

Mikhail Gorbachev meets heads of foreign diplomatic missions

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev had a traditional meeting with the heads of foreign missions to the USSR on the occasion of the 72nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in the Kremlin's St. George's Hall on November 4. Here follows his remarks to the assembled diplomats:

Esteemed Doyen,
Ladies and Gentlemen,
Comrades,

Let me welcome you to this traditional meeting on the occasion of our national holiday – the birthday of the Land of the Soviets. Each of your personal destinies has ordained that you live, together with us, through a very complex, yet very interesting and promising period in the life of the Soviet people.

Looking at how the leaderships of most of the countries represented here are reacting to what is happening in the USSR, we can see the results of your work – objective and conscientious information.

Correctly understanding one another is now exceptionally important. The entire world is at a watershed of global, historic significance. At the threshold of another century, mankind is making a choice – a choice of how to think and how to act, a choice of international and national priorities and at the same time a choice between values gained over the millennia and capable of

servicing people in the future as well.

Renewal processes are underway in countries with widely divergent socio-political systems in various corners of the Earth. And yet there is growing awareness of the interrelation and interdependence of all parts of the world community. As a result, there is increased responsibility involved even in purely domestic decisions, let alone foreign policy ones, since any of them will, sooner or later, affect the interests of others. These other countries now require special consideration and respect.

Without this, it is impossible to reorganise international relations on a democratic, humanist basis.

This has been a busy year, packed with summits and substantive diplomatic work. There are new initiatives on the negotiating table, important decisions have been reached, out-of-the-ordinary, sometimes unique documents of international significance have been adopted. Good groundwork was laid down for next year.

We attach special significance to forging both the bilateral and multilateral mechanisms needed to translate new ideas and accords into practical action in order to attain tangible results. This is now the key issue. Embassies here, in Moscow, and, naturally, our embassies abroad

form part of this mechanism.

You know our general assessment of the international situation from the latest statements and speeches by representatives of the Soviet leadership. The positive trends are gaining momentum and acquire increasingly concrete forms. Many events back up this conclusion. But almost every day also brings unpleasant news, hampering the normalisation of relations and progressive change and countering the strivings and hopes of peoples, the public at large. Therefore there is a great amount of difficult work, both constructive and creative, to be done on a global scale.

It is fundamentally important that all countries – large, medium, small and tiny, allied, neutral and non-aligned – can now contribute to this work. It is a sign of times and of the achievements over the past few years that all members of the United Nations can play an active and unique role in world affairs.

Mankind has received a chance: by thinking and acting in a new way to move step by step towards a more harmonised, safe, and genuinely civilised world order. Only together can we realise this chance.

Please convey to your governments and peoples the best wishes and greetings of the Soviet people and the Soviet leadership. □

Vladimir Kryuchkov's report at Kremlin ceremony

IN OCTOBER 1917, the peoples of the Land of the Soviets made their historical choice in favour of socialism, and perestroika confirms this choice in the new conditions and continues the cause of Great October, said Politburo member Vladimir Kryuchkov on November 4.

Vladimir Kryuchkov, Chairman of the State Security Committee (KGB), was delivering a report at a formal meeting, which marked the 72nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in Moscow's Kremlin.

Kryuchkov described perestroika as "a revolution within the revolution" and noted that "the economy, a radical improvement of which requires more and more efforts and a certain time, is being put into the foreground now."

The speaker pointed to the difficult situation in the economy and emphasised that the focal point of the reform is the problem of property.

"The essence of this problem is the need to return the means of production to the actual ownership and disposal of the people and to release their creative initiative.

"Soviet society cannot develop without a variety of forms of socialist property and their equality," Kryuchkov said.

Perestroika means the establishment of genuine socialist democracy. Speaking about the role of the Communist Party in contemporary conditions, Kryuchkov emphasised that there was no other force in Soviet society which could lead the country to prosperity. There, it is inadmissible to decrease the Party's role as a consolidating force which countervails centrifugal trends in Soviet society.

The revolutionary restructuring has created

(Continued on page 378)

It was a glorious revolution

"WE will celebrate the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in a fitting manner," said Georgi Shakhnazarov, a People's Deputy of the USSR and an aide to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev. "It deserves that, you know."

"Our position of principle was and remains unchanged – the October Revolution was the greatest event in 20th Century history. We – at least I'm speaking for the generations linked with the socialist revolution with harmonious bonds – will never betray it. Just the same way as Americans will never renounce the Declaration of Independence or the French will never give up the ideals of their revolution," he went on.

"True, many ideals of our revolution were deformed: Stalinism distorted the system that was being born. But the revolution itself – and I'm confident that few people in the world will deny that – has had an enormous impact on all aspects of mankind's life. Without the victory of the October Revolution the world would have been an entirely different place."

"Let us recall the slogans of our revolution. Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Peace. Land to the Peasants. Factories to the Workers. Who will dare to deny the great value of those ideas? It was a glorious revolution.

"I'm confident that the bulk of our society firmly adheres to ideals of the October Revolution. Of course, there are extremists who, possi-

(Continued on p381)

IN THIS ISSUE

Gorbachev meets with leading economists.....	p378
Eduard Shevardnadze's interview with TASS.....	p379
Visit to the United States by delegation from the Supreme Soviet.....	p381
Nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe.....	p382
Defence Minister's speech at parade in Moscow.....	p384

Speeding up economic reform

GORBACHEV MEETS WITH LEADING ECONOMISTS

A meeting of the country's leading economists has been held at the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee. Opening the meeting, Mikhail Gorbachev made the following statement:

COMRADES, you've probably noted that we have invited here people representing the entire spectrum of interests, positions, points of view and schools. In short, we have met here to exchange opinions, because we realise that there is a misunderstanding on the main issues which we are discussing now and on which we must take decisions. We are to adopt far-reaching decisions, which will determine the direction of our society's future development.

This misunderstanding became manifest, for example, when the draft plan for 1990 and measures to improve the financial state of our market were discussed. Differences also arose when a number of other draft laws were debated at the Supreme Soviet session, especially the draft laws on property and economic independence of republics and regions. In fact, there has been no agreement on any key problems that we are to discuss and resolve in order to speed up the economic reform.

In short, we are all interested today in making a comprehensive and objective assessment of the economic and social situation in the country. And I know that this is something on which we all agree, though we use different terms to describe it.

However, opinions differ widely about the ways of changing the situation. True, one may say that these differences are inevitable when solutions to new problems are sought. If this

(Continued from front page)

objective conditions for the revival of national self-consciousness. Kryuchkov noted that internationalism based on total equality of all ethnic groups, and friendship and fraternity among peoples was the ideal of the Party and socialism.

Touching upon foreign policy issues, Kryuchkov said that bold and well-considered Soviet initiatives have tangibly reduced international tensions. There are real prospects of lowering military confrontation. The most important thing today, Kryuchkov said, is to consolidate the positive trends and make them stable and irreversible.

"There are good reasons to hope for real results of the Soviet-American talks on 50 per cent reductions in strategic offensive armaments, for cuts in conventional armed forces and for the improvement of confidence-building measures," Kryuchkov went on.

"At the same time, he noted that "certain quarters in the leading capitalist countries continue to display a deficit in political will for co-operation. In these conditions, the Soviet Union has to maintain its defence capability at the level of reasonable sufficiency."

Speaking about the rapid changes in the socialist world, Kryuchkov said that "there is no universal model of socialism" and that "attempts to unify, standardise social development in different countries are doomed to failure."

He expressed the conviction that "peoples that have chosen the road to socialism will overcome their difficulties, work out correct decisions and pursue the policy of creation, abiding by humanistic ideals."

The speaker described the further development of their all-round interaction and equitable co-operation as an important factor. □

were so, we should regard the situation as normal, natural.

I think, however, that these differences are not only the result of the search for new solutions. They have deeper causes. They are rooted in different interpretations of the fundamental issues, which are essential for our further progress. One of them is the fundamental question of what kind of society we want to build through perestroika. This is the key to all other problems.

I want to draw your attention to the difference between a concept and a detailed plan, a timetable of revolutionary changes, so to speak. I have already discussed this matter at a meeting with mass media executives. A concept is a general idea. Our idea of perestroika is to give socialism a new lease of life and open up the potential of the socialist system by ending people's alienation from property, the means of production, political process, power and culture. I think this is the truly Marxist approach to the problem: it puts people first.

How are we to tackle it? Our concept contains an answer to this question: we want to achieve these goals through democratisation and glasnost, through reforming property relations and the political structure of our society and through the raising of its moral and cultural level. In short, we regard man as an end, not as a means.

This is a concept that has inspired us all these years, a concept that lies at the base of our specific plans for the difficult period of transition, which will probably have many different stages.

True, we have to go a long way from formulating a concept to attaining the goals we have set and changing the quality of our society. This is the long way we must travel. It is simply absurd and unscientific to entertain other illusions or count on quick solutions.

Yet, there are questions of a different kind that require urgent solutions. This concerns, above all, the situation on the consumer goods market and the state of our finances. This is something we must change as soon as possible if we want to make people feel the results of perestroika.

In other words, we are not putting the question in the correct way: we have a concept, so all we have to do is watch. No. We must analyse in due time and depth and accumulate our experience in order to continue the process of socialist renewal of society. The message of history is that we must not force life into the Procrustean bed of dogma. This is not our way. We are against subjectivism and left-wing extremism. You scientists know well what happened when such attempts were made.

We must effectively combine politics, science and practice. And I think we are beginning successfully to combine these things, perhaps, for the first time in the history of socialism. This is, perhaps, the combination which, for all our difficulties, will save us from trouble and help us find proper solutions to the problems that face us. We must continue perestroika on the basis of the concept we have formulated, and taking into account the realities of our society.

It is mainly in real life that we want to find answers. That is why we constantly discuss things with working people and intellectuals, both scientific and artistic. In short, we constantly discuss things with society. The cause we have embarked upon is extremely difficult. It requires a lot of effort from all of us. Guided by the Leninist approach and principles, which were frequently ignored in the past, we are ta-

king in everything; the challenges of our time, the global issues and the experience of other systems. Yet, we are going our own way, prompted by our own realities.

Can we just cast away the 72 years during which we've traversed an enormous historical path, for all the mistakes made and distortions suffered. This refers to the economy, to human psychology, to the social medium in which we have lived for decades and to the habits we've developed. This is what constitutes our society. And no science without taking reality into account. If it tries to do so, it's not a science, but pseudo-science or utopia. General and pseudo-revolutionary ideas of that sort are at least unworthy and destructive. One can't use them either in politics or in practice.

Let me stress once again: our concept should be based on the realities of our society. A few days ago an author of a newspaper article urged a return to 1917-1920 — not to the beginning, laid by Lenin and the Bolsheviks, but to the February of 1917. So you understand what sort of beginning we are urged to make. But if we start everything from scratch, as some propose, shall we be able to make any progress? In fact, this is in effect what's meant when we're told that the country should be put on a social-democratic footing.

Finally, there are people who believe that the experience of five years of perestroika suggests that our society is being forced to live according to laws and methods quite alien to its essence. Hence the conclusion that we should perfect the command-and-administer system and not dismantle it.

And most important, comrades, all this has crushed down on society, having caused turmoil in people's minds. Any pseudo-revolutionary phrase may throw society to the right or to the left, with all ensuing consequences. It seems it's easy to go along any of the extreme ways. But it's a lot more difficult to move steadily and consistently ahead, doing the hard job of applying new forms of social life and breaking the old stereotypes. Now that we've approached the stage of deep and genuinely revolutionary changes, affecting the foundations of our society — the material basis, the ideological superstructure and the spiritual sphere — we must make all these things absolutely clear.

Many reproach the leadership for indecision and for being the author or co-author of half-measures. Indecision about what? Let's set things straight. By the way, others accuse the leadership of speeding up the processes, saying that the people have too little time to understand them, and that everything is quite artificial and is being imposed on them.

Even experts find it difficult to understand everything, and often give mutually exclusive recommendations, they say. How can an ordinary person see what is what in this avalanche of opinions? So, comrades, the time has come to think in earnest, to compare and to co-ordinate different positions and approaches. This is vital for us today.

I think that on the whole we've made the right choice and must stick to it. We can neither return to the beginning, nor can we stop half-way. We've already lost many years. Let's be frank. In the audience there are people who in the early 1970s prepared the Central Committee's plenary meeting on the scientific and technological revolution. In fact, the purpose of that meeting was to adjust the socialist system to the

(Continued on page 383)

Eduard Shevardnadze's interview with TASS

Here follows the full text of the answers that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, gave to questions put by a TASS correspondent:

TASS: The joint proposal of the USSR and the USA to the United Nations to put on the agenda of the 44th session of the General Assembly the question of consolidation international peace, security and international co-operation in all their aspects in accordance with the United Nations Charter evoked broad response of news organisations in the USSR and abroad. A draft decision has also been submitted. This initiative is described as historic by many. Would you agree with this appraisal? What is the importance of the two countries' joint proposal?

SHEVARDNADZE: One can go along with this appraisal. The Soviet-American initiative at the United Nations is indeed of much importance.

For the first time in all the 44 years of the United Nations existence, two major states that were at the origins of this world organisation jointly made a large-scale proposal for enhancing its role and prestige in every aspect.

The proposed draft resolution urges United Nations members to exert efforts to ensure peace and security by means of co-operation.

The emphasis is placed on the United Nations Charter and the need for stringent observance of its principles that form the basis for civilised international communication in conditions of the peaceful period setting in.

In other words, the task is set to enhance the United Nations effectiveness as a centre of co-ordinated actions of states on a basis of comprehensive approach.

The line is thus drawn under the epoch connected with the cold war, when the United Nations was actually paralysed by excessive declarativeness and confrontational polemics.

A real opportunity opens to concentrate the efforts of the United Nations Organisation and all its members on practical actions for a collective quest of realistic solutions to specific international problems.

A method for such work is determined: consultations and co-operation to find multifaceted approaches to the consolidation of a system of peace, security and co-operation in common interests.

It will not be an overstatement to say that a new quality is being imparted to a dialogue in all United Nations bodies – the Security Council, the General Assembly and specialised institutions.

This initiative is a result of positive changes taking place in Soviet-American relations, and at the same time an evidence of the noble effect of the Wyoming spirit on the entire course of international development.

Mikhail Gorbachev in his United Nations address declared for new thinking in foreign policy and for conduct of states in international affairs with reliance on the United Nations prestige and possibilities.

A joint initiative of the USSR and the US in the United Nations has become possible due to the fact that both sides have been meeting each other halfway. As a result it has been agreed in Wyoming to tackle jointly the task of enhancing the United Nations effectiveness.

We believe that the Soviet-American initia-

tive is also a patent example of effectiveness of a broad international dialogue whose development is the purpose of joint proposals of socialist countries, also in the United Nations. It is in the interest of states in any system of political-geographic coordinates – East-West, North-South, South-South.

How does the joint initiative in the United Nations relate to the forthcoming meetings of the leaders of the USSR and the US in the Mediterranean?

The relationship is direct. This initiative is part of the Soviet-American dialogue. It shows again the possibility and feasibility of co-operation of the USSR and the US in international affairs during the development of constructive parallelism of Soviet-American and multilateral interaction, also in international organisations.

We talked a great deal about the possibility of such a meeting with President George Bush in Washington and US Secretary of State James Baker in Wyoming.

The unofficial nature of the summit does not preclude its discussing large-scale questions that are the concern not only of the USSR and the USA, but also of the entire international community. It will be an important conversation on essential matters. It will be a milestone also in asserting the adherence of the two countries to the United Nations goals and principles, to common human values.

I am confident that despite its unofficial character, the Mediterranean meeting will be of milestone importance. It will largely determine the importance and substance of the official summit talks to be held late in spring – early in summer next year. □

(Moscow, November 5)

Shevardnadze and Loncar conclude negotiations

EDUARD SHEVARDNADZE, USSR Foreign Minister and member of the Politburo of the CPSU Communist Party Central Committee and visiting Yugoslav Foreign Secretary Budimir Loncar concluded their negotiations in Moscow on November 1.

They had an in-depth exchange of opinions on key aspects of the international situation. It was noted that positive changes in the world arena attest to an ever-stronger effect of the new political thinking on the improvement of the international climate and the consolidation of universal peace and security.

There is a common opinion that the forthcoming Soviet-American summit will become an important milestone in this process.

The ministers declared in favour of an early achievement of agreements at the talks on 50 per cent cuts in strategic offensive arms, on the limitation of nuclear testing, and on the banning and elimination of chemical weapons.

The heads of the foreign policy departments of the two countries positively assessed the work carried out by delegations of 23 countries during the second round of the Vienna Talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe. They declared for the conclusion of an appropriate agreement in 1990.

Gorbachev meets Egon Krenz

ON November 1 Mikhail Gorbachev, President of the USSR Supreme Soviet and Egon Krenz, General Secretary of the Socialist Unity Party and President of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic met and exchanged information on the developments in the two countries and on preparations for the 28th CPSU and the 12th SUPG congresses.

The two leaders said they intend to intensify political interaction in party, state and social areas and broaden all contacts.

Given the important scale of their economic relations, they agreed on the need to seek effective forms of co-operation and clear all remaining obstacles obstructing the development of co-operation.

They said that joint ventures, including those with the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and other countries ought to be especially encouraged.

The two leaders had a detailed discussion on security and co-operation matters. They favoured further headway in the all-European process and consistent implementation of the agreements reached within its framework on disarmament and economic and humanitarian matters.

Gorbachev and Krenz emphasised their countries' firm resolve to co-operate with all states in global problems on the basis of reciprocity, respect for the sovereignty, inviolability of frontier and territorial integrity of states and non-interference in the internal affairs of others.

The two leaders underscored the significance of stable, equal and good-neighbourly relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany for peace and security in Europe and elsewhere.

Gorbachev reaffirmed the Soviet viewpoint that all questions concerning the GDR are decided only in its capital.

The conversation was held in an atmosphere of complete understanding, frankness and cordiality. □

They pointed out that the talks by 35 countries, participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) conducted simultaneously make it possible to work out a new generation of confidence and security-building measures in close coordination with the solution of matters of disarmament.

It was emphasised that confidence-building measures should be balanced and should apply not only to land forces, but also to air forces and navies.

Both sides are convinced that positive processes in Europe make the task of consolidating stability and security in the Mediterranean more and more topical.

The ministers noted the expediency of the joint quest for ways of improving the situation in the region and turning the region into a zone of stable peace and co-operation, in which there are neither foreign armed forces nor military bases.

The ministers discussed matters of a collective quest of the ways for an undelayed and fair political settlement of dangerous regional conflicts in various areas of the world through talks on the basis of balancing interest and respect for the right of each people to choose its road of development.

Loncar spoke about Yugoslavia's efforts for

(Continued on page 380)

At the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee

THE Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee discussed at a regular meeting on November 3 Agrarian policy issues connected with the fulfilment of the Food Programme and further development of grain production in the country.

It was noted that the political significance of the grain problem demands the elaboration and implementation of an effective economic mechanism. The mechanism must provide greater incentives to collective and state farms for increasing grain production on the basis of scientific and technological advances and new production relations.

The Politburo supported the government proposals to elaborate and implement a nationwide programme to boost grain production from 1991 to 1995.

They examined progress in the fulfilment of the resolution to increase the production of drugs and their delivery to medical establishments and the population.

The implementation of the measures to clean up the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear accident was discussed as fulfilment of earlier decisions.

The Politburo endorsed the results of Gorbachev's talk with Angelo Sodano, head of the Foreign Political Department of the Vatican and special envoy of Pope John Paul II. It was noted that the meeting revealed new possibilities in the developing USSR-Vatican political dialogue and enhanced the mutual efforts and agreement between the USSR and the Vatican to promote peace, stronger international security and co-operation.

Also discussed were the results of Mikhail

Gorbachev's visit to Finland. The results of Gorbachev meeting with Egon Krenz, General Secretary of the SUPG Central Committee, Chairman of the GDR Council of State, were examined and endorsed.

Having considered Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's information about his visit to Poland, the Politburo noted that further activation of comprehensive Soviet-Polish co-operation is fully in line with the interests of both countries and peoples and in the interests of security and stability in Europe.

The Politburo also heard Shevardnadze's report on the results of the meeting of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Treaty in Warsaw between October 26-27.

The Politburo examined information on the results of Oleg Baklanov's working visit to Czechoslovakia. □

Meeting of CPSU commission on combating crime

PRINCIPLES of draft federal programme for combating crime were discussed in Moscow on November 1 by the Commission for Legislation Politics at the CPSU Central Committee.

Boris Pugo, Chairman of the Party Control Committee, presided over the commission's meeting.

The participants at the meeting noted that the further strengthening of the rule of law and the stepping up of the struggle against crime were among the most urgent issues of political significance in conditions of perestroika and the establishment of the law-governed state in the country.

An entire effective system of organisational,

legal, economic, educational, preventive and other special actions is required to counter violations of law and resolve the pressing issues.

The federal programme for combating crime must comprise all these measures.

It is advisable to single out two basic stages in the preparation and the implementation of the programme, the participants pointed out.

The objectives of the first stage are the working out urgent measures to secure the normalisation of the situation in the country during 1990 and the creation of organisational, technical, material and legal resources to prevent and effectively combat crime.

The second stage is intended to draw up a long-term, theoretically substantiated, complex programme of action meant to secure a reliable protection of socialist society against criminal infringements in the 13th five-year plan period (1991-1995) and in the perspective.

Many speakers stressed the need to make the entire legal system consistent with the present conditions of the development of Soviet society and the international agreements ratified by the Soviet Union.

The commission approved the principles of the federal programme for combating crime. It recommended that the relevant law-enforcement ministries and departments work towards the final text of the programme taking account of the suggestions and remarks made at the meeting. □

(Continued from page 379)

the implementation of the decisions made at the Ninth Non-Aligned Summit Conference held last September in Belgrade.

It was noted that the Non-Aligned Movement is striving vigorously to participate in the solution of the key problems of the present and to play an independent role in positive changes in the world. The Soviet side expressed a readiness for an active dialogue and interaction with every non-aligned country and the Non-Aligned Movement as a whole for the construction of a new, more equitable world order, free from wars and violence, and assurance to all peoples of a worthy place in the world community.

It was noted that the constructive role of the Non-Aligned Movement as an important factor of international politics continues to grow. □

Central Committee commission on foreign affairs meet

THE course of the implementation of ideas and proposals in the area of international relations, advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev in his speeches in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk, was discussed by a meeting of the Commission of the CPSU Central Committee on questions of International Politics.

It was noted that these ideas and proposals have laid down the basis for contemporary Soviet Asia-Pacific doctrine, in keeping with the spirit and principles of new political thinking, meeting the long-term national and state interests of the USSR and real tendencies and processes in the area.

Substantial contribution to the consolidation of peace and stability was made by the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, elimination of intermediate-and-shorter-range missiles in the Asian part of the USSR on the basis of the agreement with the United States, the beginning of the reduction of Soviet forces on the Eastern area of the USSR by 200,000 men, and withdrawal of 75 per cent of the Soviet military contingent stationed in Mongolia to within the limits of the USSR territory.

The meeting discussed questions connected with the preparation of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Italy.

There was an exchange of options on the development of contacts between the Soviet Communist Party and social democratic parties and other left forces.

Other questions related to instructions of the CPSU Central Committee and tasks of deepening the Soviet Union's co-operation with socialist, capitalist and developing countries were discussed. □

BOOKLETS

Now available from Soviet Booklets

The Cost of the Arms Race	50p
Europe: An Outline of Security	40p
The Soviet Economy: A look into the Future	20p
Is a New Model of Soviet-American Relations Possible?	60p
From the ABCs to Higher Mathematics	50p
Small Countries and 'Big Politics'	50p
Time for Practical Work	30p
The Great French Revolution and the Present Time	30p
Philanthropy in Soviet Society	50p
Siberia in the 20th Century	80p
The Non-Aligned Movement	40p
Co-operatives: Work and Initiative	40p
The Russian Orthodox Church before and after its 100th Anniversary	60p
Socialism: An Appraisal of Prospects	60p
Muslims in the USSR	40p
The Judicial System in the USSR	60p
The Events of 1939: Looking Back after Fifty Years	30p
The Origins of World War Two	80p
Nelson Mandela: Patriot, Fighter, Humanist	50p

The above are available at the prices indicated from:

Soviet Booklets (SN),
3 Rosary Gardens,
London SW7 4NW

Philanthropy in Soviet Society

price 50p from:
Soviet Booklets (SN),
3 Rosary Gardens,
London SW7 4NW.

Visit to the United States by delegation from the Supreme Soviet

A DELEGATION from the USSR Supreme Soviet visited the United States between October 25 and November 5 at the invitation of Senate Democratic Majority Leader George Mitchell and Senate Republican Minority Leader Robert Dole.

This was the first official visit by a Soviet parliamentary delegation since the election of the new Soviet legislature.

In Washington, the delegation, led by Yevgeni Primakov, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet's Council of the Union, had detailed discussions with a large number of congressmen and administration leaders.

It met senate and house leaders, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the senate group of observers over the arms control talks.

The senators and members of the House of Representatives, and the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet discussed a wide range of arms control issues, including the current state and prospects of negotiations on nuclear and conventional arms.

The Geneva Talks on nuclear tests and chemical weapons were also discussed. The sides agreed that arms limitation continues to be an important and promising element of Soviet-US relations.

The Soviet delegation was particularly interested in the Senate's role in the ratification of treaties.

The Soviet delegation favoured broader Soviet-American economic co-operation and trade. It called on the United States to remove obstacles impeding the development of normal trade relations.

Soviet and American legislators supported efforts to remove all barriers towards broader economic co-operation caused by the difference in the countries' economic systems as well as administrative procedures and rules.

Parliamentarians of both countries pointed to the growing understanding of the importance of transnational problems, such as damage to the environment, international terrorism, drug trafficking, and the forecasting of natural calamities and global epidemics.

Both sides agreed that the Supreme Soviet and the US Congress can make a considerable contribution to international efforts to solve these global problems and are ready to seek the achievement of these goals.

They expressed support for victims of earthquakes and natural calamities in their countries.

American legislators and Soviet deputies called for wider contacts and for a continued dialogue on the basis of more regular exchanges to discuss common problems of Soviet-US relations and concrete issues of mutual interest.

The sides agreed that intensive working relations will promote progress in the establishment of closer relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, based at a higher level of co-operation. □

Yevgeni Primakov addresses Soviet-American conference

YEVGENI PRIMAKOV, Chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, leading a Soviet parliamentary delegation which is visiting the United States at the invitation of the US Congress, addressed the 5th General Chautauqua Conference on US-Soviet relations at Pittsburg on November 4.

Speaking at the conference sponsored by the Chautauqua Institution, Primakov dwelt at

(Continued from p377)

bly, dream of restoring the old order. But I don't think they have a chance of doing that. We should go forward, not backwards," Shakhnazarov added.

"Going forward means, first, restoring all genuine values of socialism, and second, making use of all the valuable things accumulated in the world, being in the maelstrom of modern development. We should, however, retain our originality and faith in the ideals of the October Revolution," Shakhnazarov said in conclusion. □

(Novosti)

Siberia in the 20th Century

price 80p from:
Soviet Booklets (SN),
3 Rosary Gardens,
London SW7 4NW

length on the development of Soviet-American relations in the next decade.

It was recently announced that an unofficial meeting between Soviet Mikhail Gorbachev and US President George Bush would take place early in December, Primakov noted.

The report hit the headlines of American newspapers and has evoked immense interest throughout the world. This interest is quite logical.

Soviet-American relations long overstepped the framework of bilateral contacts: they radically influence the development of the international situation as a whole. That was the situation in the post-war period, and this will be the situation in the 1990s.

At the same time it would be erroneous to assess the world situation from the viewpoint of these relations. Only full realism in the assessment of world developments and only firm recognition of the inalienable right of all nations to independent choice of some or other model for development may create conditions conducive to confidence-building and to fruitful co-operation between the USSR and the United States, he noted.

Primakov stressed that the return to 'the gamble with a zero option' could have the most negative effect: it would be counter-productive to assess again situations difficult for one side as advantageous for the other and vice versa.

Describing prospects for Soviet-American relations for the coming decade, the Soviet statesman expressed hope that they would develop dynamically and rise to a higher level.

"These relations are too valuable for all of us, and all world affairs depend very much on their progress," he said in conclusion. □

Soviet delegation visits UN headquarters

REPRESENTATIVES of the Soviet public delegation, who took part in the fifth conference of Soviet and US public on bilateral and international relations at the University of Pittsburgh, visited the UN Headquarters on November 4. The delegation met Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar.

During the meeting Valentina Tereshkova, head of the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies, Veniamin Yakovlev, Soviet Justice Minister, and Academician Konstantin Frolov, Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, all Soviet MPs, expressed their satisfaction with the co-operation which has been recently established between the Soviet Union and the United Nations. The Soviet MPs briefed Perez de Cuellar on the results of the conference.

The Soviet delegation and Perez de Cuellar held a substantive discussion on human rights. In particular, it was noted that the Soviet Union was the first to deliver its report at the Human Rights Committee in Geneva, which set a new standard in the approach to discussing such issues. This underlines the new approach of the Soviet Union to the United Nations and the approach of the world body to the Soviet Union, Yakovlev said.

"We can feel the usefulness of the United Nations, especially in tackling restructuring problems in our country, because its ideas are in full conformity with the main ideas of UN work. We told the UN Secretary-General about the activities of the Union of Friendship Societies, its active involvement in UN activities and hope that co-operation will become even closer," Tereshkova said.

The UN Secretary-General told the Soviet parliamentarians about the priority problems in the work of the world body. These include nature conservation, regional conflicts, drug trafficking and international terrorism, and some problems in the work of the international court. In conclusion Perez de Cuellar gave a high appraisal of the Soviet Union's constructive proposals aimed at enhancing UN efficiency and standing in international affairs. □

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV

Visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to Cuba	40p
Visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to Great Britain	40p
On the Agrarian Policy of the CPSU in the Present Conditions	30p
Visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to China	40p
On Major Directions of the USSR's Domestic and Foreign Policy	30p
The Nationalities Policy of the Party	40p
Visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to the FRG	50p
Visit of Mikhail Gorbachev to France	50p
Address by Mikhail Gorbachev at the Meeting to Mark the 40th Anniversary of the German Democratic Republic	30p

The above titles are obtainable at the prices indicated from:

Soviet Booklets (SN),
3 Rosary Gardens,
London SW7 4NW

Nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe

by Yevgeni Babenko, TASS political analyst

THE regular session of the Interparliamentary Commission of Nordic Countries for the Establishment of a Nuclear-Free Zone in the North of Europe, which ended recently in Copenhagen, once again drew the attention of the world community to the problem of making the region nuclear-free.

The idea was first put forward by the late President Urkko Kekkonen of Finland more than a quarter of a century ago.

It surfaced again and again under various circumstances and was supported in many countries. A new impulse to the drive was imparted two years ago in the far-reaching Soviet initiatives, advanced in Murmansk by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. They concerned the entire European north — from the Baltic Sea to the Barents Sea and the North Atlantic.

The Soviet Union, confident that the Arctic must become a zone of peace, called for a radical reduction of the level of military confrontation in this region.

The Soviet Union proposed to all concerned countries to begin negotiations on the curtailment and reduction of military activity in

the north of both the eastern and the western hemisphere.

The guaranteed security of the north would undoubtedly prove a major stabilising influence on the whole European process.

During the Soviet-Finnish summit in Helsinki in October, Mikhail Gorbachev further developed the concept in his speech in the Finlandia Palace.

He announced that practical steps were being taken towards the establishment of a nuclear-free zone: the Soviet Union had decided to eliminate some categories of its sea-based nuclear forces in the Baltic Sea.

The store of anti-submarine nuclear missiles intended for submarines scheduled for scrapping will be eliminated and never to be renewed.

Facts indicate that the Soviet President's visit to Finland has affected the hearts and minds of Finns, and not Finns alone. Within a few days of the visit, the first practical international response became known.

The Copenhagen session of the Interparliamentary Commission of the Nordic countries adopted a resolution welcoming Gorbachev's Helsinki initiatives aiming to promote the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe.

All these developments have once again em-

phasised the need to try to use new opportunities for disarmament and undertake new initiatives towards the reduction of nuclear stockpiles in Europe, the resolution said.

The establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe could be a major contribution towards this objective and provide an impulse to a new positive development in this region.

The success of the Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional arms and the growing awareness of the need to re-orient armed forces towards non-offensive pursuits and remove offensive groupings from the decisive border areas makes the steps towards the establishment of a nuclear-free zone particularly timely.

The preconditions for proclaiming a non-nuclear zone in the north of Europe have recently been considerably consolidated, the participants in the Copenhagen session pointed out.

The parliamentarians called upon the governments of the Nordic countries to help expedite the work of the commission of experts of these countries' foreign ministries, who have been studying prospects for the establishment of the zone for two years.

The experts' report is required for the subsequent political decision-making.

The opinion of the Interparliamentary Commission, judging by its composition, carries weight and will undoubtedly be heeded. □

INCONSISTENCY

By Lieutenant-General V. Pavlov

THE recently published communique of the NATO nuclear planning group is noted above all for contradictory and inconsistent assessments and positions.

On the one hand, the ministers who took part in the meeting in Almansil, Portugal, on October 24 and 25, stated that the signing of verifi-

able arms control agreements, designed to strengthen security and stability at lower balanced ceilings of armed forces and armaments, is the inalienable part of NATO policy in the sphere of security. On the other hand, they welcomed progress in the work of NATO countries and bodies for ensuring the effectiveness of NATO nuclear forces.

On the one hand, the ministers stated that the

Soviet Union has a superiority in short-range nuclear missiles. On the other hand, they did not even mention the Warsaw Treaty proposal of a year ago for talks on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

The issue of superiority of one side in any specific type of weapons, discussed outside the framework of tactical nuclear weapons in general (which would make it justified to talk about NATO superiority), does not testify to a serious desire of the bloc to work for stronger stability in Europe. The attempts to attain stability of reducing armaments of only one side (that is by securing superiority for the other side) can have only a negative effect.

NATO has long been pursuing this policy at the talks. Proof of this is the elaboration of the mandate of the Vienna talks on conventional forces in Europe. Contrary to the logic of the balance of power of the sides, NATO countries managed to exclude the issue of naval reductions from the agenda. This has put a limit to possible reductions of ground and air forces, because in case of radical reductions naval imbalances will tip the balance of forces in Europe in favour of NATO.

This lop-sided approach to reductions of military activity and capabilities is influencing the talks of the 35 CSCE countries on confidence-building measures in Europe. NATO is practically sabotaging the Madrid agreement on spreading confidence-building measures to naval and air force activities.

A graphic example of NATO's inconsistency and bias is the part of the communique which concerns the Krasnoyarsk radar station. The ministers welcomed the public statement of the Soviet Union on the decision to dismantle the radar, and stressed that they would wait impa-

Pravda supports 'open-sky' concept

"THE open sky concept can and should be implemented on a world-wide scale," *Pravda's* political analyst Yuri Zhukov writes in the November 2 issue of the newspaper.

He stresses that the concept, mentioned in Shevardnadze's and Baker's joint statement on the Wyoming talks, was an important instrument for building up confidence among nations and for overcoming the syndrome of suspicion and fear. The sides have also expressed readiness to take part in an international conference in Canada on the concept's practical implementation, Zhukov recalls.

The groundwork for this new mentality of diplomats and military leaders, the analyst believes, was laid by the disarmament process. Formerly this process was hampered by the problem of verification which sometimes seemed to be unsurmountable.

Things changed in the second half of the eighties when Washington and Moscow agreed in principle on scrupulous control over any disarmament measures, including on-spot inspections. As a result Zhukov was not surprised by President Bush's statement of May 12 at Texas

A and M University, in which he proposed to revert to President Dwight Eisenhower's 34-year old 'open sky' plan.

Yuri Zhukov notes that diplomats should consider a wide range of problems at the Canada conference. First, they should find out who, in addition to the USSR, USA and Canada, will agree to 'open' their air space.

For many decades all nations have protected their air space from violations by foreign aircraft and now the question is being raised of "opening the sky" to a real inspection. Two versions are so far current in the West: either the agreement will include the United States, Canada and the USSR, or it will be joined by any NATO or Warsaw Treaty member wishing to accede to it.

On the other hand, the author notes, if the sky will be opened, let us say, over North America, the European states and the Asian part of the USSR, will it be possible to leave it closed over neighbouring territories hosting large military bases of the United States and its allies, spear-headed against the USSR? Zhukov is specially referring to air-space over Japan, particularly Okinawa, over Guam, the Philippines, Diego Garcia and many other places?

(Continued on p383)

(Continued on page 383)

Soviet Foreign Ministry's statement on Lebanon

The following statement by the USSR Foreign Ministry was circulated in Moscow on November 6:

A PARLIAMENTARY sitting was held in Lebanon, which approved the national accord charter and elected the Lebanese president and the president of the Parliament.

The country has made an important move towards restoring constitutional institutions and restoration of Lebanese statehood. The Lebanese people has encouraging prospects for turning the tragic page in their history and starting the restoration of the Lebanese home which should be based on national concord.

Lebanese lawmakers representing various political forces showed statesmanlike approach to the destiny of their country and overcame differences which accumulated during many years of the civil war and which divided Lebanese society.

It was difficult for them to take common decisions. Therefore, it is important to consolidate them consistently with further measures provided for by the national accord charter. It is necessary to continue the advance towards the revival of the Lebanese Republic and to make it stable and irreversible.

This is a national task whose successful implementation hinges on united efforts by all Lebanese, irrespective of their political views and religion. Those who would try to destroy the achievement of historic compromise by deliberate or rash actions, would shoulder a serious responsibility for the inevitable consequences.

The emerging process of a peaceful settlement is largely a result of energetic actions by the Arab League Tripartite Committee. The fact that Syria and other Arab countries constructively co-operated with the committee, also played an important role.

The common concern over the future of the Lebanese state and its people concentrated the efforts of the international community in favour of the earliest possible political solution of the Lebanese crisis.

This is reflected in the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand, the two Soviet-American statements on Lebanon and in the concerted actions by the UN Security Council and its five permanent members.

Co-operation by various countries in the solving of the Lebanese crisis has become another evidence of positive changes in the international political climate.

The success in Lebanese affairs would favourably influence the general situation in the Middle East and consolidate regional and international efforts in favour of a general settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The Soviet Union sincerely welcomes real changes for the better in Lebanese affairs. Pursuing the policy of principle for a peaceful settlement of outstanding issues and supporting unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon, the USSR will promote, in future too, the radical improvement of the situation in that country and its restoration as an active member of the international community. □

President of Italy's Parliament prepares to welcome Gorbachev

"PRESIDENT Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to our country is very important. It meets the interests of Italy which has always adhered and adheres to its consistent course of relaxing East-West tensions," TASS correspondent Nikolai Teterin was told by Giovanni Spadolini, President of the Italian Parliament.

Italy's policy aims to overcome misunderstanding and mistrust between the two blocs which should find ways to jointly prevent a nuclear holocaust. "Italy's firm adherence to the foreign policy of the North Atlantic Alliance has never prevented it from acting in the spirit of peace," Giovanni Spadolini continued.

"Today we can say with satisfaction that the word 'Europe', so very important for international history, has the same connotation in the East and West of our continent. This is important for strengthening economic and commercial relations," he noted.

"When President Gorbachev speaks of Europe as of our 'common home', he also has in mind such a thing as culture which is the same for Moscow and Rome, Paris and Warsaw."

"Today nobody wants to 'readjust' the post-war balance of forces. This question is difficult and requires a cautious approach. Favourable prerequisites are being created to use a large share of funds, earmarked for military purposes, to restructure the Soviet economy. This can be done in conditions of mutual respect and observance of disarmament agreements."

The President of the Italian Senate stressed the importance of establishing direct contacts between the Soviet Union and the EEC, where Italy will soon preside over the governing bodies.

"The establishment of such contacts has ushered in a new stage in relations on the European continent," Spadolini said. □

GORBACHEV'S MEETING WITH ECONOMISTS

(Continued from page 378)

scientific and technological revolution. But everything drafted then was subsequently scrapped. And that was done on the eve of the world oil crisis, when a deep restructuring of capitalism and its adjustment to the new conditions began.

(Continued from p382)

"It is superfluous to speak of Western Europe," the analyst notes, "as the place where powerful US armed forces are concentrated. Absolutely unacceptable in this case is the hazy thesis that the treaty will be open to any European state 'willing' to join it."

The analyst stresses in this connection that the concept should be implemented on a global scale. □

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV

THE NATIONALITIES POLICY OF THE PARTY IN PRESENT-DAY CONDITIONS

Address and report of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee.

September 19, 1989

price 40p from:
Soviet Booklets (SN)
3 Rosary Gardens
London SW7 4NW

Capitalism restructured itself, riding roughshod over people and throwing millions of unemployed into the streets. We, on the contrary, put off that plenary meeting, buried its ideas and slowed down the process of rational changes all of the socialist-community countries badly needed. As a result, we've lost at least 15 years.

We must move more confidently along this new path, if we care for the future of our nation and socialism, and for the role of our state. But we must be deeply convinced that we're doing the right thing. Of course, it's impossible to avoid problems — there are no ideal decisions.

Our complicated society is over-burdened with problems. So I don't think we can expect things to go smoothly. I think experts and politicians are well aware of this. So, even though journalism has conquered the minds of politicians, experts and workers, it's not populism, but scientific competence and constructive approach to all aspects of public life that matters now.

We too, must try to understand the key problems. The most important questions are: To what kind of society are we moving? Are we for federation or for something else? How do we view the new role of the Communist Party? And so on. If we don't find the right bearings, we'll get drowned in endless debates. We'll be losing time to the detriment of the revolutionary restructuring.

Comrades, I'd ask you to be frank. Our discussion today is for the sake of the cause which is to decide the future of the nation. After all, we can implement any measures. But we should know what our goals are and how to attain them. □

(Pravda, October 30)

(Continued from page 382)

tiently for an immediate and complete fulfilment of this commitment.

This statement can be regarded as recognition of the responsible Soviet attitude to the preservation of the ABM Treaty, which is rightly considered as the basic document in the system of agreements and talks on arms control and security.

However, the mention of the Krasnoyarsk radar was not complemented by an address to the US to follow the Soviet example as concerns the Thule radar in Greenland and the Fylingdales radar in Britain. These two radars (the former completed, the latter still under construction) are examples of US violations of the ABM Treaty.

Since NATO is so sensitive to the issue of compliance with international commitments (at least its representatives said so), it should be concerned over these US activities much more than over the Krasnoyarsk radar. The construction of large phased-array radars in Thule and Fylingdales, which are presented as early-warning radars, is a violation of the ABM Treaty. But there are grounds to believe that these radars can be used for ABM defence of US territory.

There are many more instances of inconsistency and bias in the communique, but I shall not discuss them. I would not like to question that part which says that the nuclear planning session was held within the framework of the comprehensive concept of arms control and disarmament, adopted by the special session of the North Atlantic Council last May.

Neither would I want to question the concept itself. But the statement according to which Europe will still need ground-, sea- and air-based systems in the near future (including ground-based missiles) is in stark contrast with the NATO concept. □

Changes for the better cannot be rushed

by Boris Prokhorov, TASS news analyst

SOME people believe that we in the Soviet Union have nothing in particular to celebrate today, on the day of the 72nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Well, one may think so, looking at the industrial downswing, inflation, transport malfunctions, coal miners' strikes, and the half-empty shelves in the shops. Yes, all this exists. These are the realities of the truly not easy days of our perestroika.

But there are also some other realities characterising the same period. The first genuinely free elections have been held in the Soviet Union.

The first Congress of the USSR People's Deputies has been held and was a political sensation. The first 'real' Supreme Soviet of the country began to function. Telecasts of its proceedings attract many more people to television screens than even the most popular films based on detective stories by Agatha Christie or Yulian Semyonov.

The elimination of a whole class of nuclear weapons — shorter-range missiles — was recently completed in the Soviet Union. Soviet troops have completely withdrawn from Afghanistan this year. And these are only the most notable changes the list of which can be continued.

What is happening? Why doesn't everything in this country change for the better? How did it happen that the frightening signs of crisis and the reassuring signs of rebirth coexist in the country's life?

Marxism teaches us that the superstructure is more mobile than the basis and that it is the first to react to a change of conditions.

This is what we are now observing in practice. Perestroika has already set the superstructure — the country's political system — into motion. Now it is the turn of the basis — the economy.

But we shall not be so naive as to think that changes in the basis can be expedited quickly: upon setting the beginning of the most complex processes it is essential to be able to wait for their results.

It is possible to mitigate the inevitable negative influences of the transitional period. This is what the Soviet Parliament and government are now trying to do. But no decision can make the basis change more rapidly. Changes in the basis are our radical economic reform.

Soberly evaluating both achievements and miscalculations, we are now really rejoicing at the former and are distressed about the latter.

But the main thing is perhaps the fact that we are now having a fresh look, unblinkered, at ourselves and at our country. □

(Moscow, November 7)

In the wake of the European Process

Alexander Yakovlev, CPSU Central Committee Secretary and Politburo member, looks at the Finnish visit in an interview with Novosti's correspondent Stanislav Polzikov:

POLZIKOV: You have had many meetings and talks with different political parties. What do you think of your work in Helsinki?

YAKOVLEV: I won't cite the agreements reached, since they are well-known, or speak of the proposals advanced by both sides. I'd rather give you my impressions of the meeting with the leaders of five parties, whose worldviews differ greatly. Our conversations seemed to be a continued dialogue. It so happens that the international situation, especially in Europe, has changed in such a way that everybody now wants to talk business, not beat about the bush.

The level of confidence has certainly risen. We've reached preliminary agreement on improvement of relations with the Liberal International. To say nothing of the steps we've charted towards further deepening of relations with the Social Democrats. We also discussed details of the Moscow meeting with representatives of the Democratic League, the conservative parties of Europe. Contradictions, disagreement in world outlooks will remain. But, the concept of the priority of universal human values, advanced in perestroika, and the fact that the world has changed radically makes all governments, parliaments and parties show a new approach to their actions, assessments and conclusions from the positions of the present and the future.

We discussed most diverse matters with the leaders of the parties. And they were all unanimous that Soviet-Finnish relations should be furthered. Their common view is based on the

understanding of the realities.

You mean to say there were no bottlenecks during the visit?

To be serious, there were none of them. On the other hand, passing from general agreement to practical things, our economic experts were faced by red tape, discord and misunderstanding shown by both sides. Progress in politics has outpaced decision-making and competence in economics, I felt it with special force here that our administrative apparatus is poorly prepared for the new conditions of economic activities. This is a great problem for us. It's no accident therefore, that the two leaders agreed to develop proposals for the training at Finnish enterprises of our managers.

Soviet-Finnish relations are viewed today as a model for East-West relationships. Could you comment on the media's particular interest in this question?

This is absolutely true. Our relations have a history: During confrontation between the East and the West there were attempts to accuse Finland of too close relations with the Soviet Union, which in turn was blamed for allegedly Sovietising Finland. But, our two countries have shown enough wisdom to preserve our good relations and make them stable.

We have always viewed Finland as a neutral country. It couldn't be otherwise. We have never thought of attacking each other, we are bound by the Treaty of Friendship, and we actively co-operate in the economic and political

Defence Minister's speech at parade in Moscow

"PROCEEDING from the priority of universal human interests, the Soviet Union and allied socialist countries are directing their efforts towards reducing the military threat," the Soviet Defence Minister, General of the Army Dmitri Yazov, said in a speech made at the military parade in Moscow's Red Square on November 7 on the occasion of the 72nd Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

"The Soviet Government initiated unilateral reduction in the armed forces and conversion of a part of defence production to civilian uses have been approved and supported by the Soviet people, the world public, and the leaders of many countries," he said.

"This creates favourable opportunities for curbing the arms race, slashing defence spending, and settling regional conflicts.

"However, in a number of countries, there are influential circles that still follow the guidelines inherited from cold-war times," the Defence Minister emphasised.

"The irreversibility of the already commenced positive processes has not yet been guaranteed. This is being taken into account by the Communist Party and the Soviet State in their policy in the field of defence and security of the country.

"The effectiveness of the policy is ensured by transition to new qualitative parameters for maintaining the country's defence potential at the level of reasonable and reliable sufficiency.

"Perestroika is gaining in scope and strength in the Soviet Armed Forces, just as in all spheres of Soviet society's life. The combat readiness of troops is growing, the combat skills of the personnel are being polished, and discipline and order in multi-ethnic military units are being strengthened.

"The Soviet Armed Forces," Yazov said in conclusion "vigilantly and reliably guard the creative work of the Soviet people, the gains of socialism, and ensure full security of the country." □

spheres. Finland has been equidistant both to military blocs and countries with different social systems. During the visit Mikhail Gorbachev said that we respect the neutral status of Finland and will continue to build our policy as this status requires. His words seem to have received broad public response.

Now the situation has changed so sharply that the experience of our relations can be used in building the European home. Soviet-Finnish relations are one of its bulwarks.

What, do you think, must be done to increase our countries' participation in the European process?

In my opinion the construction of a common European home should be accomplished in several stages. I believe that drawing up the blueprints for the European home is now the privilege of one nation, party or government. They should be drawn up by a concerted effort, through discussions, symposiums and conversations. I'm sure the results of the process will be wonderful. Europe has seen most of the suffering on the Earth. Blood poured in torrents here. Now Europe must open up a new era of non-violence without wars, weapons and hatred. It must become a continent co-operation and confidence for centuries to come. □