

## Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at USSR Embassy dinner in honour of U.S. President Reagan

Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave a dinner in the Soviet Embassy in Washington last Wednesday in honour of US President Ronald Reagan. The following is the full text of Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at the dinner:

Esteemed Mr President,  
Esteemed Mrs Reagan,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,  
Comrades,

The second day of our negotiations is over. They are being carried out in a frank and businesslike atmosphere.

Our attention is focused on crucial problems of both Soviet-American relations and world politics.

I have the impression that we have made advances in several serious questions and this inspires optimism. But at the same time there remain some areas in which there are big differences.

I ought to say, Mr President, that I have the feeling that what we are discussing with you is so significant for the entire world that

we constantly sense its keen attention and interest in what is happening here.

This is only natural. The decisions that we will adopt, the results that we will attain may become crucial for the destinies of the world. This is the point at issue today. Such is the scope of our responsibility.

Without confidence in the future, without faith that one's children and grandchildren will enjoy life, the joy of existence fades. No benefits of modern civilisation, no achievements of the scientific and technological revolution can make up for that.

Our great Russian poet Alexander Pushkin said — the joy of life is the best university.

We would like to be involved in the establishment of a "university" whose curriculum will have no such "subjects" as enmity between nations, suspicion and disrespect for another people, disregard for its interests, fear and coercion.

Such a "university" will teach how to live together in the present-day complex and multi-faceted world.

As to our idea of a nuclear-free future, it is, as we understand, close to the public thought in America.

Back in 1945 at a time when the first atomic bomb was made, outstanding American scientists who took part in its development came out against production and use of this terrible weapon.

Of course, bombs and missiles have no power of thinking, even though people do equip them with an "electronic brain". This mechanism is deprived of soul and conscience and, therefore, is more dangerous than any madman.

There is no issue — be it conventional arms, regional conflicts or human rights — on which it will be impossible today to reach understanding or make progress, provided, naturally, one regards it honestly and seriously.

(Continued on Page 448)

## Mikhail Gorbachev's speech on White House Lawn

*IN his speech on the White House Lawn on Tuesday December 8 Mikhail Gorbachev said:*

Esteemed Mr President,  
Esteemed Mrs Reagan,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,  
Comrades,

Thank you very much, Mr President, for the cordial welcome and kind words of greeting.

History has charged the governments of our countries, and the two of us, Mr President, with a solemn duty to justify the hopes of Americans and Soviet people, and of people the world over, to undo the logic of the arms race by working together in good faith.

In the world's development, much will depend upon the choice that we are to make, upon what is to triumph — fears and prejudice inherited from the cold war and leading to confrontation, or common sense, which calls for action to ensure the survival of civilisation.

We in the Soviet Union have made our choice. We realise that we are divided not only by the ocean, but also by profound historical, ideological, socio-economic and cultural differences. But the wisdom of politics today lies in not using those differences as a pretext for confrontation, enmity and the arms race.

We are beginning our visit 46 years after the days when the United States entered the Second World War. And it was in those same days — in 1941 — that the rout of nazi forces began near Moscow. That is symbolic. Those days mark the beginning of our common path to victory over the forces of evil in a war which we fought as allies.

History is thus reminding us both of our opportunities, and of our responsibility. Indeed, the very fact that we are about to sign a treaty eliminating Soviet and US intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles, which are now going to be scrapped, shows that at crucial phases in history our two nations are capable of shouldering their high responsibility.

This will, of course, be the first step down the road leading to a nuclear-free world, whose construction you, Mr President, and I discussed at Reykjavik. Yet it is a great step into the future, the future to which our two peoples and the peoples of all countries aspire.

I have come to Washington with the intention of advancing the next and more important goal of reaching agreement to reduce by half strategic offensive arms in the context of a firm guarantee of strategic stability. We are also looking forward to a most serious and frank dialogue on the issues of Soviet-American relations.

Soviet foreign policy today is most intimately linked with perestroika, the domestic restructuring of Soviet society. The Soviet people have boldly taken the path of radical reform and development in all spheres — economic, social, political, and intellectual.

Democratisation and glasnost are the decisive prerequisites for the success of those reforms. They also provide the guarantee that we shall go a long way and that the course we are pursuing is irreversible. Such is the will of our people.

In charting these ambitious plans, the Soviet people have a vital stake in preserving and strengthening peace everywhere on earth.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen,

May I express the hope that the Soviet Union and the United States, working together with all nations, will take their places in the history of the outgoing 20th century not only as allies in the battle against nazism but also as nations that have paved mankind's way to a safe world, free from the threat of nuclear annihilation.

On behalf of the Soviet people, I declare that we are prepared to go all the way along our part of the road with the sincerity and responsibility that befit a great and peaceful power.

Thank you.

### IN THIS ISSUE

Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at USSR Embassy dinner for U.S. President Reagan .....	p. 445
Mikhail Gorbachev meets representatives of the U.S. public .....	p. 446
Mikhail Gorbachev meets leaders of U.S. Congress .....	p. 448
Soviet-U.S. Summit Statement .....	p. 449
Mikhail Gorbachev's speech on Soviet Television .....	p. 453

# Mikhail Gorbachev meets representatives of the U.S. public

*ON Tuesday, December 9 Mikhail Gorbachev met representatives of the US public, including well-known politicians, businessmen and people in culture and the arts, at the Soviet Embassy in Washington. Addressing the audience, Mikhail Gorbachev said:*

I'm sincerely glad to have this meeting and I cordially welcome you to this hall. I value the fact that gathered here are those who, busy as they are, have responded to our invitation, and who, having given up their business and their occupation for a while, have come here to meet with us.

If we have a movement towards each other, that means a lot. So thank you very much for that spirited movement on your part.

I mentioned in my NBC interview that I had received 80,000 letters from Americans. That is without those that have arrived here at the Embassy. For that matter, I get about 70,000 letters from my own fellow-countrymen, sometimes as many as 120,000 a month. So I get a big mail.

This is what Emily Holders, 17, writes, "many Americans mistrust the Russians. Many Russians mistrust Americans. We have many causes for not trusting them, and they, the Russians, too, have many reasons, causes for not trusting us. But I feel," she writes, "that there's something wrong about all this, there's something lacking."

This is a question posed by a person who is just 17 years old. And then the letter continues, "we must have a feeling of common responsibility for our survival. Therefore, what we must do is to try and build a world of responsibility as if our entire lives depended upon it. And if we, one human family, do not learn to co-operate as one humankind, then we will inevitably be destroyed by what we ourselves have created. But if we do learn to co-operate, then just think of the opportunities opening up before us, the wonderful future opening up before us."

Now this — see, there's a young budding philosopher talking with some very good optimistic views. So I think the young people who are coming to replace us are a good generation.

In another letter addressed both to myself and President Reagan, the following question is raised, "Mr President, Mr General Secretary, you've lived your lives. And you are meeting together. You will be discussing questions on which the lives, human lives depend. Please see to it that we can live our own lives, too, and preserve the future."

Now I feel something very serious is afoot, something very profound, something that embraces broad sections of the people both in the United States and in the Soviet Union — an awareness that we cannot leave our relations as they are, the relations between our peoples, between our two nations.

And I thought that any time there is this kind of movement in the minds of men, it begins with the intellectuals — in the minds of the intellectuals. They are the yeast of society as it were — it is they who trigger off new processes in society.

At the same time I ask myself and you — are we not perhaps lagging behind? We, the representatives of political and intellectual circles, are we not lagging behind what the people have come to realise?

We should really ponder whether we might not be lagging behind sentiments, the feelings of our peoples, because those sentiments are certainly in favour of the two countries and peoples drawing closer together.

Academician Velikhov has shown initiative and organised exchanges of groups of school-children for the summer holidays, and a group of American kids came to the Soviet Union. They were in an area not far from Moscow — in Pereslavl-Zalessky. They wrote some marvellous letters and had them taped.

Back in the United States, they published a newspaper. One of its sub-titles was, "The Russians are Coming". And then, they explained what kind of Russian "invasion" they were talking about and what the consequences would be.

I'm really thrilled by the fact that our kids — 12, 13, 14 years old — the oldest were just 17 — how profoundly, how deeply aware they are that something needs to be done. And they certainly lay big demands on us.

I feel that we have approached a crucial point in history when we politicians, first of all, came to bear special responsibility, that of expressing in full the sentiment of the people in favour of rapprochement between our two countries, in favour of an improvement in relations.

At the Moscow Forum, I met with a group of prominent Americans, including Mr Vance, Dr Kissinger, Mrs Kirkpatrick, Mr Peterson and others. We said to each other that you can't build confidently a realistic policy nowadays unless there is a fusion of efforts by politicians, scientists and artistic people.

You know how many former secretaries or ambassadors are present here? It was only later that they learned that you can only uphold, usefully uphold, your interests if you heed other peoples' interests. If there is a balance of interests.

The Soviet Union has its own interests, and the United States has its interests. And who has said that, let's say, India doesn't have any interests of its own, or Kampuchea, or Bangladesh... They all have their interests. And I think it is important that precisely this understanding underlie the structuring of new relationships.

What I mean to say is that there are new realities, and those realities have dictated their new imperatives. We call them the challenges of the time.

We, all of us, are the children of our time. And that is our wealth, our treasure, if, of course, we dispose of that wealth properly, if we don't just lump it all together, but if we draw lessons and compare how we acted before, and in what situation, what the world was in the past. And whether we can — in today's world — still act as we did 10, or 20, or 30 years ago.

I see here representatives of very many theories which were advanced, starting from "the balancing on the brink of war", of "containment", of "rolling back"... But, this has all become a thing of the past. And unless we understand — we and you in the United States — unless we realise all this, it'll be hard, indeed, for the world to switch to another track, to take a new path, the path of improving international relations, of co-operation.

And you know, how those around us feel this — these needs that are knocking on the doors, on Soviet doors and on American doors, that we should not turn a deaf ear to that.

Such are the new realities. It seems that we have perceived them but, perhaps, we have not yet come to understand everything to the full extent. But we have endeavoured to perceive them and put that perception at the basis of our analysis, our vision of the world today. So, if in the past, we emphasised only the fact we are different — and we are saying so today, and this should be realised, but must not

be overdramatised — today we emphasise, nonetheless, that we are all part of one and the same civilisation. We are interconnected — through science and technology, through the environment, through the challenges that are growing and dictating to us that we should be united in our thoughts and actions. Isn't it the duty of the intellectuals to communicate this perception to the nations? I think it is the duty of all intellectuals to do so. I told the President today it was desirable that there should be a scientific element in the elaboration of the policies of each nation, both domestic and foreign, and that people in the arts should make their ethical contribution to politics. We've lost a lot because policies frequently have been unethical. To rectify that we are prepared not only to practise exchanges, but also maintain co-operation, hold meetings in order to perceive the situation together from the viewpoint of universal human values. I don't see any grounds for being upset simply because we are different. Take any family, different people live together in it. Take the international community, can all who make it up be identical? We are all different, but we are of one and the same civilisation. Everything is interconnected. We will remain different, but we live in one and the same world, so let us all think what intellectual contribution we — the Soviet Union and the United States — can make, above all, from the viewpoint of coming to understand the new realities, and how we can contribute to a restructuring of relations, first and foremost, between our two nations.

At this point, I would like, sincerely, to expound my vision of the present-day situation, to share my ideas as to where we stand and what our common responsibility is.

Now, I cannot understand the people who have given a hostile reception to elements of co-operation, elements of mutual understanding that appeared in the process of drafting the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. I fail to understand them as a human being. Although it can be explained — it concerns interests. Everything is explained by the interests. But there are different kinds of interests. There are interests of the mass of the people — including American and Soviet people — and these are the supreme interests. And the task of politicians is to express exactly these interests, not the narrow selfish interests of some groups or strata in one or other society.

We do not make claims to having the truth in the highest instance — we are prepared to make our contribution. We have enough intellectual resources ready to join in this process of perceiving the world and the process of building up a new relationship. I believe that both our countries have immense opportunities in this respect.

As to the second part of what I wanted to say, I can describe — just to keep you informed — the state of the restructuring of Soviet society at the current phase.

We initiated perestroika because we need it. We could not live any longer in the way we had been living before. Economically, we could have continued to move by inertia. There was still some growth and we could have ensured a two or three per cent rise of the national income. But that is not the crux of the matter. We tried to take a fresh look at our society as a whole, and we came to the major conclusion that the potential of the socialist system was not being utilised in full in terms of both the human factor and manoeuvring through the planned economy. So we took a look at our society in a bid to

(Continued on Page 452)

# Mikhail Gorbachev's remarks at signing of Soviet-American Treaty

THE Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons — medium- and shorter-range missiles — was signed at a ceremony in the White House on Tuesday December 8.

Addressing those present, Mikhail Gorbachev said:

Mr. President,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,  
Comrades.

Succeeding generations will hand down their verdict on the importance of the event which we are about to witness. But I will venture to

say that what we are going to do — the signing of the first ever agreement eliminating nuclear weapons — has a universal significance for mankind both from the standpoint of world politics and from the standpoint of humanism.

For everyone, and, above all, for our two great powers, the treaty whose text is on this table offers a great chance at last to get onto the road leading away from the threat of catastrophe. It is our duty to take full advantage of this chance and move together toward a nuclear-free world, which holds out for our children and grandchildren, and for the children of these grandchildren, the promise of a fulfilling and happy life without fear and without a senseless waste of resources on weapons of destruction.

We can be proud of planting this sapling, which may one day grow into a mighty tree of peace. But it is probably still too early to bestow laurels upon each other. As the great American poet and philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "the reward of a thing well done is to have done it".

So let us reward ourselves by getting down to business. We have covered a seven-year-long road replete with intense work and debate.

One last step towards this table — and the treaty will be signed.

May December 8, 1987 become a date that will be inscribed in the history books. A date that will mark the watershed separating the era of a mounting risk of nuclear war from the era of the demilitarisation of human life.

## Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at luncheon given by U.S. State Department

*Here follows the full text of Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at a luncheon given in his honour by the US State Department on December 9:*

Esteemed Mr Secretary of State and Mrs Shultz,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Allow me to express my gratitude for the invitation to such an authoritative institution as the State Department of the United States of America. A great deal in international politics depends on those who work here. In any case, the event which we witnessed yesterday and in which we participated would not have taken place without their part.

The President of your country and I signed yesterday the treaty on the elimination of an entire class of nuclear weapons, two classes, to be more precise. As a result the world will be rid of altogether approximately 2,000 lethal warheads. This is not a very large number. But the importance of the treaty goes far beyond the limits of its concrete contents.

We assess it as the beginning of the implementation of the programme for the construction of a world without nuclear arms, which I proposed on behalf of the Soviet leadership and Soviet people nearly two years ago, on January 15, 1986.

I have been asked more than once since then if I continue to believe that that programme is realistic. I answer yes, certainly. The signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles shows that the road to this aim is far from easy, but it also shows that it is the right road and that the aim is feasible.

The will of hundreds of millions of people operates in this direction. They come to realise that as the 20th Century is running out, civilisation has approached the divide between not so much systems and ideologies as common sense, the instinct of self-preservation of mankind, on the one hand, and irresponsibility, national egoism, prejudice, in a word, old thinking, on the other.

Humanity comes to realise that it has fought enough wars, that wars should be banished.

Two world wars and the exhausting cold war alongside "local conflicts" that have taken and

continue taking the toll of millions of lives is too high a price to pay for adventurism, conceit, disregard for the interests and rights of others, unwillingness or inability to face the realities, to show consideration for the right of all peoples to make their own choice and have a place in the sun.

This means that the lofty ideals of humanists of all times — the ideals of peace, freedom, the awareness of the value of every human life — should be the basis of practical policy.

Each new step in world development, given sound and responsible approach to it, enables us to grasp problems more profoundly and equips us with additional opportunities for their solution.

It is essential not to let these opportunities slip, to use them to the utmost for the construction of a more secure world, rid of trappings and psychology of militarism, a more democratic world.

It won't be an overstatement to say that this step — I mean the treaty signed — and its preparations were truly instructive. They enriched our two countries and world politics with the recognition of the significance of difficult but simple truths. It will be appropriate to mention some of them.

First of all, in meeting each other halfway we came to appreciate still more the role and importance of Soviet American relations in present-day international development, and at the same time, our great responsibility not only to our peoples but also to the world community.

Second, we have become aware how important the support for our efforts by our allies is, moreover, what a substantial reserve is contained in their ideas, advice, in their real and engaged participation, in coordinating our actions with them.

Third, we have tested in practice how important is the understanding of one's intentions, proposals and plans by the allies of one's partners and, certainly, sympathy and solidarity, and even a simple wish of success from many developing and non-aligned countries, large and small.

All this confirmed convincingly a simple but very important truth that peace today is not a monopoly of a state or group of states, no matter how powerful. Peace is the concern and destiny

of many, and in an increasing degree of all. And wherever many inter-act, reciprocity is indispensable and compromises cannot be avoided.

Peace from positions of strength is intrinsically fragile, no matter what is said about it. In its very nature it is based on confrontation — covert or overt, on the constant danger of outbreaks, on the temptations to use force.

Over centuries humanity was compelled to put up with such a really lean peace. But we can tolerate this no longer.

Some people think that in drafting the treaty the Soviet side conceded too much, while others think that it is the US side that made too many concessions.

I think that neither view is right. Each side conceded exactly as much as necessary in order to balance their interests in the given concrete area.

Creating the atmosphere of contacts, of direct communication, getting to know each other better, without which it would be more difficult to achieve the treaty, we realised more profoundly, as I hope you realised, too, that it is above all necessary to preserve peace so that we should all remain different, live in our homes the way we choose and have the opportunity to hold disputes with each other and assert our views.

A fundamentally new important step, if a modest one, was made today toward a more equitable, more humane order in international relations. One would like to hope that the subsequent steps will not be long in coming. Besides that, it is easier to continue a good undertaking, relying on the experience of the work already carried out.

We are all now on a transition from knowledge as dogma to knowledge as thinking. We have embarked on restoring the peacemaking predestination of politics. It should not be any longer the continuation of war by other means, the way it happened in the 20th Century after the ending of world wars.

As politics change, the predestination of diplomacy changes, too. It is called upon to seek out seeds of accord even in the sea of differences and to turn the possible into realities.

The diplomatic services of our two countries had to exert themselves much in recent years.

*(Continued on Page 454)*

# Mikhail Gorbachev meets leaders of U.S. Congress

ON December 9 Mikhail Gorbachev had a meeting with the leaders of the United States Congress. Taking part in it were James Wright, Thomas Foley, Robert Michel, Tony Coelho, Trent Lott, Robert Byrd, Robert Dole, Alan Cranston and Alan Simpson.

Present from the Soviet side were Eduard Shevardnadze, Alexander Yakovlev, Anatoli Dobrynin, Vladimir Kametsev and other officials.

Mikhail Gorbachev made the following speech:

I am glad to see you in this hall. When still in Moscow, when we were considering the programme for this visit, we felt that contacts and meeting with the leaders of the US Congress should be an important element of our programme. And that is only too understandable as Congress is indeed a most important element in the political process in the United States of America. Nothing can happen in the USA without its participation, just as in our country nothing can happen without the participation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Due to common effort and meeting each other half way, we arrived at yesterday's event — a unique event in the history not only of our relations, but of international relations generally. A very big step has been taken, and I think we can congratulate each other on having taken it. I have familiarised myself with the initial reaction in the world to the act of the signing of the treaty, and I can see that it evoked great response in the world. Proceeding from yesterday's event, I would like to invite you all to think together on a very important theme, in effect — how are we going to live together in this great world of ours? For instance, I can feel there is a great desire among broad sections of the Soviet people for the bettering of our relations, and I feel there is a similar movement among the American public. But if this mood of the people is not really perceived in the political institutions such as Congress, and the Supreme Soviet, the United States Administration and the Government of the USSR, this process will not have the necessary impetus.

On the eve of my departure for Washington I had several international meetings, specifically, with the Australian Prime Minister and the Zambian President. They have come from the opposite corners of the world. And all the conversations started with their telling me — you are going to the United States for a visit, be sure to do everything that your relations start changing for the better. So we all bear vast responsibility. And it is not only the responsibility to our peoples. Peoples the world over want our relations to improve. There is incipient progress in our relations on a political plane. More senators and congressmen now come to the Soviet Union. We have always attached much importance to such visits. And I am sure that you have seen for yourself that we all want the dialogue between parliamentarians to be serious, to become broader. That was my first point.

And my second point would be this. Ahead lies the process of disarmament that is by no means an easy process. What we want is to try and see to it that this burden be lightened as far as possible so that it should not press heavily on the United States and the Soviet Union. And when I say this, many people, I would say not far-sighted people speculate that Gorbachev is not having an easy time if he's come to the USA and talks about

easing the burden of the arms race on the Soviet Union.

But to that let me say that that is not the case. The point of the matter is to have a true understanding of the problem. The arms race greatly complicates the political dialogue and other ties and is affecting economic processes in both our countries. We can see how high are the mountains of arms we have amassed as a result of the arms race. And we are sitting atop of that all. And just consider what would happen if it should suddenly go into effect, if it comes out of our control. If we are all aware of that, we should try to move towards each other. I welcome the fact that through a difficult dialogue, realistic thought, nevertheless, is seeking to make a way for itself in public and political circles, both in the United States and in the Soviet Union.

We believe the time has come for our political institutes, the main, supreme institutes to become aware of this urgent need and realise it in politics.

Yesterday we took but a first step. It relates to not more than five per cent of the nuclear arsenals, but its political importance is much greater, for the most difficult step has been taken. It seems to me that since the American side and the Soviet side have all been very strict in scrutinising our approaches to the treaty and felt that this is not a simple matter, you should bear in mind that for the first time in our country this matter was proceeding not easily. I told the President yesterday that many questions are asked in our society, questions are asked of the General Secretary and the Government, openly, in the press, to say nothing of letters, whether the Soviet leadership was right in reducing three to four times greater volumes of nuclear weapons. For that matter, the Gallup Institute and our own Institute of Public Opinion had a poll taken in the United States and the USSR, and it turned out that half of the population of the Soviet Union

(from front page)

The world is interconnected and interdependent not only because a nuclear catastrophe would not spare anyone. Growing with every passing year is the risk connected with the fact that the poles of wealth and poverty are moving apart more and more widely. To solve the problem is one of the huge tasks involved in protecting the contemporary world from annihilation.

Investments in disarmament and peace are the most reliable and promising input of capital.

Shortly before the trip here I was shown a youth newspaper called "Bridge" which American boys who visited the Soviet Union this year began to publish. Together with Moscow schoolchildren they set up a camp of friendship near the ancient Russian town of Pereslavl Zalessky not far from Moscow.

Their pursuits there included computers, telecommunications, sports, music, the Russian and English languages, games and excursions — everything they are capable of. The American children now write about their impressions.

I am not sure that any one of you has held this newspaper in your hands. But it deserves most serious attention. This is a significant phenomenon. This is a school of human contacts in which we adults should learn from our children.

Children show to us an example of how one should get rid of prejudices and boring stereotypes.

It turns out that it is possible easily and naturally to establish most friendly and close relations and to regard the citizens of another

said that we should carefully consider if the signing of this treaty will not be damaging the security interests of the Soviet Union. Now, that was news to us, I must tell you. So we feel that we will have to work with our public opinion and with the Supreme Soviet. Perhaps for the first time the process of ratification in our own country will not go through so easily. But in so far as I was deeply involved with the treaty, including its details, I would like to say that it is a very seriously elaborated treaty. And the main thing is that we had arrived at quite unprecedented machinery of verification. This is important not only for this treaty. This also engenders the hope that when we approach the stage of cutting strategic arms, we can put to good use the experience we have gained. This is an example of how the coincidence of interests can be established and acted upon even in such a delicate matter as verification.

\*

The congressmen who took the floor thanked Mikhail Gorbachev for the meaningful and sincere conversation during which most important questions of Soviet-American relations and the international situation were discussed in a spirit of complete openness. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, James Wright, said that everything which is now taking place in Washington, including the agreement signed yesterday, means a good initial step on the road to a better mutual understanding and more fruitful relations between the two great countries. Addressing Mikhail Gorbachev he said he had been very frank with the congressmen today and that they all admired what he was doing and trying to achieve in the Soviet Union. James Wright said he only regretted the fact that not all of his colleagues had an opportunity to take part in so frank a discussion. He said he was absolutely confident that the people of the

(Continued on Page 455)

country with trust and jointly create something useful.

This greatly ennobles one and makes both sides more humane, simple and, I would say, more clever.

The history of relationships between our peoples and states is rich in various pages. Some of them are inspiring while others evoke bitter feelings. Much has been spoilt over the past forty years.

Nevertheless, in my deep conviction everything positive, and there is not so little of it, can be of benefit to both peoples. As far as Soviet people are concerned they can value both what is good, and kind words.

We shall never forget the American sea convoys to Murmansk and the sacrifices for the sake of the common victory and, of course, the link-up on the Elbe.

We also remember the factories built in the first five-year plan periods with the assistance of American engineers and workers, the joint work of scientists who battled against serious ailments of the century, and the joint space flight.

Our confrontation and antagonism have their causes in the evaluation of which there is no agreement. However, peace and co-operation are much more wise than confrontation and unfriendliness.

Peace to the peoples of the United States of America and the Soviet Union!

Peace to the peoples of the planet Earth!

I wish Mr President and his wife and all guests of our home health and happiness.

Till we meet in Moscow.

# SOVIET-U.S. SUMMIT STATEMENT

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, met in Washington on December 7-10, 1987.

Attending the meeting on the Soviet side were Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze, Member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Alexander Yakovlev, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoly Dobrynin, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Vladimir Kamentsev, Chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, First Deputy Minister of Defence of the USSR and Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergei Akhromeyev, Assistant to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoly Chernyayev, Head of the General Department of the CPSU Central Committee Valery Boldin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Alexander Bessmertnykh, Ambassador of the USSR to the United States of America Yuri Dubinin, member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Viktor Karpov, and Ambassador-at-large Alexei Obukhov.

Attending on the US side were Vice-President George Bush, Secretary of State George Shultz, Secretary of Defence Frank Carlucci, Chief of Staff Howard Baker, Jr., Acting Assistant to the President Lieutenant-General Colin Powell, Counsellor of the Department of State Ambassador Max Kampelman, Ambassador-at-large and special adviser to the President and Secretary of State on arms control matters Paul Nitze, special adviser to the President and Secretary of State on arms control matters Ambassador Edward Rowny, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral William Crowe, Jr., Ambassador of the US to the USSR Jack Matlock, and Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs Rozanne Ridgway.

During the course of the official visit, which had been agreed during the two leaders' November 1985 meeting in Geneva, the General Secretary and the President held comprehensive and detailed discussions on the full range of issues between the two countries, including arms reductions, human rights and humanitarian issues, settlement of regional conflicts, and bilateral relations. The talks were candid and constructive, reflecting both the continuing differences between the two sides, and their understanding that these differences are not insurmountable obstacles to progress in areas of mutual interest.

They reaffirmed their strong commitment to a vigorous dialogue encompassing the whole of the relationship.

The leaders reviewed progress to date in fulfilling the broad agenda they agreed at Geneva and advanced at Reykjavik. They took particular satisfaction in the conclusion over the last two years of important agreements in some areas of this agenda.

The General Secretary and the President affirmed the fundamental importance of their meetings in Geneva and Reykjavik, which laid the basis for concrete steps in a process intended to improve strategic stability and reduce the risk of conflict. They will continue to be guided by their solemn conviction that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. They are determined to prevent any war between the United States and the Soviet Union, whether nuclear or conventional. They will not seek to achieve military superiority.

The two leaders recognised the special

responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United States to search for realistic ways to prevent confrontation and to promote a more sustainable and stable relationship between their countries. To this end, they agreed to intensify dialogue and to encourage emerging trends towards constructive co-operation in all areas of their relations. They are convinced that in so doing they will also contribute, with other nations, to the building of a safer world as humanity enters the third millennium.

## I. Arms control

### The INF Treaty

The two leaders signed the treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. This treaty is historic both for its objective — the complete elimination of an entire class of Soviet and US nuclear arms — and for the innovative character and scope of its verification provisions. This mutual accomplishment makes a vital contribution to greater stability.

### Nuclear and Space Talks

The General Secretary and the President discussed the negotiations on reductions in strategic offensive arms. They noted the considerable progress which has been made toward conclusion of a treaty implementing the principle of 50 per cent reductions. They agreed to instruct their negotiators in Geneva to work toward the completion of the treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms and all integral documents at the earliest possible date, preferably in time for signature of the treaty during the next meeting of leaders of state in the first half of 1988. Recognising that areas of agreement and disagreement are recorded in detail in the joint draft treaty text, they agreed to instruct their negotiators to accelerate resolution of issues within the joint draft treaty text including early agreement on provisions for effective verification.

In so doing, the negotiators should build upon the agreements on 50 per cent reductions achieved at Reykjavik as subsequently developed and now reflected in the agreed portions of the joint draft START treaty text being developed in Geneva, including agreement on ceilings of no more than 1,600 strategic offensive delivery systems, 6,000 warheads and 1,540 warheads on 154 heavy missiles; the agreed rule of account for heavy bombers and their nuclear armament; and an agreement that as a result of the reduction the aggregate throw-weight of the Soviet Union's ICBMs and SLBMs will be reduced to a level approximately 50 per cent below the existing level, and this level will not be exceeded by either side. Such an agreement will be recorded in a mutually satisfactory manner.

As priority tasks, they should focus on the following issues:

(a) The additional steps necessary to ensure that the reductions enhance strategic stability. This will include a ceiling of 4,900 on the aggregate number of ICBM plus SLBM warheads within the 6,000 total.

(b) The counting rules governing the number of long-range, nuclear-armed air-launched cruise missiles (ALCMs) to be attributed to each type of heavy bomber. The delegation shall define concrete rules in this area.

(c) The counting rules with respect to existing ballistic missiles. The sides proceed from the assumption that existing types of ballistic missiles are deployed with the following numbers of warheads. In the United States: Peacekeeper (MX): 10, Minuteman III: 3, Minuteman II: 1, Trident I: 8, Poseidon: 10. In the Soviet Union:

SS-17: 4, SS-19: 6, SS-18: 10, SS-24: 10, SS-25: 1, SS-11: 1, SS-13: 1, SS-N-6: 1, SS-N-8: 1, SS-N-17: 1, SS-N-18: 7, SS-N-20: 10 and SS-N-23: 4. Procedures will be developed that enable verification of the number of warheads on deployed ballistic missiles of each specific type. In the event that either side changes the number of warheads declared for a type of deployed ballistic missile, the sides shall notify each other in advance. There shall also be agreement on how to account for warheads on future types of ballistic missiles covered by the treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms.

(d) The sides shall find a mutually acceptable solution to the question of limiting the deployment of long-range nuclear-armed SLCMs. Such limitations will not involve counting long-range, nuclear-armed SLCMs within the 6,000 warhead and 1,600 strategic offensive delivery system limits. The sides committed themselves to establish ceilings on such missiles, and to seek mutually acceptable and effective methods of verification of such limitations, which could include the employment of national technical means, co-operative measures and on-site inspection.

(e) Building upon the provisions of the treaty on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, the measures by which the provisions of the treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms can be verified will, at a minimum, include:

1. Data exchanges to include declarations by each side of the number and location of weapon systems limited by the treaty and of facilities at which such systems are located and appropriate notifications. These facilities will include locations and facilities for production and final assembly, storage, testing, and deployment of systems covered by this treaty. Such declarations will be exchanged between the sides before the treaty is signed and updated periodically after entry into force;

2. Baseline inspection to verify the accuracy of these declarations promptly after entry into force of the treaty;

3. On-site observation of the elimination of strategic systems necessary to achieve the agreed limits;

4. Continuous on-site monitoring of the perimeter and portals of critical production and support facilities to confirm the output of these facilities;

5. Short-notice on-site inspection of:

- i) declared locations during the process of reducing to agreed limits;
- ii) locations where systems covered by this treaty remain after achieving the agreed limits, and
- iii) locations where such systems have been located (formerly declared facilities);

6. The right to implement in accordance with agreed-upon procedures, short-notice inspections at locations where either side considers covert deployment, production, storage or repair of strategic offensive arms could be occurring;

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

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

Taking into account the preparation of the

treaty on strategic offensive arms, the leaders of the two countries also instructed their delegations in Geneva to work out an agreement that will commit the sides to observe the ABM Treaty, as signed in 1972, while conducting their research, deployment, and testing as required, which are permitted by the ABM Treaty, and not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty, for a specified period of time. Intensive discussions of strategic stability shall begin not later than three years before the end of the specified period, after which, in the event that the sides have not agreed otherwise, each side would be free to decide its course of action. Such an agreement must have the same legal status as the treaty on strategic offensive arms, the ABM Treaty, and other similar, legally binding agreements. This agreement will be recorded in a mutually satisfactory manner. Therefore, they direct their delegations to address these issues on a priority basis.

The sides shall discuss ways to ensure predictability in the development of the US-Soviet strategic relationship under conditions of strategic stability, to reduce the risk of nuclear war.

### Other Arms Control Issues

The President and the General Secretary reviewed a broad range of other issues concerning arms limitation and reduction. The sides emphasised the importance of productive negotiations on security matters and advancing in the main areas of arms limitation and reduction through equitable, verifiable agreements that enhance security and stability.

### Nuclear Testing

The two leaders welcomed the opening on November 9, 1987, of full-scale, step-by-step negotiations, in accordance with the joint statement adopted in Washington on September 17, 1987, by the Secretary of State of the United States and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

The Soviet and US sides have agreed to begin before December 1, 1987, full-scale stage-by-stage negotiations which will be conducted in a single forum. In these negotiations the sides as the first step will agree upon effective verification measures which will make it possible to ratify the USSR-US Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974 and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty of 1976, and proceed to negotiating further intermediate limitations on nuclear testing leading to the ultimate objective of the complete cessation of nuclear testing as part of an effective disarmament process. This process, among other things, would pursue, as the first priority, the goal of the reduction of nuclear weapons and, ultimately, their elimination. For the purpose of the elaboration of improved verification measures of the USSR-US treaties of 1974 and 1976 the sides intend to design and conduct joint verification experiments at each other's test sites. These verification measures will, to the extent appropriate, be used in further nuclear test limitation agreements which may subsequently be reached.

The leaders also welcomed the prompt agreement by the sides to exchange experts' visits to each other's nuclear testing sites in January 1988 and to design and subsequently to conduct a joint verification experiment at each other's test sites. The terms of reference for the experiment are set forth in the statement issued on December 9, 1987, by the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States. The leaders noted the value of these agreements for developing more effective measures to verify compliance with the provisions of the 1974 Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the 1976 Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty.

### Nuclear Non-Proliferation

The General Secretary and the President reaffirmed the continued commitment of the Soviet Union and the United States to the non-

proliferation of nuclear weapons and in particular to strengthening the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The two leaders expressed satisfaction at the adherence since their last meeting of additional parties to the Treaty and confirmed their intent to make, together with other states, additional efforts to achieve universal adherence to the Treaty.

The General Secretary and the President expressed support for international co-operation in nuclear safety and for efforts to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, under further-strengthened IAEA safeguards and appropriate export controls for nuclear materials, equipment and technology. The leaders agreed that bilateral consultations on non-proliferation are constructive and useful, and should continue.

### Nuclear Risk Reduction Centres

The leaders welcomed the signing on September 15, 1987, in Washington of the Agreement to establish nuclear risk reduction centres in their capitals. The Agreement will be implemented promptly.

### Chemical Weapons Ban

The leaders expressed their commitment to negotiation of a verifiable, comprehensive and effective international convention on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. They welcomed progress to date and reaffirmed the need for intensified negotiations toward conclusion of a truly global and verifiable convention encompassing all chemical-weapons-capable states. The Soviet Union and the United States are in favour of greater openness and intensified confidence-building with regard to chemical weapons both on a bilateral and a multilateral basis. They agreed to continue periodic discussions by experts on the growing problem of chemical weapons proliferation and use.

### Conventional Forces

The General Secretary and the President discussed the importance of the task of reducing the level of military confrontation in Europe in the area of armed forces and conventional armaments. The two leaders spoke in favour of early completion of the work in Vienna on the mandate for negotiations on this issue, so that substantive negotiations may be started at the earliest time with a view to elaborating concrete measures. They also noted that the implementation of the provisions of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe is an important factor in strengthening mutual understanding and enhancing stability, and spoke in favour of continuing and consolidating this process. The General Secretary and the President agreed to instruct their appropriate representatives to intensify efforts to achieve solutions to outstanding issues.

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

### Follow-up Meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe

They expressed their determination, together with the other 33 participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to bring the Vienna CSCE follow-up Conference to a successful conclusion, based on balanced progress in all principal areas of the Helsinki Final Act and Madrid concluding document.

## II. Human rights and humanitarian concerns

The leaders held a thorough and candid discussion of human rights and humanitarian questions and their place in the Soviet-US dialogue.

## III. Regional issues

The General Secretary and the President engaged in a wide-ranging, frank and business-like discussion of regional questions, including

Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq war, the Middle East, Kampuchea, southern Africa, Central America and other issues. They acknowledged serious differences but agreed on the importance of their regular exchange of views. The two leaders noted the increasing importance of settling regional conflicts for reducing international tensions and for improving East-West relations. They agreed that the goal of the dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States on these issues should be to help the parties to regional conflicts find peaceful solutions that advance their independence, freedom and security. Both leaders emphasised the importance of enhancing the capacity of the United Nations and other international institutions to contribute to the resolution of regional conflicts.

## IV. Bilateral affairs

The General Secretary and the President reviewed in detail the state of Soviet-US bilateral relations. They recognised the utility of further expanding and strengthening bilateral contacts, exchanges and co-operation.

### Bilateral negotiations

Having reviewed the state of ongoing US-Soviet negotiations on a number of specific bilateral issues, the two leaders called for intensified efforts by their representatives aimed at reaching mutually advantageous agreements on — commercial maritime issues; fishing; marine search and rescue; radio navigational systems; the USSR-US maritime boundary; and co-operation in the field of transportation and other areas.

They noted with satisfaction agreement on the expansion, within the framework of the Soviet-US Air Transport Agreement, of direct air passenger services including joint operation of the Moscow-New York route by Aeroflot and Pan American Airways, and on the renewal of the Soviet-US World Ocean Agreement.

### People-to-people contacts and exchanges

The two sides took note of progress in implementing the Soviet-US general exchanges agreement in the area of education, science, culture and sports, signed at their November 1985 Geneva meeting, and agreed to continue efforts to eliminate obstacles to further progress in these areas. They expressed satisfaction with plans to celebrate jointly the 30th anniversary of the first exchanges agreement in January 1988.

The two leaders reaffirmed the importance of contacts and exchanges in broadening understanding between their peoples. They noted with particular satisfaction the progress made in the development of people-to-people contacts under the initiative they launched at their 1985 meeting in Geneva — a process which has involved tens of thousands of Soviet and US citizens over the past two years. The leaders reaffirmed their strong commitment further to expand such contacts, including among the young.

### Global Climate and Environmental Change Initiative

With reference to their November 1985 agreement in Geneva to co-operate in the preservation of the environment, the two leaders approved a bilateral initiative to pursue joint studies in global climate and environmental change through co-operation in areas of mutual concern, such as protection and conservation of stratospheric ozone, and through increased data exchanges pursuant to the Soviet-US environmental protection agreement and the Agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America concerning co-operation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes. In this context, there will be a detailed study on the climate of the future. The two sides will continue

*(Continued on Page 454)*

# Mikhail Gorbachev's press conference at USSR Embassy

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV gave a press conference at the USSR Embassy in Washington last Thursday on the results of his official visit to the United States.

"The visit was a major event in world politics. We can speak of reaching a new very important stage from the viewpoint of both bilateral Soviet-American relations and the world situation," Mikhail Gorbachev said.

"The fact that this was the third Soviet-American summit speaks for itself — and first of all for the dynamism of the political dialogue between the United States administration and the leadership of the USSR. We can say that neither Geneva, Reykjavik nor the other steps both on our part and on the part of the American administration were in vain. The very fact of the holding of the third meeting, undoubtedly, is important, but had it not brought about certain results this would not have given us reason to classify this visit as a major event."

"On concluding the talks with the President of the United States we adopted today a joint Soviet-American statement at summit level," Mikhail Gorbachev told the press conference. "By itself this fact is evidence of a certain dynamism, of a certain level of our political dialogue."

"The importance of this document is that it shows the range and content of the discussions in that took place," the Soviet leader noted. "When reading this document you will also be able to determine the degree of mutual understanding and accord on various matters. At the same time this document is also confirmation of still remaining big and serious differences."

"We again forcefully confirmed the solemn declaration of Geneva that nuclear war should never be unleashed, that there can be no victors in it, that we are fully resolved to prevent any war between our countries — nuclear or conventional, that we will not strive for the attainment of military superiority."

"We regard this as a timeless commitment of the two great powers to the entire world community," Mikhail Gorbachev stressed.

"Realistically assessing the preservation of differences in some areas, I would say very serious differences, we do not regard them as insurmountable," he pointed out. "On the contrary, they prompt a still more vigorous dialogue. Summing up this conceptual part of our joint statement it can be said that at the highest level of our two states it is recognised that they are now moving away from a prolonged confrontation, that they are prepared to leave it behind. This is an important political result and an important political statement in the joint document. Precisely this is the essence of the transition to the new stage in Soviet-American relations," he stressed.

"On reaching agreement on the elimination of two classes of missiles we opened a new stage in the real process of nuclear disarmament," Mikhail Gorbachev continued.

"I would say that this is our common success, a success of our two countries, but at the same time it is also a success of our allies who took part throughout this long marathon at all stages in the search for compromises, new approaches and solutions to difficult problems," he pointed out.

"I would also recall here all the participants in the public movements in the world who stimulated the politicians of our countries and political quarters in the whole world to the search for solutions necessary for concluding the treaty on eliminating nuclear armaments first of all of this class, and prevented it from stopping despite all difficulties and obstacles."

"Measures of verifying compliance with the future treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms were worked out in detail in the course of these Soviet-American talks," Mikhail Gorbachev said. "In the past this caused us big difficulty. Mutual understanding in the field of verification is a result of the successful work that was done when preparing the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles."

"With due consideration for the drafting of the treaty on strategic offensive arms the President of the United States and I have instructed the delegations in Geneva to work out an accord that will oblige both the Soviet and the American side to observe the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972," Mikhail Gorbachev told the press conference. "This concerns both the process of carrying out research, development and, when necessary, tests that are permitted by the ABM Treaty and non-withdrawal from the Treaty in the course of the agreed-upon period. This is from the text of the joint statement."

"We have agreed to continue intensive discussions of strategic stability," he said. "It has also been determined that if the USSR and the United States fail to reach agreement on observance of the Treaty after the expiry of its period of operation, each side would have the right to determine independently its course of action."

"After we genuinely reached the positions of eliminating intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and tackled the problems of reducing strategic offensive arms, the questions of conventional armaments and chemical weapons began to loom larger. They have become more acute and moved to the forefront — although", the Soviet leader stressed, "we are against dramatising the situation and censure attempts to speculate on it."

"Nevertheless, both we and the West Europeans have genuine concern. That is why we are inclined now to pay the most serious attention to these types of armaments. I must say that we already have good experience accumulated during the preparation of the just-signed treaty."

"Concerning conventional armaments and armed forces, I offered the President here in Washington to give this issue a new political impulse like the one we imparted in Reykjavik to the problems of nuclear disarmament when we saw that the talks in Geneva were deadlocked for all practical purposes," Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out. "This has produced results and we now have the first treaty on the elimination of nuclear armaments."

"Basing ourselves on this experience we can act today similarly also in respect of conventional armaments," he continued. "We believe that we should act as follows — sit down at the table, brush aside all wrangles, exchange all data, evaluate it, identify asymmetry in armaments and troops and start solving the problem. As far as we are concerned, we are prepared to start this work without delay and will insist on it. Such is the opinion of our allies as well. We are prepared for the most radical reductions," he stressed.

"We have discovered lately that the process of advance to drafting a convention banning chemical weapons has clearly slowed down," Mikhail Gorbachev told the press conference. "In our opinion it has slowed down through the fault of the United States. We feel that the American side would like to depart from the aim that we agreed upon in Geneva — general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons — and keep their binary types outside the ban. The United States would also wish in the event of the signing of such a convention even with such 'blank spots' to limit verification of facilities only to state-owned ones. For the Soviet Union this is everything, while for America and the West Europeans it is almost nothing. What equal approach is this, what account for concerns is this, what sort of partnership is this?" — the Soviet leader queried.

"On military aspects of the talks held I would like to say that a serious, extremely important breakthrough on questions of verification has taken place," Mikhail Gorbachev stressed at the press conference. "I would say that the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles sets unprecedented standards in openness and glasnost, in scope and depth of mutual verification and control."

"As far as verification of disarmament goes, we shall be the staunchest supporters of the strictest, most genuine verification," the Soviet leader said.

"We witness the fact that there is broad striving all over the world to resolve the existing regional conflicts by political means," he went on to say. "This can be seen not only from the positions of countries involved in conflicts. It is also clearly shown by the attitudes of many governments. This gives us, the two countries on which a great deal depends, a chance of really doing something in the solution of these acute problems of world politics."

"The discussion of regional problems was not easy," Mikhail Gorbachev continued. "I will not say that we have advanced far in their discussion. Nevertheless, all of us had a feeling that the US administration started approaching regional problems in a somewhat more realistic way."

"We and the Americans and other countries should definitely proceed from the recognition of every people's right to choice. This is the cardinal starting point," the Soviet leader said.

"The Soviet Union has straightforwardly stated that it does not want and does not strive to establish a pro-Soviet regime in Afghanistan," Mikhail Gorbachev stressed. "But the American side must clearly and precisely state that it does not strive for the establishment of a pro-American regime in Afghanistan. A government on the basis of a combination of and account for political realities, on the basis of cooperation, on the basis of a coalition for national reconciliation should be created in free, nonaligned and neutral Afghanistan," he stressed.

"As of today only 220 citizens in the Soviet Union have not been allowed to leave the country for permanent residence abroad," Mikhail Gorbachev told the press conference. "This is because they were linked to this or that extent with defence computer technology and control systems, with state secrets. No matter what we are told, we will not let them go abroad until these secrets become obsolete. So far the world is such and we are obliged to take this into consideration."

# USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs' and U.S. Secretary of State's Statement

Following is the full text of the Statement by the Secretary of State of the US and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, distributed by the State Department:

In accordance with the joint statement on the problems relating to nuclear testing, adopted in Washington on September 17, 1987, the US and the USSR are proceeding to design a joint verification experiment. This experiment will be conducted as soon as possible at each other's sites (respectively in Semipalatinsk and Nevada) for the purpose of elaborating improved verification measures for the 1974 Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the 1976 Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty. These verification measures will, to the extent appropriate, be used in further nuclear test limitation agreements which may subsequently be reached.

For the purpose of the joint verification experiment, each side will provide the other side with an opportunity to measure the yield of one or two explosions at each other's test site with

yields not less than 100 kilotons and approaching 150 kilotons.

For the purpose of the joint verification experiment, each side will have the opportunity, on the basis of complete reciprocity, to measure the yields of the explosions for verification purposes, using teleseismic methods, and, at the other side's test site, hydrodynamic yield measurement methods, in a satellite hole. As a yield standard, the experiment will include yield measurement by means of a hydrodynamic method in the emplacement hole.

The joint verification experiment will not be designed to produce statistically significant results, but will be conducted in such a way as to address all other concerns identified by either side regarding methods proposed by the other side for verification of the 1974 Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the 1976 Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty. The sides have also agreed that the experiment will give sufficient information to resolve these concerns by providing an example of the effectiveness of the verification methods used in the joint verification

experiment and by demonstrating their practicality and non-intrusiveness. The experiment will thus provide the basis for agreeing on those verification measures which could be used by either side to verify compliance by the other side with the provisions of the 1974 and 1976 treaties. The understanding has been reached that in the future each side will be entitled to apply any or all of these agreed verification measures.

In order to develop and reach agreement on specific technical and organisational parameters of the joint verification experiment the sides have agreed to establish ad hoc working groups at their negotiations.

In order to help prepare themselves to design and conduct the joint verification experiment, the sides have agreed to exchange visits of delegations to the two sides' nuclear test sites. These visits, to the USSR Semipalatinsk test site and the US Nevada test site, will take place in January 1988 as the preliminary work of the next negotiating round in Geneva.

(TASS December 10)

(from page 446)

understand it and ourselves, to find out what kind of a society we lived in. What we needed for this was glasnost and democratisation. These, of course, are complex and extremely thorough processes. Their purpose is not just to shake our system apart. We want to really fathom it, and on the basis of the objective analysis, to build up a concept and then intelligently to go through this very complicated period. And that is what we have initiated. The quest is not an easy one, and it is not always easy for us to assess our historical past. We have had to call a spade a spade on occasions.

We have not yet said everything and sorted it out, but we have got to the bottom of one thing, the most important thing which forms the basis of the policy of perestroika. Over the two and a half years we have formed a view of the society which we live in and tried to take a look at the future and the roads which we will have to take. We are taking exactly these roads. The process is far from simple. There is nothing to be concealed here. Comrade Zalygin, editor of the magazine *Novy Mir*, is sitting here. On the example of the work of his magazine he can tell how feelings are running high in all spheres of our society — political, economic, spiritual, moral and social. We will go along the chosen path. There is simply no other alternative. The alternative is stagnation and marking time. Our people will simply not agree to this now. But while on this road we will put the conservatives in their place and, at the same time, prevent jumping over the stages and prevent adventurism. Quite a few meetings have been held in the past one and a half to two years. Yes, they are needed because revolutions always started in this way. The entire society came into motion. And today, at the next stage, there is a growing need for the practically difficult, serious, profound and responsible work. Now as we started linking the concept with life, millions of people became affected. The next two to three years will be most painful. Everything must change — political institutions and the economic situation. Some of you have already written that we would not cope with this task because we try to solve it on the basis of our socialist values. Let us wait and see. I am convinced that we will make it, that we will link the interest of the individual with that of the public through relevant mechanisms, new economic mechanisms, an improved centralism and elections of managers.

Because when a person depends on the results

of economic performance on the basis of cost-accounting he will no longer tolerate at the head of his enterprise a loafer or an incompetent manager. Now he needs a knowing, intelligent manager who is capable of successfully doing his business today and seeing the morrow. That is why elections are needed. That is why we are spreading the process of democracy to the economy as well. As to plan economy, it gives us the chance to carry out structural changes less painfully. I think that we are not using even 50 per cent of our system's potential. We are only now realising what socialism is and what it can really yield. We are returning to Lenin. In his concluding years he gave much thought to the future of the country and saw that something that impeded socialism as a system from unfurling was beginning to happen. We are trying to understand this thought of Lenin's. Of course we are not trying to apply his ideas mechanically to present-day life — society, the country and the people have changed very much since then. We are making a big effort to see how to tap socialism's potential, its economic and democratic potential, its political, spiritual and moral potential.

You should also remember that 90-odd per cent of the population are people who were born after the Revolution. They know no other government and no other system. And we will remake our society on the basis of this system's mainstays and values, as we perceive it. This is our concern. I do not understand why it should worry Americans. It is only natural that our new thinking in respect of internal processes in the country, our approaches to them are making themselves felt also on our views on the world as a whole, on relations with this world. And it is our view that international relations need a perestroika. On the other hand, we cannot impose it "by decision of the CPSU". This should be a result of consent by the entire human community, of all its participants. We are open to dialogue, to a comparison of views, to exchanges, and we respect the value and choice of each participant.

In short, we will be firmly following our road, the road of perestroika regardless of difficulties. It will become easier later on.

As to relations with America, I simply do not know how we can tolerate any further such a state of our economic and trade ties. We are actually not linked with you.

True, this also shows that in this respect both you and we can live without one another. But is this the point that we wanted to prove to each other? No. I think we have an immense mutual interest. Take our scientists, ask them about the interest with which they meet and exchange ideas. This is very important to them. I know this, and they cannot do without this. It would not be a normal situation if the scientists of the two biggest countries would have no contacts, would not be enriching each other with ideas. The same goes for other spheres. I know, for example, your businessmen.

The time has come when we and you really should think everything over, determine where we are, what stage have we reached, analyse everything. Perhaps this will require another ten, twenty, thirty or a hundred meetings in order to determine at long last how we should live in this world. This question concerns both our two peoples and all peoples. America and the Soviet Union must find a way of co-operating, of drawing closer together and, in future, also of being friends. Let us not hurry, let us not develop any euphoria, and let us have a responsible attitude. We do not need illusions for there are stubborn realities. At the same time it is necessary to begin, for everything begins with a first step.

If this visit and the things that have originated in the last few years in our relations are now drawing their energy in public sentiments which are moving in this direction, this means that the ice has been broken. Personally, I am an optimist.

## The Socialist Republics of the Soviet Union

A new series of booklets from Novosti Press Agency (APN)

The Russian Federation .....	£1
Armenia .....	70p
Byelorussia .....	70p
Kirgizia .....	70p
Latvia .....	70p
Lithuania .....	70p
The Ukraine .....	70p
Fraternal Alliance (on the USSR) ....	70p

Available from Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW (01-373 7350).



# Mikhail Gorbachev's speech on Soviet Television

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV spoke on Soviet Central Television on Monday evening. Follows the full text of his speech:

Good evening, dear comrades,

The visit to the United States is over. The way to it was a no simple one — there was Geneva and Reykjavik, an intensive dialogue between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, intensive diplomatic negotiations.

We permanently cooperated with our allies and had an active exchange of views with the leaders of other states. We were lending a particularly attentive ear to the sentiments of the international public, workers in science and culture, and representatives of different political trends advocating peace. All that enriched our idea of the processes taking place in the world, infused us with confidence that we are acting in the right direction.

Thus we were going to Washington with the mandate of our people, our allies, and reckoning with the sentiments and aspirations of millions of people of goodwill.

When going to the USA, we prepared very thoroughly, comprehensively weighing and discussing at the Political Bureau more than once the principled stand from which we would act there, and once again calculated everything from the military-technical viewpoint. The philosophical-political basis of these preparations were the decisions of our Party's 27th Congress and the Programme for a nuclear-free world proclaimed on January 15, 1986.

The content and results of our visit are known. We have signed with the President of the United States the treaty on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. The agreement reached on that issue is a major international event, a victory of the new political thinking.

The intensive talks, which took up most of the time, centred on the issues of reducing strategic offensive weapons. We have reaffirmed our readiness for a 50 per cent cut in the strategic offensive weapons on condition that the ABM Treaty be preserved in the form in which it was adopted in 1972 — which is reflected in the joint statement on the results of the meeting.

We again brought into sharp focus the issue of the need for the earliest conclusion of the treaty to end nuclear tests. We discussed thoroughly questions of eliminating chemical weapons and reducing conventional arms and armed forces in Europe.

In general, our aspiration is that the questions of disarmament, eliminating the nuclear threat, lessening tensions and confrontation in the world, and strengthening new approaches in building international relations be put to the foreground. This really happened in the course of the talks.

The main outcome of the Washington visit is, certainly, the signing of the treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles. This is the first step towards a real destruction of the nuclear arsenal.

Only yesterday this seemed a utopia to many people. Today it is becoming a fact.

They say that just a modest step has been made — humanity will get rid of only 4 per cent of nuclear weapons. Yet, it shall not be forgotten that according to the calculations of scientists, it would take only 5 per cent to destroy every living thing on Earth.

But this is not all. The treaty has shown for everybody to see the possibility of a turn from arms race to disarmament. Now the point is to preserve the atmosphere which made it possible to conclude the treaty, to act further constructively and consistently. To this end it is necessary, in the first place, to give the treaty its legitimate force by ratifying it.

As far as the USSR Supreme Soviet is concerned, I hope that it will support the treaty, since this is the will of our people.

It is also important that many deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, its commissions, in the first place the foreign commissions, practically participated in examining the issues connected with the drafting of the treaty.

We know that struggle around the ratification is underway in the United States. But we also know that the American people support the treaty. We have felt this most acutely once again when staying in America.

This is a very important period. And I wish to tell you that the awareness of the importance and pivotal character of this moment was manifested in full measure at the meeting of leaders of the Warsaw Treaty countries in Berlin.

Having unanimously endorsed the results of the visit in the communique adopted, they resolutely declared that at the new stage they will be acting in concord in the interests of disarmament and international cooperation.

It can be said that there was a very positive reaction to the results of the Washington meeting in most countries.

But when old views are being scrapped, resistance of those who link their political and material well-being with them invariably increases.

Merely three days have passed since our return, but definite circles in the United States and in other Western countries are already rallying to prevent the changes for the better.

Voices calling on the leadership of the United States not to go too far, to halt the process of disarmament, sound ever louder.

Demands are made to take urgent measures to 'compensate' for the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles by bringing new nuclear forces closer to Europe and into Europe, by modernising nuclear and other armaments remaining in Europe.

Certain persons even try to assert that the talks in Washington have removed differences on such a problem as SDI and under that pretext make calls for speeding up work on that programme.

I must say outright that these are dangerous tendencies and that they should not be underestimated. They can undermine the nascent turn in the process of demilitarising international relations.

We hope that the world community, above all the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union, and sound forces in all countries will redouble their efforts to save the first sprout of nuclear disarmament that has pushed through concrete walls of prejudice and stereotypes of hostility.

It is now important to work all together to promote the deepening of positive tendencies, the strengthening of mutual understanding and cooperation.

The arrangements reached offer an historic chance to the whole of humanity to start getting rid of the heavy burden of militarism and war which took a horrible toll in human life and rolled back economic development and material

culture, shackled freedom and the spiritual and social creativity of peoples.

At the discussion of every question during the visit, the issue of the role and responsibility of the United States and the Soviet Union as to how they should interact and build their relations came up for discussion in one way or another, for this is important for both our countries and the whole world.

The awareness of this is growing not only in the Soviet Union but also in the United States. We noticed this while meeting and holding conversations with political leaders and public figures, with representatives of science and culture.

During our conversations with the President and American political leaders, we emphasised more than once that it is necessary to grasp new realities and to act in relations between the two countries accordingly, to coexist and to show respect for the choice of each people.

We said outright that we came to Washington not in order to be engaged in altercation and mutual recriminations, as is often the inclination of the US side. We came in order to be engaged in real politics.

I think that for all of you, comrades, it is of course interesting to know what the reaction, the behaviour of the US Administration was, what its positions and its view of our relations were, whether there were any changes in this respect.

We on the delegation exchanged views more than once relating to this question, a question that was not easy to comprehend. I should tell you — from a firm viewpoint, standing on the ground of facts and without exaggeration, it is so far early to speak about a drastic turn in our relations.

Nevertheless, I want to point out that the dialogue with the President and other political figures of the United States was different from before — it was more constructive. After talking with representatives of intellectual and business circles and mass media bodies, I formed the impression that changes are taking place.

What riveted our attention most was the mounting wave of goodwill on the part of ordinary Americans — as they learn through television and the press our objectives, our true views, what we want and how Soviet people really regard America and Americans.

I said to the President — the Soviet leadership is ready for transferring our relations into a channel of mutual understanding, into a channel of constructive interaction in the interests of our countries and the entire world. It is precisely within this context that we raised other issues, inviting the US Administration to join us in the search for the solutions to most acute problems of present-day politics.

We persistently raised before our counterparts the issue of our two countries' possibilities in rendering assistance in the political settlement of regional conflicts.

Although we did not move far ahead in this area, the discussion of these issues has clarified the situation and provides for the continuation of the dialogue.

The joint Soviet-American summit statement, as you noticed, gives much place to the development of bilateral relations between the USSR and the United States. Specific agreements were reached on a number of issues — in the sphere of scientific cooperation, cultural exchanges and people-to-people contacts.

In the talks and especially during the meeting with businessmen we had an interesting dis-

*(Continued on next page)*

(from previous page)

cession of issues of expanding economic cooperation and trade.

Positive changes in that sphere would be of major importance for improving the entire atmosphere of Soviet-American relations and the situation in the world for that matter. However, as I have already had a chance to say, enormous efforts will be required here, primarily from the American side through the fault of which there appeared a no small number of artificial barriers in the way of normal and mutually beneficial economic ties.

I would like, dear comrades, to make one more point: The visit to the United States has demonstrated very plainly the extent of attention with which the entire world is watching our restructuring drive. Numerous questions of a most diverse character are asked. What is restructuring? Is there resistance to it? How determined are we to carry restructuring through? Won't we stop half-way? Is the people willing to accept such a profound renewal of Soviet society?

Really, this is true and sincere interest in what is happening in Soviet society along the lines of restructuring. It attests to the recognition of our country's role in the world today. And for

all of us it is one more reminder that the more successful we are in furthering the revolutionary cause of restructuring the better will be the affairs on the international scene.

Such is the situation today, such is the dialectics of world development — one more proof of the interconnection and integrity of the present-day world despite its entire diversity and its contradictory nature.

We should understand this and bear this in mind as we are addressing specific practical tasks in every town and village, in every work collective and the country as a whole.

Let me say words of gratitude to Soviet people for their increasing contribution to the restructuring drive, for their practical deeds in response to the Party's call for a revolutionary renewal of society, for their active participation in the transformations that have started, for their support for the efforts of the Central Committee and the government in the work for peace. Without all this there would have been no success in the recent talks, and those talks could have hardly taken place at all.

Thank you comrades! Let us congratulate ourselves on this success and let us keep working.

All the best to you. □

(from Page 447)

And noting the truly historic event — the signing of the treaty — moreover, while staying here one should pay tribute to the many who applied their minds, drive, patience, persistence, knowledge, a sense of duty to their people and the international community. I would like above all to commend Comrade Eduard Shevardnadze and Mr George Shultz.

I would like to say a kindly word also about diplomats working abroad. They were not merely conducting negotiations. In the capitals of their host countries they helped people realise what can be achieved and what cannot, what is promising and what is so far not feasible.

I liked the thought expressed in a recent article in an American newspaper that diplomacy is the first line of a country's defences and the forward line in the struggle for peace.

But foreign policy has ceased to be the domain of professionals alone. The practice of accords and agreements deceiving peoples and dooming them to actions and sacrifices running counter to their vital interests becomes a thing of the past. Any falsity, any untruth becomes revealed one way or another.

In this characteristic feature of the present I see an earnest of genuine democratisation of inter-state relations. In a strong field of human attraction, attention and exacting demands on people authorised to represent their states in other countries, they should constantly account for their steps and explain them.

Besides that, they are on the sensitive line of the contact of cultures and much depends on them in the understanding of one people by another. And this is extremely important now in politics, too.

The presence in this hall of outstanding representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union is not a mere concession to protocol and etiquette. This is evidence of the fact that a political course of a better mutual understanding between our countries has authoritative support.

This support inspired us on the long and arduous road to the agreement about the beginning of real nuclear disarmament. But since we do not intend to halt at the start of the road, this support will be needed also tomorrow, when we shall continue joint work to eliminate the biggest and the most dangerous part of our nuclear arsenals.

In this connection I would like to mention such a reserve for the relations between our countries as contacts between scientists and workers in culture. It is they precisely who largely shape national awareness and attitude to other nations. And precisely for this reason they find the common language quicker, creating the necessary background also for politics. The role of the intelligentsia of the two countries in relations between our peoples and states is large and important.

In the language of ordinary human communication, in Russian and in English, what we have achieved here means the revival of hope. Force is a variable and unstable category, while truth achieved by honest work is constant, for it is human.

We are now closer to the truth than we were yesterday.

My congratulations to you.

(from Page 450)

to promote broad international and bilateral co-operation in the increasingly important area of global climate and environmental change.

### Co-operative Activities

The General Secretary and the President supported further co-operation among scientists of the Soviet Union, the United States and other countries in utilising controlled thermonuclear fusion for peaceful purposes. They affirmed the intention of the USSR and the US to co-operate with the European Atomic Energy Agency (EURATOM) and Japan, under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency, in the quadripartite conceptual design of a fusion test reactor.

The two leaders noted with satisfaction progress under the bilateral agreement on peaceful uses of atomic energy towards establishing a permanent working group in the field of nuclear reactor safety, and expressed their readiness to develop further co-operation in this area.

The General Secretary and the President agreed to develop bilateral co-operation in combating international narcotics trafficking.

They agreed that appropriate initial consultations will be held for these purposes in early 1988.

They also agreed to build on recent contacts to develop more effective co-operation in ensuring the security of air and maritime transportation.

The two leaders exchanged views on means of encouraging expanded contacts and co-operation on issues relating to the Arctic. They expressed support for the development of bilateral and regional co-operation among the Arctic countries on these matters, including coordination of scientific research and protection of the region's environment.

The two leaders welcomed the conclusion of negotiations to institutionalise the COSPAS/SARSAT space-based global search and rescue system, operated jointly by the Soviet Union, the United States, France and Canada.

### Trade

The two sides stated their strong support for the expansion of mutually beneficial trade and economic relations. They instructed their trade ministers to convene the US-USSR joint commercial commission in order to develop concrete proposals to achieve that objective, including within the framework of the long-term agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to facilitate economic, industrial and technical co-operation. They agreed that commercially viable joint ventures complying with the laws and regulations of both countries can play a role in the further development of commercial relations.

### Diplomatic missions

Both sides agreed on the importance of adequate, secure facilities for their respective diplomatic and consular establishments, and emphasised the need to approach problems relating to the functioning of embassies and consulates-general constructively and on the basis of reciprocity.

### V. Further Meetings

The General Secretary and the President agreed that official contacts at all levels should be further expanded and intensified, with the goal of achieving practical and concrete results in all areas of the Soviet-US relationship.

General Secretary Gorbachev renewed the invitation he extended during the Geneva summit for President Reagan to visit the Soviet Union. The President accepted with pleasure. The visit will take place in the first half of 1988.

### Expert Opinion

- Modern Socialism Must First and Foremost Know Itself**, by Alexander YAKOVLEV, Member of the Politburo and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee ..... 40p
- Soviet Trade Unions — an Influential Force in Society**, by Stepan SHALAYEV, Chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions ..... 40p

These Novosti booklets in the Expert Opinion series are available from Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW (01-373 7350).

### The Soviet Union's Foreign Economic Ties

This Novosti booklet is available from Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW (01-373 7350). Price 40p.

### Perestroika Views and opinions

*a writer, state farm manager, scientist, film director, minister, actor and historian say what they think*

available at 60p from: Soviet Booklets (SN), 3, Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW.

# Mikhail Gorbachev speaks in Berlin

"It is no exaggeration to say," Mikhail Gorbachev said last Friday, "that the signing of the first treaty eliminating two classes of nuclear weapons is an event of historic, decisive dimensions." The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee made a speech in Berlin on December 11 at a dinner at the State Council of the GDR in honour of the Warsaw Treaty leaders.

"It took the interaction of many various factors to resolve this complex task," said the Soviet leader. "It is clear that this would have been impossible had the socialist countries not acted in agreement, had they not conducted persistent and consistent struggle for disarmament and had

they not advanced an integral programme of measures in this direction, including those that have now been implemented.

"The Washington treaty can justly be regarded in two ways — as completion of a seven-year-long political and diplomatic marathon and as the first act of the real curbing of the arms race; as the end of one stage in the development of international relations and the prologue to another."

"This new stage begins in favourable conditions. I mean advancement on the issue of the 50 per cent reduction of strategic offensive arms. Understanding also was reached that it is necessary to press without delay for the solution of other topical issues — elimination of chemical weapons, cessation of nuclear testing, reduction of conventional arms and armed forces.

"The search for settling regional conflicts, serious and responsible discussion of humanitarian issues, including human rights, will be continued.

"Of course, it would be wrong to believe that all this is easy to achieve, that the train of disarmament, picking up speed, will rush on its own. We are realists. We realise full well how much effort will be required so that the first step be followed by other far more important and big steps.

"In what concerns us, the peoples can rest assured — the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries will do everything so that the treaty signed in Washington be followed by other agreements, so that the arsenals of deadly weapons be reduced till they cease to threaten the life of the human race." □

## Berlin meeting of Warsaw Treaty member-states

AS mutually agreed a meeting of the general (first) secretaries of the central committees of the fraternal parties of the Warsaw Treaty member-states was held in Berlin on December 11, 1987.

Mikhail Gorbachev informed the participants in the meeting in detail about his visit to the United States of America, and the course and results of his talks with President Ronald Reagan.

The leaders of the allied states wholeheartedly supported and highly praised the results of the Washington talks. A step of historic scope was made and it is already having a favourable impact on the political climate in the world, building up mutual trust among states and boosting hopes for the triumph of realism and reason in the present-day complicated, contradictory but interconnected world.

It was emphasised that the Soviet Union's consistent and vigorous efforts — which have produced the first real results in the sphere of nuclear disarmament — come as evidence of the efficacy of the new political thinking and are an expression of the general peaceful course of the Warsaw Treaty member-states, the initiatives and actions of the socialist countries.

Note was made of the constructive stand of the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic which expressed the readiness to assist in implementing

those provisions of the Washington treaty which apply to those states.

The Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles comes in line with the interests of all and enhances security in Europe and Asia and beyond their boundaries. Actions taken by many a state, including nonaligned states, steps made by anti-war movements and peaceful forces on all continents have promoted the treaty's conclusion.

In the joint opinion of the participants in the meeting, the fact that during the Washington talks the USSR and the US agreed in principle to cut down the strategic offensive arms of both sides by half in conditions of the strict observance of the ABM Treaty is of paramount importance. The conclusion of a relevant agreement — and this is possible even in the near future — will be a breakthrough in the cause of disarmament and the cause of establishing a nuclear weapon-free and non-violent world.

The accords reached, it was noted during the meeting, are improving the preconditions for headway in other directions that lead to the curbing of the arms race, primarily the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons, the termination of nuclear tests, and the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

(from Page 448)

USSR just as the people of the USA sincerely wished peace and that everybody's duty was to do everything within their power to achieve this goal.

The Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd said that he intended to start discussing the INF Treaty in the Senate in March next year and expressed the hope that the process of ratification will be concluded in April. He expressed concern over the slow pace of the talks on conventional armaments.

The Senate Minority Leader Robert Dole declared for lifting discriminatory restrictions on Soviet-American trade. He recalled that two years back he had been declaring for abandoning the Jackson-Vanik Amendment which, as is known, hampers normal development of economic relations between the two countries.

The Deputy Leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, Alan Cranston, welcomed new thinking in the Soviet Union and expressed the hope that the leaders of the two countries will be able to work out an agreement on the reduction of the strategic nuclear arms arsenals.

The allied socialist states reaffirmed their readiness to adhere to limits of sufficiency essential to defence, and to solve the problem of asymmetries and imbalances in individual types of weapons by means of reducing the weapons of the side that was ahead. At the same time the meeting expressed concern over intentions of certain NATO quarters to "compensate" for the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons in the continent by means of building up and modernising other types of armaments.

The participants in the meeting stated the determination of the Warsaw Treaty member-states to continue making their contribution to the cause of stronger peace, disarmament, the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security and the solution of other difficult global and regional problems. □

### USSR signs Agreement with the GDR and Czechoslovakia

THE ministers of foreign affairs of the USSR, the GDR and the CSSR attending the meeting of the leading figures of the Warsaw Treaty member-states signed in Berlin on December 11 an Agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the German Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on the inspections to be conducted in conjunction with the treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the elimination of their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. □

#### EXPERT OPINION

The Lessons of Chernobyl are Important for All, by Valeri Legasov, Member of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR... 40p

Possessing Energy Resources is not Enough, by Academician Anatoli Alexandrov, Member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR and Hero of Socialist Labour... 40p

We Count on Machine Building, by Konstantin Frolov, Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR... 40p

cheque postal order

The above booklets in this new series from Novosti Press Agency Moscow are available now from Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW (01-373 7350).

#### Realities and Guarantees for a Secure World

Mikhail Gorbachev's article published in *Pravda* on September 17.

Price 30p from:  
Soviet Booklets (SN),  
3 Rosary Gardens,  
London SW7 4NW.

#### Man, Nature and the Future of Civilisation

by Nikita MOISSEYEV  
Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences

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

Price 35p.

# The visit to Washington — results and hopes

by Vladimir Katin, APN political analyst

THE long and hard marathon of peace is finally over. The third Soviet-American summit has ended with welcome results.

A titanic job was done in the course of that meeting, which is reflected in the final document — the joint summit statement. The document has been made public and is now being carefully studied and commented on throughout the world. Let us try to do the same here.

According to the Soviet leadership, its primary importance lies in the fact that it explicitly shows both the scope and the content of the discussions in Washington. In particular, while reading the joint statement, one can find there both the degree of mutual understanding and consent on specific issues and confirmation of the still remaining major differences. Let us first turn to the positive part.

As an epigraph to the new stage of Soviet-American relations one can take the following mutual statement by the two leaders — the USSR and the US are near the exit from their drawn-out confrontation and are prepared to leave it behind. Let us hope that from now on the whole range of our contacts and cooperation will stay on the ascendant.

For all the diversity of the projected avenues of interaction between the USSR and the US, the primary route, as before, will be the nuclear arms reduction process, where fairly good prospects exist now. Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan have reiterated that nuclear war must never be started and cannot be won. Both leaders are fully determined to prevent any war, nuclear or conventional, between the two countries, and will not seek military superiority.

A remarkable thing about the Washington summit is that this programme, which was theoretically formulated by the two leaders in Geneva back in 1985, has for the first time materialised in an actual treaty — the treaty

on the elimination of intermediate and shorter-range missiles.

In other words, the first step on the way to a nuclear-free world has been made. In fact, the importance of the treaty reaches far beyond the limits of our bilateral relations, for the elimination process will immediately involve nine countries on whose territory the said missiles are deployed. This means more safety not only for Europe but also for Asia, the Mediterranean, North Africa and the Middle East. For example, Sicily — where US Cruise missiles are deployed now which will be removed under the treaty — is very close to both North Africa and the Middle East.

Sceptics insist, however, only four to five per cent of the existing nuclear arsenals are to be scrapped as a result of the treaty. The leaders of the two great powers are perfectly aware of the fact and are not stopping at this. They concentrated all their attention in Washington on a radical — 50 per cent — cut in strategic offensive weapons. According to Mikhail Gorbachev this is the central issue in Soviet-American relations. There has been appreciable progress here, too. Anyway, there is every sign that a relevant agreement will be signed in Moscow in the first half of next year.

For a long time progress at the talks had been held back by the issue of verification of observance of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Now this stumbling block has been removed. Without going into detail let us just note that the USSR and the US have agreed on truly unprecedented forms of verification. This, incidentally, is important not only for this treaty, but for the extension of these already proven principles and forms of verification to the future agreement on strategic nuclear weapons.

Nor did the two leaders overlook the issue of conventional weapons which have been a subject of a chronic dispute for years now. The West is insisting that the Warsaw Treaty countries have a conventional superiority, but the East claims just the opposite. The funny thing is that each side has a point here. That point is that each side relies on

data which confirm the historical asymmetry in the conventional arms pattern. So how can that dispute be resolved? Through negotiations, says the Soviet leader and adds that the Soviet side is prepared for radical cuts.

There is a growing drive in the whole world for resolving regional conflicts by political means. Practice shows that sheer force and weapons are not an effective tool for that purpose. These questions, too, were naturally on the agenda of the Washington summit. The leaders of the USSR and the US have had a broad, open and businesslike discussion of regional problems, including Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq war, the Middle East, Kampuchea, southern Africa and Central America. So what are the results here?

"I would not say that we have advanced far in the discussion of regional problems," said Mikhail Gorbachev. "Even so, we have the impression that the US administration has developed a somewhat more realistic approach to regional problems." Here lies the grain of hope for closer positions on these issues in the future.

The US President has been told in this connection that regional solutions cannot be divorced from the problem of human rights. The logic here is that nothing can possibly be more important than the right to live in safety and to manage one's national affairs as one sees fit. This is the premise from which the USSR proceeds.

Over the three days of talks the sides have discussed practically the whole range of current international problems and the state of Soviet-American relations with all their details and nuances. This refers to the cessation of nuclear testing, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, peaceful uses of atomic energy, prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, environmental problems, cooperation in trade, science, cultural exchanges, drug control, air and sea transportation safety, etc.

All this can be described as blue-prints for a future Soviet-American building project for the benefit of global peace and security. From paper, these blue-prints must now be converted into tangible things, and all those who treasure peace can make a contribution.

## Pravda on Soviet-U.S. Summit meeting

THE recently-concluded Soviet-US Summit treaty in Washington has become a turning point in the destiny of mankind. This is the principal idea of an article to this effect published in Monday's Pravda.

"A qualitative change has undoubtedly occurred in Soviet-US relations, of which security issues constitute the core. The point is how fully its positive consequences will be utilised. The treaty on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles stands good chances for ratification. But in the US Senate, there are opponents of the treaty who have by no means downed arms," Pravda emphasises.

"A solution to new important disarmament issues lies ahead. These are, first of all, the question of radical reduction in strategic offensive arms, and such important aspects as the elimination of chemical weapons and termination of nuclear tests. The question of headway in the cause of reducing conventional arms is also

arising," the article points out.

In this connection Pravda gives an evaluation of the so-called asymmetrical approach by certain circles in the United States to disarmament issues.

"Its meaning is in the fact that influential forces across the ocean and in NATO circles, while seeking to prevent radical changes leading to an overall thaw in Soviet-US relations and relaxation of international tension as a whole, look for possibilities to portray the treaty signed in Washington as a certain political triumph of the West which ostensibly makes it possible to dictate conditions to the Soviet Union. At the same time those forces seek to find a 'replacement' for intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, which would make it possible to 'make up' for the loss of the two classes of missiles subject to elimination," Pravda points out.

"However, and this has been once again confirmed by Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Washington, world public opinion is becoming an increasingly vigorous force which counters the

plans being devised by the advocates of confrontation and the arms race."

"The peoples have come to realise the inevitability of misfortunes and the necessity for changes. They look for ways to get closer together, and gravitate towards one another. People want to live in a world in which they will not have to spend huge funds on weapons which they, in the final analysis, can use only against themselves."

"People want to live in a world in which each nation has a right to be the master of its own destiny and to choose its own way of development. They want to know the truth about one another, and to feel the great affinity of all nations, languages and cultures," Pravda emphasises.

"Common sense and the new thinking, which counter the prejudices of the cold-war times, as if symbolise a divide between the era of the growth of nuclear threat and the era of demilitarisation of mankind's life," the article points out.