variance with the interests of the working people in the two republics and would harm inter-ethnic relations.

Let me recall that as early as the 1920s, two national entities with different prerogatives — the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (with a constitution of its own, responsible for comprehensive economic and social development on its territory) and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region — were formed in Azerbaijan in areas with a predominantly Armenian population. Regrettably, neither the Constitution of the USSR nor the constitutions of the union republics specify the rights of autonomous regions.

With the atmosphere of general euphoria people tended to believe that the nationalities question had been solved once and for all in the Soviet Union. And if so, why worry about a caring attitude towards the needs of every nation so as not to permit the slightest distortion or detect in time even a microscopic flaw? In this context, the events in Nagorny Karabakh are instructive, since toasts, marches and solemn odes were sounded only recently in honour of national relations there.

What were the outward signs, that were previously not typical of Stepanakert? The few enterprises and educational establishments here came to a standstill. Several thousand people kept a round-the-clock vigil in a large square in front of the building of the regional Party committee.

There were no excesses, although people in Karabakh are generally known for their passionate bellicosity, in the noble sense of this word. Small nations are particularly fond of counting their heroes. According to the local figures, the people of Karabakh hold an all-Union record per capita for the number of military leaders and soldiers decorated with military awards. One in three inhabitants of Karabakh defended the motherland during World War II and every second of them did not return to the orphaned home.

I can put it on record as an eyewitness. In Stepanakert I did not see a single serviceman and practically no militia. On scarlet posters there were slogans — "One people — one land!", "With the Russian people — for all time!", "Long live friendship between the Armenian and Azerbaijan peoples!", "Long live the Leninist nationalities policy!", "Leninist friendship of peoples is our great asset!", "Friendship!", "Moscow!", "Gorbachev!", "Lenin, the Party, Gorbachev!". The latter slogan was chanted most frequently and loudly. Was everyone being sincere?

But, in the meantime, the enterprises and schools were inactive. The events in Nagorny Karabakh were followed by similar events in Armenia, primarily in Yerevan. The population of Azerbaijan, including Armenians residing outside the NKAR, was stirred into commotion.

During the talks and discussions I had with people from widely different walks of life, they advanced what were in effect arguments of the same type. My counterparts stressed that the main question now was the need to restore justice, because originally, in keeping with the Soviet Government's decrees and with Lenin's support, Nagorny Karabakh was proclaimed an inalienable part of Soviet Armenia. They also emphasised the unique situation which makes the NKAR the Soviet Union's only autonomous entity, the majority of whose population is similar to that of an existing union republic. But there arises a counter-argument. Several generations of Azerbaijani inhabitants did not accept this point of view, and this was their constitutional right. Moreover, the NKAR has no common frontier with Armenia and has been integrated with Azerbaijan's national economic complex.

On the other hand, it is wrong to brush aside the demographic problem in the NKAR (2.6% of Azerbaijan's population and 5% of its territory) where, according to census findings over two decades (1959-1979), the percentage of Armenians dropped from 84.4 to 75.8%, while that of Azerbaijanians increased from 13.8 to 22.9%.

I see the root cause of this situation not so much in the higher birth rate among Azerbaijanians as in the deformation of the socio-economic and cultural conditions of life in the autonomous region. Statisticians have prepared for the NKAR a place under the sun, in all indices. But there are weighty reasons for doubting these optimistic calculations. The rights to autonomy have been limited and are sometimes even fictitious. Even a hiring of a doctor or a teacher is sanctioned by the republican ministry. A blind curtain has been put up between the NKAR and Armenia, from where they could at least receive books in their native language. Even the curricula of the humanities faculty of the Stepanakert Pedagogical Institute, the only higher educational establishment in the autonomous region, have no course on the history and geography of Armenia.

The social sphere has been particularly neglected. The metal structures of the planned sports complex have turned rusty. The promises to build a Young Pioneers House and childcare institutions have not been honoured for years.

The scientists of the two republics do not set the best example to the younger generation when they engage in a tug of war to prove the historical primogeniture.

There is much bitterness and resentment about the events that have been accumulating for decades in Nagorny Karabakh, and people lay the blame on the former leadership of Azerbaijan and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region. B. Kevorkov, who headed Karabakh's Party organisation for more than fifteen years, turned out to be politically bankrupt. The communists elected Genrikh Pogosyan First Secretary of the Regional Party Committee.

I met him the fourth day he was in office. He is a native of Nagorny Karabakh and a graduate of the Moscow Institute of Mechanisation and Electrification of Agriculture. As First Vice-Chairman of the Regional Soviet of People's Deputies he was at the head of the agro-industrial complex. Youthful and quick moving for his almost sixty years, a technocrat with basic oratory skills, he enjoys high prestige. "The main thing today is to concentrate on specific economic and social tasks in the spirit of the policy of perestroika and renewal," he says in a voice which became hoarse with all the meetings and discussions.

During the alarming days of late February and early March the peoples of Karabakh and the

whole of Azerbaijan and Armenia felt the pulse of Moscow and the concern of the CPSU Central Committee. Present throughout this time in Azerbaijan were alternate members of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee Georgi Razumovsky, Secretary of the Party's Central Committee, and Pyotr Demichev, First Vice-President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. They studied the state of affairs in the localities, the needs of the working people, and helped the local Party and government organisations find ways to normalise the situation.

Of crucial importance for normalisation of the situation is Mikhail Gorbachev's appeal to the workers and all other people of Azerbaijan and Armenia. On more than one occasion I saw newspaper clips with the text of the appeal, read literally until they fell apart, and kept carefully in breast pockets. Can a sincere person and a patriot be left indifferent by these words — "Mothers don't want national strife for their children, but lasting relations of friendship, equality and mutual assistance — socialism's truly great asset."

The Party leadership's call is being filled with specific content. A few days ago the Politbureau instructed the Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee to organise an in-depth and all-round study of the problems piled up in the NKAR, the reasons for the exacerbation of inter-ethnic relations around it, and work out pertinent proposals for their implementation.

For all their specifics the events in Nagorny Karabakh are only one of the neuralgic knots that have come to light of late in national relations — the most sensitive and delicate sphere of human mentality and existence. That is why one of the coming plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee will deal specially with the development of national relations. One of the key issues, I believe, is to guarantee the autonomous region's socio-economic and cultural rights against unconstitutional and unlawful actions.

Today Stepanakert and the settlements and villages of Nagorny Karabakh live and work the normal way. The enterprises, regrettably few in number, and educational establishments are making up for lost time. And the peasant is as always in the field, caringly tending to the future harvest of wheat, barley, potatoes, cotton, tobacco or grapes, or putting sheep to graze. He works with care on the land lavishly soaked with the blood of internationalists, fighters for the victory of the socialist revolution in this proud mountain country.

Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan, which one hundred years ago accounted for about half the world oil output, has moulded the magnificent traditions of working class international brotherhood. The first plenipotentiary body of Soviet power in the Caucasus was the Baku Government headed by Lenin's comrade-in-arms Stepan Shaumyan, in whose honour the capital of Nagorny Karabakh has been named. Soviet power was overthrown by British-German interventionists and Azerbaijan nationalists. On September 20, 1918, 26 members of the Baku Government, including its leaders brought together by bonds of fraternal friendship, were heinously shot in the sands of the Transcaspien region. Let us recall some of their names. Stepan Shaumyan, an Armenian, Meshadi Azizbekov, an Azerbaijani, Alexei Dzhaparidze, a Georgian, Ivan Fioletov, a Russian. Their feat is not just something to be remembered from the past but a reminder to the present generations, for whom the hour of reason and sober decisions has come.

Karen Khachaturov,  
Vice-Chairman of the Board,  
Novosti Press Agency.