

**Mikhail
GORBACHEV**

**Selected
Speeches
and
Articles**



**Mikhail
GORBACHEV**

**Selected
Speeches
and
Articles**

Second Updated Edition



Progress Publishers
Moscow

Translated from the Russian

М. С. Горбачев
ИЗБРАННЫЕ РЕЧИ И СТАТЬИ
На английском языке

© Progress Publishers 1987

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Г $\frac{0902010000-160}{014(01)-87}$ без объявл.

CONTENTS

From the Publishers	9
On Convening the 27th CPSU Congress and the Tasks Involved in Preparing for and Holding It. Report at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. <i>April 23, 1985</i>	11
To the Participants in the Meeting at Torgau	37
Speech at a Reception in Warsaw Given in Honour of the Partici- pants in the Meeting of Top Party and State Leaders of the Warsaw Treaty Countries. <i>April 26, 1985</i>	39
To the National Council of the French Republican Association of War Veterans and Victims	43
Immortal Exploit of the Soviet People. Report at a Meeting in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on the 40th Anniversary of the Soviet People's Victory in the Great Patriotic War. <i>May 8, 1985</i>	45
Interview with the Press Trust of India. <i>May 18, 1985</i>	69
Speech at the Kremlin Dinner in Honour of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of the Republic of India. <i>May 21, 1985</i>	76
Speech at a Luncheon Given in the Kremlin in Honour of Willy Brandt, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and Chairman of the Socialist International. <i>May 27, 1985</i> . . .	82
Speech at a Dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Honour of Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi. <i>May 29, 1985</i>	86
Speech at a Dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Honour of Gustáv Husák, General Secretary of the CPCz Central Com- mittee and President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. <i>May 31, 1985</i>	91
Speech in the Kremlin on the Occasion of Awarding the Order of Lenin to Todor Zhivkov, General Secretary of the Central Com- mittee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and Chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. <i>June 7, 1985</i>	96
The Key Issue of the Party's Economic Policy. Report at a Meeting at the CPSU Central Committee on Accelerating Scientific and Technological Progress. <i>June 11, 1985</i>	98
To the All-India Association of Independence Fighters	131
Speech at a Dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Honour of the	

Party and Government Delegation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Headed by Le Duan, General Secretary of the CPV CC. <i>June 28, 1985</i>	133
To Participants and Guests of the 14th Moscow International Film Festival	138
Speech in the Kremlin at the Third Session of the Eleventh USSR Supreme Soviet. <i>July 2, 1985</i>	139
Outer Space for Peace Alone! Reply to the Union of Concerned Scientists	143
Speech at the Opening Ceremony of the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow. <i>July 27, 1985</i>	146
Statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee	149
Reply to a Message from the Japanese Council of Organisations of Victims of Atomic Bombings	151
To Mr. Willy Brandt, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany	154
An Interview for TASS	155
To the Conference Participants Reviewing How the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Has Worked	159
To Mrs. Jane Smith	161
Answers to <i>Time</i> Magazine. <i>August 28, 1985</i>	162
Speech at the Dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Honour of J. Batmuh, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and Chairman of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic. <i>August 29, 1985</i>	185
To the Participants in the International Conference "Forty Years of the Victory over Japanese Militarism and the Tasks of the Peace Movement in the Countries of Asia and the Pacific"	189
To the Indian Institute for Non-Aligned Studies	191
Address on French Television. <i>September 30, 1985</i>	193
To the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions	210
To the First International Congress of the Association of Space Explorers	212
For a Peaceful, Free and Prosperous Future for Europe and All Other Continents. Speech at a Meeting with French MPs. <i>October 3, 1985</i>	213
Statement at the Joint Press Conference with François Mitterrand in the Palais de l'Élysée. <i>October 4, 1985</i>	225
Address to the Perugia-Assisi Peace Marchers	242
Speech at the Dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Honour of the Leader of the Libyan Revolution Colonel Muammar Gaddafi. <i>October 12, 1985</i>	244

On the Drafts of an Updated Edition of the CPSU Programme, Changes in the CPSU Rules, and the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and for the Period Ending in 2000. Report at the Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. <i>October 15, 1985</i>	248
Press Conference in the Soviet Press Centre in Geneva	260
Report at the Fourth Session of the Eleventh USSR Supreme Soviet. <i>November 27, 1985</i>	282
Statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee	308
Answers to <i>l'Humanité</i>	321
Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. <i>February 25, 1986</i>	341
Concluding Remarks at the 27th Congress of the CPSU. <i>March 6, 1986</i>	463
Reply to a Joint Message of the Leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and Greece	470
Speech on Soviet Television. <i>March 29, 1986</i>	473
Answers to the Algerian Magazine <i>Révolution Africaine</i>	479
Policy of Peace Versus Policy Leading to War. From the Speech at a Meeting with the Working People of the City of Togliatti. <i>April 8, 1986</i>	496
Message to Muammar Gaddafi, Leader of the Libyan Revolution. <i>April 15, 1986</i>	502
From the Speech at the 11th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. <i>April 18, 1986</i>	504
To the Participants in the World Peace Council Session. <i>April 25, 1986</i>	510
Reply to a Message of the Leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and Greece	512
Speech at a Kremlin Dinner for José Eduardo dos Santos, Chairman of the MPLA-Party of Labour and President of the People's Republic of Angola. <i>May 6, 1986</i>	515
Speech on Soviet Television. <i>May 14, 1986</i>	519
On the Five-Year Plan of the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and the Tasks of Party Organisations in Carrying It Out. From the Report at the CC CPSU Plenary Meeting. <i>June 16, 1986</i>	528
Speech at the 10th Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party. <i>June 30, 1986</i>	571
Statement on Soviet Television. <i>August 18, 1986</i>	583
Statement on Soviet Television. <i>October 22, 1986</i>	592

From the Publishers

What changes are occurring in the Soviet Union? What are the realities on the threshold of the Soviet state's seventieth anniversary? How does the ruling Communist Party of the Soviet Union see the future of its country and the rest of the world?

You will find the answers to these and many other questions in the straightforward and outspoken speeches, articles, and statements of Mikhail Gorbachev, who has been heading the CPSU Central Committee since March 1985, dealing with the intricate problems of Soviet society and the world at this crucial turning point in history.

The Communist Party's present policy approved by its latest congress, as Mikhail Gorbachev observes, is a harmonious blend of continuity and innovation. On the one hand, it is a fair assessment of the past achievements of the Soviet people: defying the agonising trials that fell to its lot, the country, backward in the past, has grown into a mighty industrial-agrarian power and has thereby proved the historic advantages of socialism. On the other, it ushers in far-reaching change in the Party's strategy and tactics, giving full play to socialism's constructive potential.

The Party has made a self-critical examination of the situation that shaped in the Soviet economy by the mid-1980s, and produced the concept of the country's accelerated social and economic development as the basic pillar of its policy.

This means intensifying the economy through the latest scientific and technical achievements and radical reform of management. It means a forceful social policy and a considerable im-

provement of the Soviet people's quality of life. It also means the people's direct participation in running the affairs of state and society, advancement of socialist democracy, and consolidation of the people's socialist self-government.

In this collection you will come upon no few sharply critical judgements concerning domestic issues. These judgements are evidence of profound faith in the powers of the socialist system, and of the Party's and society's spiritual good health.

Much space is devoted to foreign relations. The nuclear and space age calls for a new approach to international affairs. Cumulatively, the speeches, articles and statements of Mikhail Gorbachev give an exhaustive idea of the Soviet Union's dynamic foreign policy moved by a lofty sense of responsibility for the future of humankind, and focussed on broad international cooperation, disarmament, elimination of nuclear weapons, a weapons-free outer space, abolition of regional conflicts, and assertion of unassailable and lasting peace.

Whatever Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, writes and says, is imbued with sincerity, realism, and lofty humanitarian ideals. The reader of this collection is bound to see this for himself.

On Convening the 27th CPSU Congress and the Tasks Involved in Preparing for and Holding It

Report at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

April 23, 1985

Comrades,

Our Party, the Soviet people and the peoples of the socialist countries, all progressive mankind solemnly marked yesterday the 115th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

Life itself and the entire course of history convincingly confirm the great truth of Lenin's teaching. It has been and remains for us a guide to action, a source of inspiration, and a reliable compass for determining the strategy and tactics of our march forward.

Lenin taught Communists to proceed, in everything, from the working people's interests, to make a profound study of realities, to assess social phenomena realistically, from class positions, and to be in a constant creative quest for the best ways of implementing the ideals of communism.

Today we check our actions and plans against what Lenin taught, against his great ideas, and we live and work according to Lenin's behests.

Our Plenary Meeting is to consider questions of great political importance—on the convening of the 27th Party Congress and the tasks involved in preparing for and holding it.

The Political Bureau proposes, in keeping with the Rules of the CPSU, that the next Party Congress be convened on February 25, 1986. It proposes that the Congress agenda include the following items:

1. Report by the CPSU Central Committee and the tasks of the Party.
2. Report by the CPSU Central Auditing Commission.
3. On updating the CPSU Programme.
4. On changes in the CPSU Rules.

5. On the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and for the Period Ending in 2000.

6. Election of the Party's central bodies.

It is intended to hear and discuss the reviews of the reports by the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Auditing Commission of the CPSU, and also on the guidelines for economic and social development. As for the updated Programme and changes in the CPSU Rules, they can be dealt with in the Central Committee Report and it is not necessary to present separate reports on them.

It is proposed that one out of every 3,670 Communists be elected a delegate to the Congress; so there will be altogether 5,000 delegates. This will make it possible to have all the organisations of our Party fully represented and to reflect the Party's social and national composition.

In the ten months left before the opening of the Congress, we are to make an all-round analysis and a realistic assessment of what has been done since the 26th Congress and to determine the prospects for further development and the tasks of home and foreign policy. We are to prepare extremely important documents and, above all, such fundamental documents as the updated CPSU Programme and the guidelines for development for the next five-year period and until the end of the century, to consider them at a Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, and then submit them for broad discussion by the Party and countrywide. Great attention should be paid to the drawing up of reports and holding of elections at a high level by Party organisations and to the fulfilling of the targets of the 11th five-year plan in a fitting manner.

In short, it will be a period of intensive and versatile work—political, economic, organisational and ideological-theoretical.

Today, we once again affirm the continuity of the strategic line worked out by the 26th Party Congress and the subsequent Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee. Continuity, as Lenin understood it, means steady advance, the singling out and solution of new problems and elimination of everything that hinders development. We must follow this Leninist tradition unswervingly and enrich and develop our Party policy, our general line of perfecting developed socialist society.

The forthcoming 27th CPSU Congress will undoubtedly become a landmark in the country's development. Its importance is determined by the paramount significance of the questions put on the agenda, the characteristic features of the current period and the novelty and scope of the tasks facing society. This imparts a special significance to the entire pre-Congress work of the Party and calls for a profound understanding of the current situation as well as bold decisions and vigorous actions.

The country has achieved major successes in all spheres of public life. Relying on the advantages offered by the new system it has, within a historically short period of time, attained summits of economic and social progress. Today the USSR has a powerful, highly developed economy and skilled work force, specialists and research personnel. We lead the world in many fields of industry, science and technology.

There have been profound changes in social life. For the first time in history the working man has become the master of his country, the maker of his own destiny. The guaranteed right to work and remuneration for work, society's concern for man from his birth to old age, wide access to intellectual culture, respect for the dignity and rights of the individual, the steady broadening of the working people's participation in management—all these are permanent values and inherent features of the socialist way of life. Herein lies the most important source of political stability, social optimism and confidence in the future.

The Soviet people are justly proud of all this. But life and its dynamism dictate the need for further changes and transformations, for bringing about a qualitatively new state of society, in the broadest sense of the word. This means, first of all, the modernisation of production on the basis of scientific and technological achievements and the attainment of the world's highest level of labour productivity. This also means the perfection of social relations and, above all, economic relations. This means major changes in the sphere of work and in the material and cultural standards of the people. This means an invigoration of the entire system of political and social institutions, the extension of socialist democracy and people's self-government.

The development of Soviet society will be largely determined by qualitative changes in the economy, by its going over to the intensive methods of development, and by a maximum rise in

efficiency. The state of the national economy should be assessed, and future tasks determined, precisely from these positions.

As is well known, alongside the successes achieved in the country's economic development, unfavourable trends have grown in the last few years and quite a few difficulties have arisen. We managed to improve the work of many sectors of the national economy and somewhat to improve the situation, thanks to the active work carried out by the Party, beginning from 1983. However, the difficulties are far from being completely overcome and much effort needs to be made in order to build a reliable foundation for achieving rapid progress.

What is the reason for the difficulties? The answer to this question, as you no doubt realise, is a matter of fundamental importance for the Party.

Of course, the influence of natural and a number of external factors has made itself felt. But the main thing, I believe, is that the changes in the objective conditions of industrial development and the need for accelerating its intensification, for introducing changes in the methods of economic management were not properly taken into consideration in good time and, what is especially important, no persistent efforts were made to elaborate and implement large-scale measures in the economic sphere.

We must, comrades, fully and profoundly grasp the situation that has taken shape and draw some basic conclusions. The country's historic destiny, the positions of socialism in the world today in a large measure depend on how we shall act further. By using on a wide scale the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, and by devising forms of socialist economic management in keeping with modern conditions and requirements, we shall achieve a substantial acceleration of socio-economic progress. There is simply no other way.

This is what determines today the success of the cause of socialism and communism and the tremendous responsibility that rests with the Party, its Central Committee and all Party organisations at the current, most important period of history. And we Communists must do everything to live up to this responsibility and to the major tasks which are dictated by our times.

The main question now is: how and with what resources will the country be able to accelerate economic development? Considering this question in the Political Bureau we have unani-

mously arrived at the conclusion that real possibilities for this exist. The task of accelerating the rates of growth, and a substantial growth at that, is quite feasible, if we place in the focus of our entire work the intensification of the economy and acceleration of scientific and technological progress, if we carry out a reorganisation of management, planning, and the structural and investment policy, if we raise the efficiency of organisation and tighten discipline everywhere, and if we basically improve the style of our work.

I think the participants in the Plenary Meeting will support this conclusion.

It is possible to obtain relatively quick results if we put to work organisational-economic and social reserves and above all if we activate the human factor, i.e. make sure that every person works on his job conscientiously and to the best of his ability.

How great are the possibilities that exist in this respect was noted at the recent meeting with workers, managers, specialists and scientists at the CPSU Central Committee. When the need arises, the participants in this meeting pointed out, it is possible to raise within a short time labour productivity to such a degree which may at times be comparable to the planned targets for an entire five-year period, only on account of the collectives and their leaders bracing up and starting to work better.

And such reserves can be found at every enterprise, every construction site and every collective and state farm. Nobody knows better about them than the work collectives themselves, their Party organisations and managers. Therefore, much depends on their approach to work, on their activity and their ability to get people interested in the maximal utilisation of all existing possibilities for increasing production and raising its efficiency.

An important aspect of the question of responsibility and discipline is the timely and efficient deliveries of raw materials, fuel, completing articles, freight cars, etc. There are people who are responsible for this and who should be made answerable for this. Some progress has been made in the tightening of contractual discipline in the national economy. It must be consolidated by steadily increasing exactingness in the matter of the fulfilment of contractual obligations without making any allowances for objective conditions.

Another source of reserves which should definitely be used

is eliminating waste and losses. Executives in many ministries and enterprises try to get as much capital investments, machine-tools, machinery, raw materials and fuel as possible from the state. But their approach to the matter of rational utilisation of resources is quite often irresponsible. Equipment sometimes stays idle or is not used to the full.

And how do matters stand in capital construction? The construction of many projects is taking an unreasonably long time. As a result, quite a lot of material resources are left unused. The expansion of capacities is being held up and the country does not get the products it needs in time.

The plan for putting fixed productive assets into operation is not being fulfilled satisfactorily. A good deal of equipment has not been installed as planned, but has been accumulating at depots of enterprises and construction sites. The direct losses of material values are quite considerable because of negligence in the haulage, storage and use of cement, coal, mineral fertilisers, timber, agricultural produce and foodstuffs.

We must put an end to such waste immediately. It is obviously not enough to issue appeals only—there have been plenty of them. It is necessary more strictly to make persons, who are responsible for the proper storage and correct utilisation of all material values, answerable, legally answerable for their work. Good order must be established at every enterprise and construction site, at every collective and state farm, at every organisation. Without this there can be no talk about any kind of rational economic management or the growth of the economy's efficiency.

The Party attaches foremost importance to the task of greatly accelerating scientific and technological progress as the key strategic lever of intensification of the national economy and the most rational utilisation of the accumulated potential. A special meeting of the CPSU Central Committee is scheduled for June to discuss this question. Here I would like to make some observations that are of fundamental importance.

In most industries scientific and technological progress is taking place at a sluggish pace, in fact, evolutionally, at it were, that is, mostly through improving existing technology and in part through modernising machines and equipment. Implementation of these measures, of course, does give certain results, but only

small ones. There should be revolutionary changes, a transfer to fundamentally new technological systems, to technologies of the latest generations, which ensure the highest efficiency. This means in fact a retooling of all the branches of the national economy on the basis of up-to-date achievements of science and technology.

The urgency of the question is explained by the fact that over the last years the country's production facilities have aged considerably, and the rate of renewal of the fixed productive assets has dropped. That is why the task of considerably raising the plant replacement coefficient should be given priority in the 12th five-year-plan period.

The engineering industry has a decisive role to play here. Its development should be given priority so that the industry's growth rate would be 1.5 to 2 times higher in the 12th five-year-plan period. The key task is quickly to go over to the production of new generations of machines and equipment which can ensure the introduction of progressive technology, raise productivity several times over, reduce the amount of material per unit of output and increase the returns on assets. Priority should be given to the machine-tool manufacturing industry and to accelerating the development of computer technology, instrument-making, electrical engineering and electronics as catalysts of scientific and technological progress.

In the light of these tasks one cannot regard as normal the fall in the prestige of the work of the engineer. There is room for improvement here. We must enhance the role and prestige of foremen, engineers, designers and technologists and provide greater material and moral incentives for their work.

The acceleration of scientific and technological progress and the growth of production efficiency are inseparable from a decisive improvement in output quality. The goods produced fail to meet modern technological, economic, aesthetic and, for that matter, all consumer requirements, and are sometimes of obviously inferior quality, which is actually plunder of material resources and waste of our people's labour effort. That is why a general rise in the quality of products should be given a central place in our economic policy. Quality and once again quality—this is our motto today. In solving the problem of quality one can at the same time solve the problem of quantity. This is the only

reliable way of satisfying on an increasing scale the country's requirements in modern technology and the growing demand of the population for various consumer goods, and of eliminating goods shortages in the national economy.

Whatever question we consider, and from whatever point of view we approach the economy, everything finally comes down to the need for a substantial improvement of management and of the economic mechanism as a whole. This was confirmed once again during the recent meeting at the CPSU Central Committee with workers and managers and during the visit to the ZIL Motor Works. Participants in the meetings were obviously concerned and worried as they described the worsened conditions of work due to flaws in the system of management, unnecessary regimentation and the issuing of superfluous instructions. There is only one way out: immediate and vigorous measures should be taken covering the whole spectrum of management problems.

Today we have a clearer idea of how the economic mechanism should be restructured. In further developing the principle of centralisation in coping with strategic tasks it is necessary to move forward more boldly along the path of broadening the rights of enterprises, their independence, of going over to the cost-accounting system and on this basis to increase the responsibility and interest of work collectives in the end results of their work.

It seems that the results of the large-scale experiment carried out along this line are not bad. But they cannot fully satisfy us. A stage has been reached when we should go over from experiments to setting up an integrated system of economic management. This means that a practical reorganisation of work should also be carried out among the upper echelons of economic management, that they should be primarily geared to tackling long-range socio-economic and scientific and technological tasks and to conducting a search for the most effective forms of uniting science with production.

Today greater demands are being made on planning, which lies at the heart of management. Planning should become an active lever for intensifying production, implementing progressive economic decisions and ensuring a balanced and dynamic growth of the economy. At the same time, the plans drawn up by amalgamations and enterprises should discard some of the many

indicators. They should make wider use of economic norms that make for greater initiative and enterprise.

It is time to start streamlining the organisational structures of management, to do away with unnecessary management bodies, to simplify the apparatus and raise its efficiency. It is also important to do this because some of these bodies have become a hindrance to progress. The number of instructions and regulations which at times arbitrarily interpret Party and government decisions and thus shackle the independence of enterprises should be drastically reduced.

It is extremely important to explain to every work collective and every individual worker the principles of the cost-accounting system. This will make it possible to link up the measures for improving the system of management at the top with the development at grass-root level of collective forms of organisation and provision of incentives for work, and will also heighten the activity of working people.

It is no less important to increase the responsibility of republican and local bodies for the supervision of economic, social and cultural work and for meeting the needs of working people. But to do this, it is of course necessary further to extend the rights of local bodies, to enhance their initiative and interest in the development of production, in the rational utilisation of resources and the smooth functioning of all spheres of services to the population. Therefore, local authorities should be made fully responsible for dealing with all questions within their competence and should more quickly rid themselves of "feed me" attitudes.

Comrades, the CPSU regards as the highest purpose of accelerating the country's socio-economic development a steady, step-by-step improvement of the people's well-being, an improvement of all aspects of their life, and the creation of favourable conditions for the harmonious development of the individual. In this respect it is necessary consistently to pursue a policy aimed at a socially fairer distribution of material and cultural benefits, at enhancing the influence of social factors on the development of the economy and raising its efficiency.

This policy is meeting with the full approval and support of the Soviet people. What needs to be done now is to work out concrete and effective measures of eliminating from the distribution mechanism the practice of levelling, unearned incomes, and

everything that runs counter to the economic norms and moral ideals of our society, and ensuring that the material position of each worker and each work collective should depend directly on the results of their work. The Party will continue to wage a most resolute struggle against all negative phenomena, phenomena that are alien to the socialist way of life, to our communist morals.

Careful drafting of the social programme to be presented by the Party at its 27th Congress is now under way. At the same time there are urgent tasks that call for special attention.

I refer primarily to the implementation of the Food Programme. In recent years, positive changes have taken place in the development of agriculture, and the supply of foodstuffs to the population has somewhat improved. But it still leaves much to be desired. Collective and state farms, as well as the processing enterprises, are in a position markedly to increase the output of foodstuffs. The available possibilities should be employed intelligently, and the available potential put to use effectively.

Sometimes attempts are made by local authorities to shift all responsibility concerning food supply, and especially fodder supply, to the central authorities. Such practices are unacceptable. The task is to make the most of all reserves for increasing food production at collective and state farms, and on individual citizens' small-holdings and enterprises' subsidiary farms.

So, comrades, we ought to step up our work on fulfilling the Food Programme and to supplement it with substantial measures aimed at developing the processing branches of the agro-industrial complex and forging closer links between them and collective and state farms. The USSR State Planning Committee and relevant ministries have been assigned these tasks by the Political Bureau, and they are expected to fulfil them conscientiously and thoroughly.

Management of the agro-industrial complex also needs to be further improved. Far from everything has been done in this respect. Concerned about departmental interests, district and regional associations very often fail to achieve an adequate degree of coordination in solving problems of the comprehensive development of agriculture and related industries. If we are firmly convinced that there should be one master on the land, and

that agro-industrial associations should bear full responsibility for the fulfilment of the Food Programme (and I hope nobody has doubts on this matter), we must take steps to make it possible to manage, plan and finance the agro-industrial complex as one whole at all levels. This was agreed upon at the May 1982 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee.

Much has to be done to meet more fully the demand for manufactured goods and services, saturate the home market with needed items, improve the quality and offer a wide assortment of goods, make the price system more flexible, and raise the standard of trade. A comprehensive programme of promoting consumer goods production and developing public services has been worked out for the purpose of fulfilling these tasks. The programme provides for a considerable increase in the output of quality clothes and footwear and modern household goods and durables, and for further development of various services.

This programme will be approved in the near future. Meanwhile, as you know, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers have already adopted resolutions on some of its aspects, such as the increase in the production of footwear, the development of local industries, house-building and repair services, improvement of telephone communication services for the population, etc. It is important that the Soviet people should feel a change for the better as soon as possible.

We must take into account the changes that are taking place in the structure of the solvent demand. Working people want to spend a greater part of their incomes on improving housing and amenities, on leisure activities, on tours and excursions, etc. These requirements must be met more fully. It is profitable for the state, too. But the possibilities are not being adequately used. Let us take, for example, such a specific question as the development of market-gardening and vegetable-growing cooperatives. This is a very useful undertaking which interests many people. However, it has not yet received all the attention it deserves. The demand for plots of land and cottages, building materials and tools is far from being satisfied. The Political Bureau has discussed the question in great detail and has instructed the relevant agencies to take appropriate measures so that people's demands could be met as fully as possible and all unreasonable barriers be removed.

Public health and education are the two spheres that are becoming ever more important in the life of our society and every individual, and consequently, in the Party's social policy. We have achieved a good deal in their development, making these vitally important benefits equally accessible to all citizens. Nevertheless, today we are facing new tasks in this respect.

From the point of view of modern requirements, there should be a considerable improvement of the material and technical basis of the public health system and the quality of medical services, and the population should be better supplied with medicines. Not long ago the Political Bureau discussed the need for large-scale measures in this sphere, which should be provided for in the 12th five-year period development plans.

We have launched the school reform, the significance of which for this country's future can hardly be overestimated. And now the set tasks should be approached in a meaningful rather than a formal way, and the quality of teaching and upbringing of the younger generations as well as preparing them for socially useful labour should be basically improved.

There are quite a few other problems to which we should pay close attention and find the right solutions. These are an improvement of living standards for labour veterans, especially those who retired a long time ago; an improvement of the living conditions of young families; an improvement of mother-and-child care. And naturally, it is important to continue to step up efforts aimed at solving such socially important problem as housing so that every family will be provided with a separate flat or house with all amenities.

As much attention as possible must be given to everything concerning man, his work, material welfare and leisure. For us, this is the focal point of all policy-making.

Let us now turn to the problems at hand, i.e. those involved in the implementation of this year's plan. We did not begin the year too well. In the first quarter, the increase in industrial output amounted to a mere two per cent. The greatest lag could be seen in oil, metal and power production, as well as transport. The rates of growth in labour productivity have slowed down. The situation with production costs, profit and other indicators is not much better. In April, the situation is levelling out a bit, but it will take a much greater effort in the remaining eight

months to catch up on what has been missed. We must be frank and say that this is no easy task, but the 1985 plan has to be fulfilled, and this must be done without introducing any adjustments to the plan. Socialist emulation as well as all organisational and political work must be directed towards this aim.

Farmers are facing responsible tasks, too. High results to please the entire country are expected from them.

At the same time, we must see to it that the plan for the next year and the 12th five-year-plan period as a whole is thoroughly worked out. To achieve this, it would seem advisable to make the plan targets and norms known to ministries, departments, industrial associations and enterprises as soon as possible. This would enable the work collectives' proposals on mobilising reserves to be taken into account as much as possible, and, what is particularly important, to start the 12th five-year-plan period in a well-organised and energetic manner from the very first day of the next year.

Comrades, the complex and large-scale tasks of the present period, which involve every aspect of our life, can only be accomplished if we rely on the creative endeavour, talent, wisdom and work of all the people. We must instil in millions of workers the desire to fulfil these tasks. We must steadily promote the initiative and energy of the working class, collective farmers and intelligentsia. We must set in motion the inexhaustible reserves of socialist society and more actively support all useful undertakings.

The Leninist Party, the Party of Communists, has always been and continues to be in the forefront. Today the Party is expected to lead in the nationwide drive to intensify the country's social and economic development. To this end, every Party organisation and every Communist must join in the struggle for accomplishing both short-term and long-term tasks.

Preparations for the Congress, the forthcoming reports and elections must enhance in a comprehensive way the upsurge in the Communists' activity and responsibility, the strengthening of the efficiency of the Party organisations, the consolidation of their ties with the masses and, in the long run, the enhancing of the Party's leading role.

The report and election campaign will start with the primary

organisations which are the Party's chief potential. It is in them that the Party policy is being translated into real work. It is in them that our successes and shortcomings, our possibilities and reserves are particularly evident.

That is why it is so important that when Communists hold meetings the results of what has already been done should be summed up in a Leninist way, without false idealisation or idle talk, that all the positive experience should be gleaned carefully, that shortcomings should be exposed fearlessly, and the possibilities and specific ways of achieving the growth of production, of raising the economy's effectiveness and of improving work should be discovered.

The duty of the Party committees is to show the utmost concern that the meetings of the primary organisations are held in a businesslike manner, in an atmosphere of criticism and self-criticism, of Bolshevik frankness, and that the most urgent questions concerning the life of work collectives and the ways of removing everything that slows work down are discussed. It is essential to make sure that each Party member is fully able to use his right, provided by the Party Rules, to make proposals and comments so that not a single critical remark is ignored.

The question of tightening order and discipline is particularly relevant today. It is an imperative demand of the day, which the Soviet people see as including order in production and in the service industries, in public and daily life, in every working unit, in every town and village. And we shall spare no effort in making sure that such order is strengthened in the country.

Life has shown how the measures on tightening order meet with unanimous support of the people and what tangible results they produce. But it must be said frankly that attention to this most important question has been rather lax in recent times. And in this case we must, above all, make more strictly accountable the managers of collectives who bear personal responsibility for discipline. It is not entirely uncommon to come across instances when managers of enterprises forgive the lack of discipline among their workers in the hope that their subordinates will, in their turn, pardon their own mistakes. We shall not be reconciled to such a psychology of mutual forgiveness.

One other condition must be met if discipline and order are to be strengthened. Each one has to do his own work, to carry

out his direct responsibilities honestly. It is impossible to achieve substantial results in any field so long as a Party functionary is substituting for an economic manager, an engineer for a messenger, so long as a researcher is working at a vegetable storehouse, and a factory worker on a farm. Unfortunately, today that is often the case. Of course, such a situation has not arisen overnight and is determined by certain difficulties in some places, neither can it be rectified overnight. But it must be rectified. Only then will we be able genuinely to rid ourselves of irresponsibility and laxity.

Greater demands should be put on the tone, businesslike manner and exactingness at the forthcoming district, city, regional and territorial Party conferences and the Congresses of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics. There should be no expressions of praise and compliments, as is sometimes the case, and no attempts should be made to conceal the essence of the matter behind general verbiage, or to explain away shortcomings by referring to objective circumstances or departmental discrepancies.

We expect the leading personnel, the Central Committee members, the heads of ministries and departments to take a direct part not only in the Party conferences but also in the meetings of primary organisations and do everything for the pre-Congress collective council of the Communists to be held in the most constructive way and in the spirit of utmost criticism.

The main slogans of the moment, which must be the keynote of our pre-Congress meetings and all the preparations for the 27th Party Congress, are creative endeavour, the unity between words and deeds, initiative and responsibility, exactingness towards oneself and one's comrades. Communists must set an example. It is necessary to increase the responsibility of each Party member for his attitude to his public duty, for the fulfilment of Party decisions, for the honest and pure image of a Party member. A Communist is assessed by what he does. There are no, nor can there be, any other criteria.

The leading Party bodies are to be formed in the course of the reports and elections, they must be supplemented by fresh forces and the urgent questions regarding personnel should be resolved. The recent plenary meetings held by Party committees have demonstrated convincingly what mature personnel the Par-

ty has at its disposal. At the same time, they have confirmed once again the need for abiding, in the strictest manner, by the Leninist principles of selecting, distributing and educating personnel. In those places where these principles are violated, where the promotion of workers is allowed on the basis of personal loyalty, servility and protectionism, criticism and self-criticism inevitably falter, the ties with the masses are weakened and as a result failures in the work occur.

The Political Bureau regards it as fundamentally important to continue upholding the course for securing the stability of Party leadership, the correct combination of experienced and young workers. But this cannot be accompanied by any kind of stagnation in the movement of personnel. In their letters to the Central Committee Communists draw attention to the fact that some leaders occupying one and the same post for a long time quite often stop seeing what is new and get used to shortcomings. This gives food for thought, and calls for a search for ways to ensure more active promotion of our leading personnel. Women and promising young workers should be promoted to responsible posts more boldly.

And one more important conclusion which has been prompted by the recent plenary meetings of Party committees: not a single Party organisation, not a single worker, can remain outside control. The first secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of many Union Republics, and territorial and regional Party committees have reported in the last two years to the meetings of the Political Bureau and the Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee. Reports were heard from the leaders of a number of primary Party organisations, district and city Party committees, and of many ministries and departments. This kind of work must, of course, be done in the future as well and be actively developed in the Republics, territories and regions. This is in agreement with the norms of our inner-Party life.

Since we have started speaking about control, I would like to make the following observation: it is necessary to check up, to control, and each check-up should be of practical use and serve the interests of the cause. But check-ups on one and the same, quite often insignificant, question and numerous commissions which are set up out of formal considerations, distracting

people from their work and creating a tense atmosphere, are hardly justified.

The report meetings, conferences and congresses provide an opportunity for evaluating comprehensively the activities of the elected Party bodies and for making a close study of the content and methods of their work. Emphasis should be placed, first of all, on analysing their ability to cope with the key questions concerning people's life and work, production collectives, development of the economy and culture, and on how organisational work is being conducted among the masses. It is necessary persistently to continue to provide daily and concrete assistance to primary Party organisations, to ensure greater efficiency and promptness, to reduce the paper flow, to overcome the armchair method of work and the craving for numerous meetings and conferences.

It must be honestly said that far from everything has been done in the struggle against such phenomena. There are quite a few examples of this. Not so long ago the CPSU Central Committee heard the reports of the Kalinin and Tselinograd Regional Party Committees on questions concerning the development of the agro-industrial complex. Serious shortcomings were revealed in the Party's guidance of the economy, in the personnel and educational work and in the activities of the bureaus and the secretaries of the regional committees. The main thing which gave rise to the shortcomings in this case was the uncritical attitude to what had been done, the tendency towards exaggerating the results achieved and the reluctance to notice negative phenomena. The appropriate measures had to be taken as a result.

Some heads of ministries and departments adhere to the old methods in management and display a lack of self-criticism. This hinders work. Life itself puts on the agenda the need for a decisive improvement of work, for bringing it into conformity with the demands of the present-day stage in society's development.

Today mere diligence is not enough, though even this is lacking sometimes. Competence, the feeling for what is new, initiative, boldness and readiness to shoulder responsibility, the ability to set a task and see it through, the ability not to lose sight of the political meaning of management—these business-like qualities are becoming increasingly important. And I would also add: the desire to learn how to work.

Further enhancement of the Party guidance of the Soviets, trade unions, Komsomol and other links in our political system, of all the work for the development of Soviet democracy is an important task of the report and election campaign.

We must always remember Lenin's words that socialist democracy must not be understood in the abstract. It remains, as it has always been, an instrument for the development of the economy, the growth in man's activity, the communist education of the masses. And in this way the Party will work, as before, as it enriches the democratic nature of the Soviet system.

The preparations for the 27th Party Congress, the discussion by the working people of the drafts of the Congress documents will, of course, enhance the activity of the Soviet people. The Party committees are to ensure publicity, see to it that the channels of communication with the masses are working and that attention is being given to public opinion, critical comments, applications and letters sent by citizens. The CPSU Central Committee regards them as being very helpful, a tangible expression of the interest displayed by the Soviet people in the affairs of their own state.

The Central Committee has often discussed the tasks of the Party's political-educational and ideological work. The attention paid to this work is understandable and some progress has also been made. But, as I see it, far from everything has been done to bring ideological work closer to life. Formalism and exhortations continue to be a hindrance. Quite often the loss comes from idle talk, from the inability to tell people the truth. And it sometimes happens: a person hears one thing but sees something else in real life. This is a serious question and not only an educational but a political one, too.

Ideological and political education in all its forms must be coupled as much as possible with the main task of our time—the acceleration of the country's socio-economic development. This cannot be achieved without a comprehensive account being taken of the totality of conditions in our internal life, and the specifics of the international situation. You know that it was precisely to these questions that the All-Union Scientific and Practical Conference held last December was devoted. The conference also discussed the fulfilment of the decisions of the June

1983 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. It would be appropriate to point out today once more that there must be—let it not seem a paradox to anyone—less words and more deeds in propaganda and in ideological work as a whole, too.

Special mention should be made of the work done by the mass media—from the factory and local media to central media. The press, TV and radio are an effective means for organising and educating the masses, for shaping public opinion. Positive changes have been taking place in their work recently. But life demands more.

The media are called upon to make a profound analysis of the events and phenomena, to raise important questions and propose the ways for solving them, to be convincing in their content, prompt reportage and abundance of information. An intelligent word from the Party addressed to the individual gives food for thought, arouses people's initiative and fosters in them an irreconcilable attitude to shortcomings. The effectiveness of the press, TV and radio increases considerably when the Party committees give them their active support and assistance. It is only necessary that this assistance and support should always be timely and significant. And, of course, any attempts to suppress or ignore well-founded criticisms should get a principled Party assessment.

Literature and the arts play a great role in enriching society's intellectual life with new values and in the ideological and moral development of the Soviet people. The artistic intelligentsia—writers, poets, composers, artists and theatre and cinema workers—enjoy great prestige and recognition. But this also makes them greatly responsible to society. All of the best which has been created by Soviet literature and arts has been always inseparable from the Party's and the people's main activities and concerns. There is no doubt that the new tasks which are being tackled today will find a befitting response in the creative endeavour which affirms the truth of socialist life.

Comrades, we are on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the great victory over fascism. Remembering the huge price paid for the victory by the Soviet people and other peoples of the anti-Hitler coalition, recalling again and again the tragedy which befell mankind, the Communist Party and the Soviet Government consider the main task of their foreign policy to be the preven-

tion of such a tragedy ever occurring again, all the more so the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe.

The Soviet Union, our Party have been and will forever remain faithful to the sacred memory of the immortal feat of the peoples who routed fascism.

The Soviet Union declares once again that it will steadfastly pursue the Leninist policy of peace and peaceful coexistence, which is determined by our social system, morals and world outlook. We are in favour of stable, proper and, if you like, civilised inter-state relations based on a genuine respect for international law. But it must be crystal clear that international relations can be channelled towards normal cooperation only if the imperialists abandon their attempts to solve the historical contest between the two social systems by military means.

The united community of socialist states, its economic and defensive might and its unity of actions in the international arena are an invincible force in the struggle for mankind's peaceful future. The attainment of military-strategic balance with the states of the aggressive NATO bloc is a historic achievement of the fraternal countries of socialism. This parity must be preserved by all means for the sake of peace, as it reliably checks the aggressive appetites of imperialism.

As before, we will spare no efforts in providing the Soviet Armed Forces with everything necessary for the defence of our country and its allies, to ensure that no one will take us by surprise.

Today mankind has an enormous potential for peace, all-round experience, and sufficient historical and social outlook to understand where the policy of aggression can lead. This understanding is more and more firmly uniting the peace forces, stepping up the anti-war and anti-nuclear movements, and mobilising ever new progressive and democratic forces for the struggle against the threat of war. It is no surprise that Washington's egoistic militarist policy provokes ever growing criticism and resistance in many countries. Communist and workers' parties, trade unions and other mass organisations are making a great contribution to the common struggle for peace.

No nation wants war. In this fact lie enormous reserves and possibilities for the implementation of the policy of peace and progress. Everything must be done to prevent the forces of mil-

itarism and aggression from gaining the upper hand in international relations.

We are convinced that a world war can be averted. However, history has shown that the struggle for peace and universal security is no easy matter; it requires ever fresh efforts. Through the fault of imperialism the international situation remains tense and dangerous. Mankind faces a choice: either to increase further tension and confrontation or to search constructively for mutually acceptable agreements which could stop the material preparations for a nuclear conflict.

It must be stated in no uncertain terms that the responsibility for the present situation rests primarily with the ruling circles of the United States. They continue to advocate the arms race and sabotage disarmament. The world community is well aware of this. Ever new types of weapons of mass destruction are being developed on their initiative. Today we are witnessing attempts to spread the arms race to outer space. Hundreds of US military bases scattered around the globe are also destabilising the world situation.

The United States is openly claiming that it has a "right" to interfere everywhere. It ignores and often openly tramples underfoot the interests of other countries and peoples, the traditions of international relations and current treaties and agreements. It constantly creates seats of conflict and military danger, making the situation in different areas of the world tense. Today the United States is threatening the heroic people of Nicaragua with military reprisals in an attempt to deny them their freedom and sovereignty as was the case in Grenada. Solidarity with the forces of progress and democracy, with those countries and peoples which, in the face of the reactionary onslaught, are upholding their freedom and independence, is a matter of principle to us. In this respect our course remains as clear-cut as always.

One does not have to possess any special political insight to see how in recent years imperialism has stepped up its subversive activities and how it coordinates its actions against the socialist states. This covers all spheres: political, economic, ideological and military. Documents of the fraternal parties have repeatedly stressed that imperialism is attempting to stage acts of social revenge on the widest front possible, including the socialist com-

munity, the countries liberated from colonial oppression, the national liberation movements and the working people in the capitalist countries.

The economic expansion of the United States is growing in scope and intensity. The manipulation of interest rates, the plundering activities of the transnationals, the political restrictions in trade and boycotts and sanctions of all kinds are creating a climate of tension and mistrust in international economic relations, disorganising the world economy and trade and undermining their legal base. The exploitation of recently liberated countries is growing while the process of their economic decolonisation is being blocked. By concentrating the growing mass of financial and material resources of other countries in its hands, the United States directly or indirectly places them at the service of its giant military programmes.

In these conditions there is a growing interest around the world in the idea of working out and implementing measures to normalise international economic relations and ensure economic security of states.

The complexity of the international situation and the acute nature of prevailing tensions oblige us to continue to give top priority to matters of foreign policy.

The all-round improvement and enrichment of cooperation, the development of comprehensive contacts with the fraternal socialist countries, the ensuring of their close cooperation in the political, economic, ideological, defence and other fields, the concern that the national and international interests of the participants in the great community should be organically combined—all these tasks are becoming increasingly important.

The implementation of the decisions of the economic summit conference of the CMEA member-countries held last June is now on the agenda for joint work by the fraternal countries. This is something which is persistently demanded by both the community's common interests and the requirements of the socio-economic development of each state, as well as by the specific features of the international situation.

The exchange of views which we had in the middle of March with the leaders of the parties and the states which are members of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, enables us to declare confidently that we are unanimous in our conviction that while

NATO exists, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation must continue to play an important role in defending the positions of socialism in Europe and the world, serving as a reliable instrument in the prevention of nuclear war and the strengthening of international security.

The Soviet Union will purposefully and persistently consolidate mutual contacts and develop cooperation with other socialist countries, including the People's Republic of China. Our position on this matter is well known and remains in force.

We favour further expansion of comprehensive cooperation with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The CPSU and the Soviet state invariably support the right of all nations to determine, according to their choice, their present socio-economic system and to build their future without any outside interference. Trying to deny nations this sovereign right is hopeless and doomed to failure.

We invariably advocate the development of normal, equal relations with capitalist countries. All controversial issues and conflict situations should be resolved through political means—this is our firm conviction.

The Political Bureau proceeds from the fact that the inter-state documents of the detente period, including the Helsinki Final Act, have lost none of their importance. They exemplify the way international relations can be built if one is guided by the principles of equality and equal security, by the realities in the world, if one does not seek any advantages but mutually acceptable decisions and agreements. It seems that, in connection with the 10th anniversary of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, it would be useful if, on behalf of the countries which signed the Final Act, the will to overcome dangerous tension and develop peaceful cooperation and constructive foundations in international life were to be once again expressed in Helsinki.

The Soviet Union is advocating fruitful and all-round economic, scientific and technological cooperation built on the principles of mutual benefit and excluding any sort of discrimination; it is prepared to continue to expand and develop trade relations, to develop new forms of economic relations based on the mutual interest of the sides in the joint mastering of research, engineering and technological innovations, the design and construction of enterprises and in the exploitation of raw material resources.

When posing the question in this manner it is necessary to analyse the state of our foreign economic relations, to take a closer look at them, while taking account of the future. There are favourable opportunities in this field despite international tensions. The approach to mutually advantageous economic relations and foreign trade must be extensive, large-scale and projected into the future.

We are in favour of extensive, versatile and mutually beneficial cooperation with the West European states, with Japan and other capitalist countries.

It is common knowledge that we are ready to improve relations with the United States as well for mutual benefit and without attempts to impinge on the legitimate rights and interests of one another. There is no fatal inevitability of confrontation between the two countries. If we grasp both the favourable and the unfavourable experience accumulated in the history of Soviet-US relations, the history both recent and not so recent, then it must be said that the most reasonable thing to do is to seek for the ways that lead to the improvement of relations and to build the bridge of cooperation, but to build it from two sides.

However, the first stage in the Geneva talks which has already been completed gives us every reason to state that Washington is not pursuing a policy of reaching accord with the Soviet Union. This can be seen if only from the fact that it refuses in general to discuss the question regarding the non-proliferation of the arms race to outer space simultaneously with the discussion of the question regarding the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons. Thus, it violates the agreement reached in January on the relationship between the three aspects—averting an arms race in space, the reduction of strategic nuclear arms and the reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

The question arises: what is the explanation for such a position? The explanation is that certain circles in the United States still want to achieve a dominant position in the world, especially in the military field. We have often drawn the attention of the US side to the fact that these ambitious plans lack any chance of success. The Soviet Union, its friends and allies and, in fact, all other states which adhere to the positions of peace and peaceful cooperation do not recognise the right of any state or group

of states to attain supremacy and impose their will on other countries and nations.

The Soviet Union, for its part, has never set any such goal for itself.

We would like to express the hope that the United States' present position will be adjusted. This would provide the opportunity for achieving mutually acceptable agreements. The readiness for this exists on our side.

Evidence of this is the USSR's proposal for both sides to introduce, for the entire period in which the talks are held, a moratorium on the development of space weapons and a freeze on strategic nuclear arsenals. Continuing this line, the Soviet Union has unilaterally declared a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles and the buildup of other counter-measures in Europe. The whole world has looked upon this decision as an important and constructive step which would facilitate the success of the talks.

I would like to recall that this is not the only step in this direction. In 1982, the Soviet Union unilaterally pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In 1983, it unilaterally declared a moratorium on being the first to place anti-satellite weapons in outer space. The US government did not reply to either of these initiatives with even a single gesture of goodwill. On the contrary, Washington tries to put the activities of the USSR, which are aimed at reducing the danger of war and achieving accords, in a false light, to generate mistrust in them. In other words, everything is being done to avoid positive steps in reply.

People cannot but be surprised at the haste with which the US Administration gives its standard and usual "no" in reply to our proposals. This is clear evidence of the United States' reluctance to work for reasonable results. I will say one thing: the arms race and talks on disarmament are incompatible—this is clear to anyone who does not resort to hypocrisy and does not pursue the goal of deceiving public opinion. The Soviet Union will not support such a course and those who are now embarking on political games and not serious politics should be aware of this. We would not like a repetition of the sad experience of the preceding talks.

For its part, the Soviet Union will be persistently working in

Geneva for reaching practical and mutually acceptable agreements which would make it possible not only to put an end to the arms race but to achieve progress in disarmament. Today as never before we need political will for the sake of peace on Earth, for the sake of a better tomorrow.

* * *

These, comrades, are our tasks and the main trends in our domestic and foreign policies. They will of course be discussed in detail at this Plenary Meeting which is to determine the nature of the pre-Congress work of the entire Party, of each of its organisations.

We must hold the Plenary Meeting in a way which would allow us to sum it up in Lenin's own words:

"We know our tasks today much more clearly, concretely and thoroughly than we did yesterday; we are not afraid of pointing openly to our mistakes in order to rectify them. We shall now devote all the Party's efforts to improving its organisation, to enriching the quality and content of its work, to creating closer contact with the masses, and to working out increasingly correct and accurate working-class tactics and strategy."¹

The Party and the Soviet people expect from us comprehensive, well-thought-out and responsible decisions and it can be said in all confidence that they will be supported by the Communists, by all the people. This support will find its expression in their social awareness, their activity and their work.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "A Letter to the German Communists", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 523.

To the Participants in the Meeting at Torgau

I cordially welcome all the participants who have gathered here in Torgau to mark a memorable event—the 40th anniversary of the meeting of Soviet and American troops on the Elbe.

Although years and decades have passed, people will always remember with gratitude the names of those who did not spare their own lives to dispel the dark cloud of enslavement and tyranny that hung over mankind.

In our country the veterans of the Great Patriotic War, this heroic struggle against the forces of fascist aggression and militarism, are held in nationwide esteem. We bow our heads in tribute before those who fell in this struggle. The present generation is indebted to them for the opportunity to live and work in peace.

At this time, on the eve of the celebration of the great Victory, the Soviet people are also paying a tribute to the weighty contribution which the peoples and armies of the USA, Great Britain, France, China and the other states of the anti-Hitler coalition made to the attainment of the common goal. A great role in the victory was played by the military units, partisan armies and detachments of Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Hungary, the Resistance movements in France, Italy, Greece, Belgium, Netherlands, Norway, Denmark and Luxembourg. German and Austrian patriots waged a courageous struggle against Nazism.

Our combat alliance born during the war years showed the potential for cooperation that was opened up by the joint struggle for peace and a better future for mankind. So, the handshake

of the Soviet and American soldiers who met in spring 1945 on the Elbe has gone down in history as a symbol of hope and friendship.

Today, too, it is the duty of each honest person, youth or veteran, to do whatever he can to prevent the flames of war from scorching our Earth ever again.

While turning to the events of the past war, we reflect about the present and, of course, think about the future—about a just and lasting peace, about delivering the peoples from the nuclear threat.

Mutual understanding and cooperation among countries and peoples, not enmity and discord, should be reference-points for mankind. Soviet people are convinced that constructive cooperation among former allies, among all states in the effort to preserve peace can and should become a powerful factor for improving the international situation.

The people who are today shaking hands again over the Elbe are setting a good example of this.

I sincerely wish the heroic veterans who fought against Hitler fascism, their families, and all the participants in the meeting at Torgau robust health and long, happy and peaceful lives.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, April 26, 1985

Speech at a Reception in Warsaw Given in Honour of the Participants in the Meeting of Top Party and State Leaders of the Warsaw Treaty Countries

April 26, 1985

Dear Comrade Jaruzelski,
Dear comrades and friends,

Permit me on behalf of the Soviet delegation and on behalf of all participants in the meeting first of all to express heartfelt gratitude to the leaders of the Polish United Workers' Party and the Polish state for their hospitality. We also convey a fraternal greeting to the residents of heroic and beautiful Warsaw, to all the working people of people's Poland, and wishes for success in building socialism.

An act of historic importance was completed today here in Warsaw, the city that has given its name to our alliance. The Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance signed thirty years ago has been prolonged. It was renewed, as Comrade Jaruzelski said, with the conviction that our alliance is vital for all its members, vital for strengthening peace and the security of the peoples.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin stressed: a revolution must be able to defend itself. And in the Warsaw Treaty the peoples of our countries have a staunch defender of revolutionary gains. What has the Warsaw Treaty given us all? It has given us the possibility to do peaceful creative work. The inviolability of our borders has been reliably ensured. A stout barrier has been placed in the way of the latter-day subverters of socialism and claimants to world domination.

History knows no other alliance like ours where relations are based on the full equality and comradely mutual assistance of sovereign states. An alliance which is, in the true sense of the

word, an alliance of peoples. An alliance which threatens no one but is wholly devoted to defending peace. We build relations with countries of the other social system on the principle of peaceful coexistence—the only reasonable basis, especially in the nuclear age.

Our countries' major initiatives aimed to consolidate peace in Europe and ensure detente are associated with the Warsaw Treaty. Today's meeting reaffirmed our common readiness to continue to search collectively for ways to remove the threat of war and expand international cooperation. We want to make the confrontation of the two military and political alliances less acute, a situation which would be in the interests of all peoples on Earth.

It was not the Soviet Union and the other socialist states that initiated the split of Europe and the postwar world. That was done by the creators of NATO, while our alliance was only formed six years later. Since then we have repeatedly expressed readiness to dissolve the Warsaw Treaty if NATO agrees to do likewise. This principled position still stands. But regrettably the other side has never had such an intention. On the contrary, before our very eyes it has been advancing new aggressive doctrines and accelerating the buildup of both nuclear and conventional arms. And this now forces us to think of further strengthening the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

Humanity faces a choice: rectify the unfavourable course of events or the risk of nuclear war will grow. And this risk is intensified many times over by US military plans in outer space. Whatever their authors say and however they justify themselves, the essence of these plans is clear: to acquire the ability to deal a first nuclear strike and to do so with impunity. Since the USA and NATO flatly refuse to follow the USSR's example and to pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, their intentions are particularly dangerous.

The development of weapons for Star Wars is just beginning. But it is already making the present-day world feverish, destabilising the entire system of international relations and leading to an even sharper political and military confrontation. Neither the initiators of that provocative undertaking nor those who are being persuaded to join in should forget that.

We take a fundamentally different approach: do not make

space a new source of the war danger, do not create space strike weapons, but scrap the existing anti-satellite systems. Simultaneously we propose an agreement on a radical reduction of nuclear weapons and a move towards the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

A simple and natural step such as a freeze on both sides' nuclear potentials suggests itself. But the objection is raised that agreeing to that means enhancing the Soviet military superiority. First, there is no such superiority. We have repeatedly proved that with figures, and Washington has not once been able to disprove them. And second, who said that we want to stop at a freeze? On the contrary, we insist that drastic nuclear arms reduction should follow.

We have already suggested that, for a start, both sides should reduce their strategic offensive arms by one-quarter. But neither would we have objections to making deeper mutual cuts. All this is possible if an arms race does not begin in space, if space remains peaceful.

The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries do not seek superiority either on Earth or in space. We are not striving to compete to see who will build a higher nuclear fence. But we will not allow the military-strategic parity to be upset. That is a common and firm position of the Warsaw Treaty members. If the preparations for Star Wars continue, we will have no choice but to take counter-measures, including, of course, a buildup and improvement of offensive nuclear arms.

The just ended first round of Soviet-US talks on nuclear and space arms showed that they are not plain sailing. It is clear that the talks can be a success only if the principle of equality and equal security is observed and the accord on the final objective of the talks and on interconnected resolution of the questions being discussed is adhered to.

As announced, the Soviet Union has unilaterally halted the deployment of medium-range missiles and the implementation of other counter-measures in Europe. The moratorium took effect on April 7. The world public and many sober-minded US and West European politicians have assessed this step of ours at its true worth. We have the right to expect that Washington and the other NATO capitals will be more serious and thoughtful in assessing our initiative and will, in their turn, exercise re-

straint on the issue of siting US missiles in Western Europe. For mutuality on that issue could assist in moving the Geneva talks towards practical decisions and could also play a role in the settlement of more complex problems.

The Warsaw Treaty has been in effect for almost one-third of a century and throughout that period it has been the initiator of constructive ideas directed towards detente and arms limitation, towards developing European cooperation. The Treaty's growing prestige in international politics has a positive effect on the general climate in the world. And that is the result of collective efforts, of each fraternal country's contribution.

Comrades, on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the great Victory over fascism we once again recall the vow made by the victors over the graves and ruins of World War II: war must not recur! We remember that and remember what the war lessons teach. And one of the principal lessons is the example of cooperation by the powers of the anti-Hitler coalition. Today we call upon all states of Europe and other continents to rise above differences and become partners in the fight against the new danger threatening all humanity—the danger of nuclear extinction.

By renewing the Warsaw Treaty we once again express our firm conviction that war can and must be prevented through joint efforts. Such is the will of the peoples of our countries. That is the goal of the policy of our parties and governments and of all the activities of the defence alliance of socialist states.

To further cooperation of our parties and states, to their stronger unity and cohesion on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism!

May the fraternal alliance of socialist countries, the Warsaw Treaty, grow stronger!

To people's socialist Poland, to the health of Comrade Wojciech Jaruzelski and the members of the Polish leadership, and of all participants in our meeting!

To lasting peace on Earth!

To the National Council of the French Republican Association of War Veterans and Victims

It was with great attentiveness that I read your message, permeated as it is with interest in the success of the current Soviet-US negotiations in Geneva, where questions of paramount importance for the destiny of peace, for the entire human race are being discussed.

War veterans know better than anybody else just what war means and work persistently to prevent it from recurring. Especially a war involving nuclear weapons, which are capable of reducing our planet to ashes.

I can assure you: the Soviet Union went to Geneva with the firm intention of holding constructive talks aimed at preventing the militarisation of space and radically reducing strategic nuclear and medium-range weapons. Since it would be pointless to hold negotiations on the reduction of arms while at the same time building them up, we proposed that the Soviet Union and the USA should introduce, for the duration of the talks, a moratorium on the development, including research, testing and deployment of space strike weapons, and should freeze their strategic offensive arms. At the same time, the deployment of US medium-range missiles in Europe should be terminated and, likewise, the Soviet Union's counter-measures.

To facilitate the search for agreement we, as you know, introduced a unilateral moratorium, starting on April 7, 1985, on the deployment of our medium-range missiles, and suspended other counter-measures in Europe taken in response to the siting of the new US missiles. That is, we confirmed our desire to reach agreement with concrete actions which have met with a positive response in the world.

This is our unswerving and principled policy. The USSR is sincerely striving for disarmament and nuclear arms reduction. Back in 1982 our country pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and urged other nuclear powers to follow suit. In 1983 the USSR announced a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of anti-satellite weapons in space for as long as other states did likewise. Both these pledges remain in effect to this day. We also proposed that the USSR and the USA should reduce their strategic offensive arms by one quarter or more. But the US Administration has given no constructive reply to any of these initiatives.

Unfortunately, even now, judging by the first stage of the Geneva negotiations, the US representatives are displaying no desire to reach agreement. Something else is clear: the USA is carrying on a reckless arms race and is actively trying to project it into space.

Success in Geneva is dependent on the goodwill of both sides to come to agreement, with strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security. Despite a complicated and tense situation in the world, and difficulties in the Geneva negotiations, we retain our level-headed optimism.

We hope our partners will heed the voice of the peoples who want peace and a termination of the arms race. We hope that common sense, political realism and a feeling of responsibility for a peaceful future will prevail. We have faith in the ability of nations to safeguard their right to life.

Soviet people are now widely marking the 40th anniversary of the great Victory. They give due credit to the contribution of their anti-Hitler coalition allies to the total defeat of the hated fascism. We remember the courageous French patriots—soldiers and Resistance fighters who made a notable contribution to our common victory.

It is our firm conviction that no task is more important in the world today than to avert the threat of nuclear annihilation. The more actively and resolutely the public works towards fulfilling this task, the better are the chances of success.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Immortal Exploit of the Soviet People

Report at a Meeting in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses
on the 40th Anniversary of the Soviet People's Victory
in the Great Patriotic War

May 8, 1985

Dear Comrades,

Friends,

Dear guests,

The four years of war were long and harsh for our people. The road to Victory was hard. And then came that bright day in May when Soviet soldiers, Soviet people could say: The right cause has triumphed! The enemy has been smashed! Victory is ours!

The Soviet people and their valiant Armed Forces inflicted a crushing defeat on Nazi Germany, defended their homeland's freedom and independence, and brought liberation to the peoples of Europe. The defeat of fascism and the victorious end of the war were an event of fundamental, history-making importance, which opened up before mankind, that had been saved, new paths of social progress and the prospect for a just and lasting peace on this planet. Our Victory is not a thing of the past. It is a living Victory relevant to the present and the future.

The Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Soviet Government wholeheartedly congratulate the heroic Soviet people upon the fortieth anniversary of the great Victory. A happy holiday to you, my dear fellow-countrymen!

Today the country is paying tribute to the courage, valour and heroism of its sons and daughters, of everyone who, weapons in hand, did their patriotic duty to the full, and did everything for the coming of the spring of Victory.

A happy holiday to you, dear heroes—frontline soldiers, partisans and underground fighters! Glory to your combat achieve-

ment in the name of your native land, for the sake of life on Earth!

Carry on with dignity and honour the high title of veteran of the Great Patriotic War, which is so dear to the entire Soviet people!

Today the country is paying tribute to the dedicated work and unmatched staunchness of those who remained in the rear, of each and every one of those who made the weapons, smelted metal, and grew grain, who were bringing nearer the hour of Victory at factory shops and coal mines, on railways, in the fields and on livestock farms, at research laboratories and in design offices.

A happy holiday to you, dear comrades! Honour and glory to all those whose life and work in the war years were devoted to one sacred duty: "Everything for the front, everything for victory!"

The Soviet people have infinite respect for, and are infinitely grateful to the war and labour veterans. It is to you, comrades, that the country owes its Victory, and it will never forget what you accomplished then, from 1941 to 1945, both by fighting on the battlefields and by working with unprecedented intensity.

More and more generations of Soviet people are being brought up with your glorious accomplishments as a model to emulate, learning to be brave, courageous and staunch, boundlessly loyal to communist ideals, and ready to surmount all obstacles and to overcome all difficulties when the country calls on them to do so.

The sacrifices made by our people for the sake of Victory are great indeed. The war claimed over 20 million Soviet lives. Almost every family lost some of its loved ones, and was scarred by the war. Never will the pain of bereavement and sorrow for the fallen fade away. But if they had not heroically given their lives to the country, there would have been no Victory.

The memory of the immortal exploits of those who were the first to go into battle, blocked embrasures with their bodies, rammed enemy planes, threw themselves under enemy tanks with hand-grenades, who, as sailors, engaged in hand-to-hand fighting with the enemy, who sank enemy ships, derailed enemy trains, courageously fought on the intelligence front, who braved death on the battlefields, who remained staunch under torture

and in fascist dungeons and camps will forever remain in the Eternal Flame, in majestic memorials and modest obelisks, in literary works and works of art, in the hearts of our contemporaries and our posterity.

Everlasting glory to the heroes who fell in action for the freedom and independence of the Soviet homeland!

Let us now observe a minute of silence in tribute to their memory.

Comrades, a united front consisting of many countries and peoples was formed in order to repel the aggression of German fascism and Japanese militarism. Soviet people remember and highly value the contribution made by all who fought in the Second World War to the defeat of the common enemy and appreciate their combat valour in the struggle for freedom, peace and justice.

Allow me to convey my heartfelt greetings to the foreign guests who have come to Moscow to celebrate with the Soviet people the 40th anniversary of the great historic event which is held dear by all honest people on our planet.

I

Comrades, the last war went down in the history of our country as the Great Patriotic War. Soviet people fully realised that in that life-and-death struggle the future of their socialist homeland would be decided—whether our peoples would be free or become slaves, whether they would have their own statehood, language and culture or lose everything and sink into historical oblivion. The mortal danger that hanged over the country and the tremendous force of patriotism roused the whole country so that the war became a people's war, a sacred war. Soviet people drew strength from the great Leninist ideas. They were inspired by the heroic chapters of our history and our people's struggle against foreign invaders. They rose to the defence of their homeland.

In terms of its class essence, our war against Nazi Germany was the biggest armed conflict between socialism and the striking forces of imperialism. The young Soviet state, formed less than a quarter of a century before, was carrying out large-scale

social reforms. The new social system was revealing more and more fully its creative potentialities. We needed peace and only peace. The Party and the Soviet government did everything to prevent the war. Our foreign policy and diplomatic efforts were directed towards attaining that objective.

As the danger of war grew, our country made preparations so as to be able to give effective rebuff to the eventual aggressor. The Party educated Soviet people in the spirit of vigilance, hatred for fascism and readiness to defend their socialist state. It did everything to provide the Army with reliable weaponry and modern equipment. The powerful industry built in the first five-year-plan periods formed the basis for strengthening the country's defence capacity.

A great deal was done in the prewar period. However, for various reasons, we failed to do everything we needed to do and on time. We had too little time.

The beginning of the war was harsh for us. We were attacked by a cruel and treacherous enemy, which had already tested its war machine and made the economies of the European countries it had occupied work for it. Its aggregate military and economic potential was twice that of the Soviet Union. Besides, it had the advantage of launching a surprise attack. And the effects of our own miscalculations were also felt.

Fighting pitched battles, the Red Army retreated deep into the country. That retreat to Moscow, Leningrad, the Volga and the Caucasus was our bitterest experience. The Nazi invasion brought our people unheard-of suffering, pain and hardships. We also faced critical situations during the war. But from the very start it revealed the great moral force inherent in socialist society and a profound realisation that the future of the country depended on the effort of everyone. Even in the most difficult hours the people did not lose their belief in Victory, their trust in the Party, and the conviction that our just cause would triumph. The whole world admired the endurance of the Soviet soldiers and the courage of a great people.

The blitzkrieg plan, worked out by the German generals, was frustrated even in 1941 owing to the heroic rebuff given to the enemy on Soviet soil. The world remembers the unflinching staunchness of the defenders of the Brest Fortress, of Moscow, Leningrad and Stalingrad, Kiev and Minsk, Odessa and Seva-

stopol, Novorossiisk and Kerch, Tula, Smolensk and Murmansk. Cities become heroes because their defenders are heroes. The war convincingly proved this. On the defence lines of Sevastopol alone as many enemy soldiers and officers were killed as Hitler's army had lost in all the theatres of operations before its attack on the USSR. In fierce battles our Army bled the enemy white, amassed experience and strength and learned to win.

Our country held out and turned the tide. The Soviet forces routed the Nazi hordes near Moscow, Stalingrad and Leningrad, and in the Caucasus and dealt crushing blows at the enemy on the Kursk Bulge, in the Ukraine west of the Dnieper, Byelorussia and in the Jassy-Kishinev, Vistula-Oder and Berlin operations.

What determined the victorious outcome of these battles, each of which had no equal in history? What enabled us to win the war which had begun so inauspiciously for us?

The sources of Victory were the nature of socialism, of the Soviet way of life, and the popular, national character of the Great Patriotic War. The war, as a most severe test, has strikingly and fully confirmed that it is the popular masses that are the decisive force of history. Soviet citizens of different nationalities stood by their socialist homeland, showing mass heroism in battles and labour. They were united and inspired by the example of the great Russian people, whose courage, fortitude and indomitable spirit instilled in them an unconquerable will to attain victory.

The millions participating in the war were not a faceless mass in that battle of unprecedented scale. Their heroism vividly reflected the high personal qualities of the soldiers of the Great Patriotic War—from Private Alexander Matrosov to Marshal Georgi Zhukov.

The combat banners of our Armed Forces are covered with everlasting glory. The Red Army, born of the October Revolution, was a people's army. The Soviet soldiers were distinguished by total devotion to their country and by courage and high combat skill. In fierce battles they displayed their great moral qualities. Neither the immense sacrifices we made during the war nor the atrocities perpetrated by the enemy darkened their minds with a blind thirst for vengeance. Having entered the territory of Germany as victors, the Soviet people did not spread their

hatred of Nazism to the German people. The fighting was still going on when they helped the German people to start building a peaceful life.

The talent of our generals and military commanders vividly manifested itself in unprecedentedly great battles. Born in the midst of the masses and reared and educated by the Party, they proved to be worthy heirs and successors to the country's best traditions of the art of warfare. The superiority of Soviet military science and generalship—their strategic foresight, the creative character of the decisions they took, their persistence and dedication in attaining the set goals, and their ability to fuse the high morale of the officers and men with the all-crushing might of the newest military technology—was clearly seen in battles against a strong and experienced enemy. The whole country knows the glorious names of the prominent generals and military commanders of the Great Patriotic War. All war veterans, our Armed Forces and all Soviet people are proud of them.

The involvement of all Soviet people in the war found vivid expression in the formation of the two-million-strong volunteer force, in the struggle of the underground fighters on territory temporarily occupied by the enemy, and in the large-scale partisan movement. Behind the frontline, in the enemy rear, there was one more front, that of the partisans. Over one million partisans took part in the fighting. The ground burned under the aggressor's feet, and quite a number of the invaders' divisions perished in the flames of the just cause of the partisans.

“War tests all the economic and organisational forces of a nation,” Vladimir Lenin used to say.¹ And the Soviet economy withstood this greatest test with honour. The socialist organisation of industry and agriculture had convincingly proved its advantages.

In the most difficult situation, within time limits which seem fantastic even today, we moved more than 1,500 large factories and plants and a considerable amount of material resources and assets deep into the country. Just one year after the enemy attack the eastern regions of the Soviet Union accounted for more than three-quarters of the country's military output. The advantage

¹ V. I. Lenin, “Address to the Second All-Russia Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East, November 22, 1919”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, 1977, p. 154.

of the socialist economy was demonstrated most convincingly in its high efficiency. Though our output of steel and coal was only one-third and one-fifth respectively of that of Germany and the countries occupied by it, we produced nearly twice as much military hardware.

What made the Soviet wartime economy effective was the firm authority of the state plan, the discipline, strict responsibility, initiative, resourcefulness, and bold ideas and selfless efforts of the workers, collective farmers, engineers, designers and scientists, and the organising abilities of production managers.

Faced with a mortal danger, the whole country contributed to the war efforts. The Soviet working class displayed unprecedented heroism and staunchness. At most critical moments workers' battalions joined the army in the field, while plants continued to operate even when the enemy was near and shells and bombs exploded close by. With its political consciousness and organisation the working class reaffirmed its role as Soviet society's leading force, having done everything for Victory.

The worker-peasant alliance, the socialist system of agriculture and collective farming stood the test of the war. Despite the fact that the country's main grain-growing areas had been captured by the enemy and despite the shortage of manpower and machinery, the countryside provided troops at the front and workers in the rear with food, and industry with raw materials. Collective farmers, state farm workers and the personnel of machine-and-tractor stations spared no effort to smash the enemy and discharged with honour their patriotic duty.

Like the rest of the country, professional people did all they could for Victory. Our talented and hardworking scientists, designers and engineers produced aircraft, tanks, guns, mortars, and other weaponry which surpassed the military equipment of the enemy. That was truly invincible weaponry designed for Victory.

Impassioned journalism and prose writings, and patriotic songs, films, plays, poems and posters inspired people to a determined struggle against the enemy.

The exploit of Komsomol members and of all young people of those fiery years of the 1940s, whose adolescence and early manhood coincided with the war, will forever remain in the people's memory. The young people who fought the enemy in

battles belonged to the generation that was born after the October Revolution and moulded by the socialist system. From childhood they had absorbed its revolutionary and collectivist morals and psychology. And they did not flinch, boldly moving forward to the firing lines. Having gone through all the trials of the hard war years, they demonstrated that a country capable of bringing up and educating such young people could not be conquered.

It was the same in the rear. Young men and women, teenagers worked hard at factories and plants, in the fields of collective and state farms. It is often said that they worked without knowing fatigue. Of course they knew what fatigue was, but they also knew that their efforts were badly needed by the embattled country. And today millions of our contemporaries are particularly moved when they recall their wartime childhood and youth.

It is with a feeling of deep gratitude that we speak of the heroism of Soviet women. Indeed, war is not for women. But defying danger, they went into attack with the men, fought courageously against the hated enemy, removed wounded soldiers from the battlefield, and nursed them back to health at medical stations and hospitals. Millions of soldiers owe their lives to the valour and kindheartedness of women. Nor will the Soviet people ever forget the women's glorious feats on the labour front. Soviet women bore all the hardships of wartime life and the grief of losses, displaying tremendous will-power and retaining the warmth of never-fading love. Our admiration for Soviet women patriots is immense and our gratitude for what they did for the sake of Victory is deep.

The fascists, planning aggression against our country, had hoped to bring the peoples of the Soviet Union into conflict with one another and to incite national strife. These hopes were dashed by what actually happened. Mankind knows no other instance where war brought all nations and nationalities of a country so close together in order to fight an aggressor. The fraternal unity of the peoples demonstrated with full force the wisdom and foresight of the Leninist nationalities policy. The great socialist union remained firm and unshaken.

The gigantic efforts at the front and in the rear were guided by the Party, its Central Committee, by the State Defence Committee headed by Joseph Stalin, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

Party committees became real military headquarters and political organisers of the masses. Everywhere, in soldiers' trenches, in partisan detachments and underground, Party organisations were active, and political instructors inspired soldiers with impassioned words and personal example. "The history of the Great Patriotic War," *Pravda* wrote in 1942, "will include as one of the glorious and honourable figures that of the political instructor who, submachine gun in hand and wearing a camouflage cape and helmet, was always in the forefront and leading the soldiers to the achievement of a lofty and noble goal—the defeat of the German fascists and the liberation of the homeland."¹

Communists went to the most dangerous and crucial areas of the struggle. Four in five of them either fought in the Army or worked at munitions plants. Members of the Central Committee and the best Party cadres were sent there. Three million Communists died in battles against the fascist invaders. Over five million people joined the Party in those heroic years.

Lenin's Party was a fighting party which had become one with the people at war. During the most difficult period—the war period—of our history it lived up to its great responsibility for the fate of the country and led it to Victory. The political and moral prestige of our Party grew in the war years; the name of Communist rose further in the people's esteem. And we members of Lenin's Party will always cherish and be proud of this.

It was not only our weapons, economy and political system that won in the war. It was a victory of the ideas for which the revolution had been made and Soviet citizens had fought and died. It was a victory of our ideology and morality, which embody the high principles of humanism and justice, over the man-hating fascist ideology.

The Soviet Army carried out with honour its great liberatory mission. It came to enslaved Europe as the liberator, and fought in order to end war and fascism and to ensure that the peoples of Europe would enjoy a durable peace.

In observing Victory Day, we pay due respect to the valour of the soldiers of the Allied US, British and French armies. We shall never forget the steadfastness and courage of the Yugoslav people and their People's Liberation Army. We highly respect

¹ *Pravda*, March 22, 1942.

the selfless struggle of occupied but unsubdued Poland. The Polish and Czechoslovak armies fought shoulder to shoulder with our forces on Soviet territory, and then in freeing their own countries.

Partisans, underground fighters and, in the last phase of the war, the armies of Bulgaria and Romania along with Hungarian units contributed to the defeat of Hitlerism. The Albanian and Greek peoples fought with determination against the occupation troops. We remember the courageous, though unequal combat of the German Communists and all anti-fascists against the Hitler regime.

The Soviet people highly appreciate the bravery of Resistance Movement fighters. In the forefront of the movement were the Communist Parties of France, Italy, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland and other West European countries. They inspired and rallied their peoples to fight against Nazi tyranny and for their freedom and national independence. Many Communists gave their lives for victory over the enemy. The French Communist Party went down in history as a party of men shot and killed.

True to its Allied commitment in the Second World War to the end, our country played a tremendous role in defeating militarist Japan. We acted in close military cooperation with the great Chinese people. The soldiers of the Mongolian People's Republic fought the common enemy together with us. The patriots of Vietnam, Korea and other Asian countries resolutely fought the Japanese invaders.

Recalling the events of that time and the joint struggle waged by peoples against their common enemy, we can proudly say that the outcome of the Second World War was decided on the Soviet-German front. There the fascist aggressor sustained more than 70 per cent of all its losses.

The Soviet people's feat in the Great Patriotic War is a great and unforgettable one. The years of the war are a record of an infinite number of experiences—the bitterness of loss, the joy of victory, the valour displayed in fierce battles and the unostentatious greatness of day-to-day work.

Our Victory greatly enhanced the Soviet Union's international prestige. It brought about a surge of patriotism in Soviet people. For us that Victory has been and will continue to be a source of inspiration, from which we shall always draw strength in carry-

ing out our great development plans and in increasing the might and prosperity of our land, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Our Victory in the Great Patriotic War is a holiday we shall always celebrate.

II

Comrades, the main, the most valuable thing the Victory gave us is the possibility to live and work in peace. The war was a test that showed that our social system is invincible and that its vitality is inexhaustible.

Peacetime puts forth its own great demands and is a serious test of society's ability to ensure steady economic growth and constantly perfect social relations, and improve people's working conditions and living standards.

Summing up the results of the past 40 years, one has every reason to say that in peaceful development as well socialism has convincingly demonstrated its vast potentialities and great advantages.

People of the older generation remember the horrible picture of destruction in regions liberated from the invaders. They remember bomb-scarred earth, houses burned to cinders, and blast furnaces and coal mines in disuse or destroyed. Almost 1,700 cities and towns and 70,000 villages lay in ruins. Nearly 25 million people were homeless. Tens of thousands of industrial and agricultural enterprises were destroyed. The fire of war devoured nearly one-third of the national wealth created by the people. But no one can ever measure the most horrible and irreparable loss, the loss of millions of lives of Soviet people.

The enemies of socialism hoped that the destruction and damage inflicted upon this country would make it backward and dependent on the West. They miscalculated once again. The hard and dedicated work of the workers, collective farmers and members of the intelligentsia raised from the ashes the cities, villages, factories and plants destroyed by the enemy. It took the Soviet Union just three years to restore industrial production to the prewar level and five years to restore agricultural output.

That was another feat, a feat in constructive work, which

the Soviet people accomplished in the difficult postwar years. It showed most forcefully what a people inspired by the great goals of socialist construction can accomplish. Since then this country has made great progress in all fields of economic, social, political and cultural development.

Soviet society today is a society with a highly developed economy. The country's national income is more than 16 times what it was before the war, and its industrial output has grown 24 times. Our industry has been increasing its output twice as fast as that of advanced capitalist countries. Today the USSR produces more pig iron, steel, oil, natural gas, cement, mineral fertilisers, machine tools, tractors, grain combine harvesters and many other goods than any other country in the world.

There have been deep-going changes in the structure and scientific and technological standards of production. New industries, such as the atomic, aerospace, electronics and microbiological industries, have been set up. Powerful production complexes have been or are being built in the country's central regions and in the Urals, Siberia, the Soviet Far East, Soviet Central Asia and Transcaucasia, in fact, in all regions. The country has a ramified network of power transmission lines and oil and gas pipelines. Canals stretch for thousands of kilometres. The once arid steppes are no longer what they used to be, and marshlands have become fertile. The country's economic map has changed beyond recognition over these decades.

The major productive force of this society, its creative potential has essentially changed. The USSR has well-trained and highly-educated manpower today. The professional skill, general culture and specialist knowledge of factory workers and collective farmers have increased substantially. We have the biggest contingent of engineers and scientists in the world. In the postwar period, Soviet science and technology have more than once achieved outstanding successes in major areas of world scientific and technological progress. The Soviet Union built the first-ever nuclear power station and nuclear-powered ice-breaker, and launched the first sputnik. Soviet citizen Yuri Gagarin was the first man to see the Earth from space.

Soviet society today is a society of continually rising living standards. Rapid economic development has made it possible, without paying less attention to further building up the national

economic potential, to start moving towards satisfying more fully the working people's needs and to score impressive results in this respect. Real per capita incomes are more than six times as high as the prewar level. Housing construction has assumed vast proportions. The network of hospitals and out-patient clinics, kindergartens and day nurseries, and public service facilities has appreciably expanded.

Soviet society today is a society of high standards in education and culture, a society where the people enjoy a rich intellectual life. While before the war only five in every hundred workers, primarily engaged in physical labour, had a higher or secondary education, the figure now has reached 82. Our contemporary is a person of a broad cultural and political vision and high intellectual requirements.

Soviet society today is a society which has resolved major social problems. The entire system of social relations has reached a higher stage of maturity. The alliance between the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia has been strengthened. We have made progress in eliminating the essential distinctions between town and countryside, between physical and mental labour. The progress made by nations and nationalities is integral to their all-round drawing together. A sense of belonging to a single family—the Soviet people, as a new social and international community without precedent in history—is deeply ingrained in everybody's mind and heart.

Soviet society today is a society of authentic, real democracy, respect for the dignity and rights of citizens, and their great responsibility. The working people's involvement in the affairs of the nation and of their individual production group is becoming increasingly active and extensive. The system of the people's socialist self-government is being perfected.

Forty years after the great Victory, the Soviet Union is a mighty and flourishing power, confidently blazing the trail into the communist future.

Our achievements are clear to see. But the dialectics of development are such that the targets reached extend the historical horizons and place more complex and more challenging tasks before people. We also have such tasks before us today. They mean, essentially, that we have to achieve a new qualitative state of society with regard to its economy, its system of social

and political relations and institutions, and the totality of the working and living conditions for millions of Soviet people.

The April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee centred on urgent issues. The Party sees its main task in greatly accelerating the social and economic progress of the nation, which is required by life itself—both by domestic factors and the international situation. We must first of all ensure intensive and dynamic economic growth on the basis of the latest achievements in science and technology. This will enable us to further raise living standards, enhance the economic and defence might of our country, and improve our society of developed socialism in every respect.

Good end results with the most effective utilisation of resources are now the main yardstick of economic performance. It is from this angle that we must view today's economic situation. We must within a short period of time reach the highest possible levels of productivity, quality and efficiency. This is one of today's vital demands.

The way to achieve this is through scientific and technological progress. Our growth rates and the course of our economic competition with capitalism are going to depend largely on how we accelerate this progress and the introduction of the achievements of science and technology into the economy.

In short, at this new historic stage Soviet society is confronted with formidable tasks. We have all we need to cope with them and will undoubtedly reach our targets.

We are confident that the advantages of the socialist system will serve us well in the new historical conditions too. But it is important that we take urgent and often new measures without delay to bring the forms and methods of socialist economic management and social and economic administration into correspondence with the current demands and future requirements.

Our strategy of managerial streamlining is based on Lenin's idea that "socialism must achieve this advance *in its own way*, by its own methods—or, to put it more concretely, by *Soviet methods*".¹ We must develop forms and structures in the economic machinery to maximise efficiency, improve quality and further scientific and technological progress.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 1977, p. 248.

Constructive initiative by the people ensures our advancement. The working people's profound interest in the life of their socialist homeland, and their labour and political activity have always promoted social progress, helping us overcome all difficulties and obstacles. Today it is very important to give ample scope to public initiative and direct it towards bringing about faster social and economic growth.

Nothing promotes a working man's activity so much as confidence that the principle of social justice will be applied without fail. The Party shall do all in its power to ensure this. By erecting a firm barrier to all departures from socialist principles and to all sorts of negative phenomena, by blocking all sources of unearned income and at the same time enhancing the role of material and moral incentives for conscientious and effective work, we shall carry out major socio-economic, political, ideological and educational tasks, arouse the profound interest of millions of working people in the attainment of the targets set and raise even further their social consciousness and level of organisation.

In looking forward to the next, 27th CPSU Congress the Party Central Committee is taking steps to ensure that the Party's political line fully meets the requirements of social development, the interests and aspirations of the broadest sections of the working people. It is for this very reason that the Party is constantly improving its work, the forms of Party and state guidance.

Today it is exceptionally important for us to know how to act, as Lenin taught us, by virtue of authority, energy, greater experience, greater versatility, and greater talent. There must be less talk, assurances and promises and more real work, practical results, responsibility, integrity, coordination of efforts, attention to people, and personal modesty. This is the main yardstick for assessing all personnel, their ideological integrity and competence; this is the substance of Party requirements as to style and methods of work.

The efforts to intensify social and economic development, to have firm order everywhere, to tighten organisation and discipline are meeting with the warm approval and complete support of the Soviet people. The CPSU Central Committee, its Political Bureau and the Soviet government appreciate and va-

lue the people's trust in the Party's policy and will exert every effort to justify it.

The Party's entire policy is based on its profound faith in the creative powers and abilities of the Soviet people. A people who conquered the enemy in open battle, held out in the difficult years of postwar recovery and scored outstanding achievements in developing their socialist homeland will likewise prevail in the new historical conditions and meet in a fitting manner any challenge posed by the times.

The Party clearly sees the tasks facing the country and the ways in which they can be successfully accomplished, and it is mobilising the Soviet people to bring about a new and powerful upsurge in the economy in order to raise further their living standards. In this we see a worthy continuation of the cause for which the Soviet people fought with dedication during the harsh years of the war and in the years of peaceful socialist construction.

III

Comrades, returning now in our minds and hearts to the victorious spring of 1945, we naturally ask whether the hopes of the millions of people who fought so that we, our children and grandchildren could live in peace and happiness have materialised.

Yes, they have! But a great deal remains to be done to preserve our planet, the common home of mankind, both for us, who are living now, and for future generations, and to eliminate wars from people's lives once and for all.

Forty years is not a short period of time by any standards. Time passes. Those who were born after the Victory have become mature people, and their children are grown up, too. For most people today the Second World War is an event outside their personal experience. But the war left such a legacy that its results and lessons continue to influence the whole course and nature of the world's development and the people's consciousness.

The Second World War emerged long before the first battles took place on the fields of Europe and on the ocean expanses.

Its sinister shadow was looming over mankind when some politicians failed and others did not want to prevent Nazism coming to power. Today we have better knowledge than we did at that time about who helped and how they helped the Nazi ruling clique to arm itself, build up a potential for aggression and prepare for military adventures.

The attempts by leading groups of monopoly capital to manipulate German fascism's expansion, directing it eastwards, were the height of political irresponsibility. The Munich deal will go down forever in the book of shame covering the names of those who so persistently instigated Hitler to attack the Soviet Union. And one has to suffer from a profound political amnesia not to remember this.

There is no need now to recall the names of the bourgeois politicians and statesmen of the 1930s who sincerely erred and those who were motivated by their selfish class interests. History will not change its verdict: the "Munich policy" of the Western powers and their connivance at Nazi aggression resulted in a great tragedy for all the peoples of Europe. Criminal was the policy pursued by those who, ignoring persistent calls from the Soviet Union, refused to act in a united front to stop the Nazi adventurists. Time will never lift from them the responsibility for a holocaust which could have been prevented if hostility towards socialism had not blinded the leaders of the West at that time.

Unfortunately, history is repeating itself. And today, more than ever before, it is imperative to display vigilance against the intrigues of those who are pushing the world to an abyss, only this time a nuclear abyss. One should have a clear idea as to where the threat to mankind today is emanating from. The Soviet Union makes this statement just as forcefully as before the war, warning against the menacing danger. Another reason for mentioning this is that the ill-intentioned myth of a "Soviet military threat", so noisily exploited by Nazism, is still in circulation.

Despite all the efforts of the falsifiers of history to rewrite it, the peoples of the world know that the Soviet Union was the first country to sound the alarm and warn against the growing danger of fascism. It was the Communists who proposed a clear-cut programme of struggle against the brown plague when

it was still in embryo. Last but not least, it was the Soviet Union that put forward a series of proposals aimed at curbing the aggressor who was casting off all restraint. But at that time, too, it was all dismissed as "communist propaganda".

The occupation of almost the whole of Western Europe, the seizure of Paris, the bombardment of London and the attack on Pearl Harbor dashed those cynical calculations and illusory hopes. It was only after the Red Army had won a number of brilliant victories that agreements on cooperation with the Soviet Union in the struggle against fascism began to materialise.

The expansion of the fascist threat made Western politicians look at the world in a more realistic fashion. The history of the anti-Hitler coalition indisputably shows that states with different social systems can join forces in the fight against a common enemy, find mutually acceptable solutions and work effectively for a common cause.

Soviet people remember the material help which the Allies gave this country. True, it was not as great as the West is wont to claim, but we are grateful for that help and regard it as a symbol of cooperation. The opening of the second front in Europe, though belated, was a substantial contribution to the common struggle.

The favourable atmosphere of cooperation between the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition and a realistic assessment of the new situation in the world after the defeat of fascism were reflected in the postwar settlement and in the decisions made by the Allied conferences in Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. Those decisions along with the United Nations Charter and other international agreements of that time are imbued with a spirit of cooperation. They ensured that a solution would be found to the complex problems of the postwar settlement, including territorial questions, a settlement meeting the objective of attaining the long-awaited peace.

It is particularly appropriate to recall all these things today when all peoples have one common enemy, the threat of nuclear war, and one supreme goal—that of removing this threat.

Twice this century the imperialist forces unleashed bloody world wars in a bid to achieve their class aims, strengthen their positions and further their selfish interests. But history decreed otherwise. No wonder that both wars, which started out as

ventures of imperialism, which was arrogant, confident of its impunity and convinced that international law was written with the invader's fist, ended in the defeat of those who unleashed them and provoked each time a series of crises which shook the very system that breeds wars.

In defending their country's freedom and independence, the Soviet people also carried out the great internationalist mission of saving world civilisation from fascism. The defeat of fascism consolidated the positions of progressive democratic forces, which resulted in the triumph of a new social system in a number of European and Asian countries. A first workers' and peasants' state was also born on German soil. During the popular struggle against Nazism and Japanese imperialism, a struggle which closely merged with the aspirations of the masses for deep social change, the appeal of socialist ideas visibly grew, while the communist parties in many countries gained in strength and developed into a powerful force.

The postwar years have seen the formation of a world socialist system and its considerable progress; a community of socialist states has emerged. The new social system that has established itself in the world has proved its vitality. It has awakened the creative power of millions and enabled history-making accomplishments to be achieved within a short period of time. Today socialism is a mighty world system, one which is exerting enormous influence on the development of mankind and its future, and is an invincible factor for peace and a guarantor of the security of the peoples.

The states of this great community possess invaluable experience and an efficient mechanism of coordinating their policy. They act as one on international matters and steadfastly uphold the cause of peace and disarmament, the principles of peaceful coexistence. The Warsaw Treaty Organisation, its Political Consultative Committee and the Joint Armed Forces of the allied countries have a special role to play in this respect. So long as there is a threat to peace and security, the Warsaw Treaty member countries will do everything necessary as they have always done to safeguard themselves against any encroachments. Proof of this has been provided by the extension, unanimously approved by all its signatories, of the Treaty for another term.

Profound changes in the postwar world have also taken place following the collapse of colonialism, with dozens of independent states springing up where colonies and semi-colonies used to be. True, their development has been uneven, there have been ups and downs, achievements and tragedies. True, the developing countries are faced with very difficult problems—some inherited from the past and some due to the policy of neo-colonialism.

But it is also true that the system of colonialism has now been eradicated almost completely and that many young national states are playing an increasingly prominent and progressive role in world politics. With the active support of the socialist countries they are making persistent efforts to establish a new and fairer world economic order. The non-aligned movement has become an important factor in present-day international relations.

As we see, comrades, the political map of the world has undergone radical changes in the forty years that have passed since the Victory.

The sphere in which imperialism is able to dominate has perceptibly narrowed. Its opportunities for manoeuvre and for imposing its will on sovereign states and peoples with impunity have been substantially reduced. The alignment of forces inside the capitalist world has also changed. The defeat in the Second World War of such a predator as German imperialism, the defeat of militarist Japan, and the weakening of the once-powerful British and French rivals of US imperialism have enabled it to lead the capitalist world in all the major indicators—economic, financial and military. The fact that the United States is actually the only major country to have fabulously enriched itself on the war has also boosted the claims of the US ruling class to world hegemony.

In the very first years of the postwar period imperialist reaction, displeased with the social and international-political results of the war, tried to take a kind of historic revenge, to roll back socialism and other democratic forces. This strategy was spearheaded against the Soviet Union while the economic might of the United States and its temporary monopoly of atomic weapons served as levers. This monopoly was looked upon by the ruling circles in the United States as a means of pressuring us and

other socialist countries militarily and politically, and for intimidating all peoples.

That is why, when we speak about the results of the decades since the war, it would be wrong to see only those which we sincerely welcome and support. Unfortunately, we see many things which cause growing anxiety. Of course, the world today does not in the least resemble the world of the 1930s, but by no means has everyone in the West given up attempts to use threats when talking to the Soviet Union.

The cold war launched by militaristic circles in the West was nothing less than an attempt to revise the results of the Second World War, to deprive the Soviet people, the world forces of progress and democracy of the fruits of their Victory. Actually, these goals were never concealed. They found their expression in the ideology and policy of "rolling back socialism", "massive retaliation", "brinkmanship", etc. This undermined trust between nations and greatly reduced the opportunities for the constructive international cooperation which had been launched within the framework of the anti-Hitler coalition.

US militarism is in the forefront of the forces which threaten mankind with war. The United States' increasingly bellicose policies have become a constant negative factor in international relations, which we cannot afford to overlook. The aggressive designs of the US ruling elite have revealed themselves in its attempts to upset the military-strategic balance, the bulwark of international security, in its instigation of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and in its dangerous plans for the militarisation of space. Some barbarous doctrines and concepts concerning the use of nuclear weapons are being devised, and hundreds of military bases and facilities have been set up around the world. A policy of state-backed terrorism is being pursued with respect to Nicaragua, and an undeclared war is being waged against Afghanistan.

The United States has been trying to impose on the world community of nations its claims for an exclusive and special mission in history. Nothing else can explain its imperial demands for "zones of vital interests", for the "right" to interfere in the internal affairs of other states, to "encourage" or "punish" sovereign nations in any way which suits Washington. Even the

United States' political and legal commitments are being violated.

It should be said in quite definite terms that the danger of West German revanchism, in whose revival the current US leadership is so deeply involved, has been growing. The leaders of the seven leading capitalist states, who gathered in Bonn the other day to "mark" the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War in their own way, even dared to question the territorial and political realities in Europe that had emerged as a result of Nazi Germany's defeat and postwar developments. Some politicians are prepared to forget and even justify SS cut-throats, moreover to render homage to them, which is an insult to the very memory of the millions shot, burned and gassed.

Realising the scope of the military danger and being aware of our responsibility for the future of the world, we will not let the military and strategic balance between the USSR and the United States, between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO, be upset. We will continue to pursue this policy, as we have learned well, once and for all, what history has taught us.

To put it briefly, the situation remains complicated and even dangerous, but we believe there are genuine opportunities for curbing the forces of militarism. The conviction that a world without wars and weapons can really be reached, that such a world can be built in our own time, that now, today, we should actively strive for it, struggle for it, is becoming strongly implanted in the minds of people the world over.

This conviction is being proven by the experience of the policy of peaceful coexistence and the practical results of cooperation between the states of the two systems. There are quite a number of such examples. They are encouraging more and more people to oppose aggression and violence in international relations. There is a growing realisation that peace will only be durable if peaceful constructive coexistence, equal and mutually beneficial cooperation between states with different social systems become supreme universal laws governing international relations. There can be no doubt that the anti-war movement will continue to grow, more and more effectively obstructing adventurist moves by the forces of aggression.

The only sensible way out today is to promote vigorous co-

operation between all states in the interests of a universal peaceful future, and also establish, utilise and develop such international mechanisms and institutions which would enable us effectively to balance the interests of individual peoples and countries with the interests of mankind as a whole.

We urge the most diverse social and political forces to promote sincere cooperation based on goodwill for the sake of peace. It is a far from easy task which cannot be solved on a short-term basis and requires a sufficiently high degree of trust in relations between nations. The course of events could be altered radically if tangible progress were attained at Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva. This is our conviction.

The experience of the 1970s, in our view, is truly invaluable in this respect. It was at that time that good political, legal, moral and psychological foundations were laid for the cooperation between the states belonging to the two systems in new historical circumstances, covering, for example, such sensitive areas as the security of sides. But the results could have been even more substantial had the West shown a responsible attitude towards the gains of detente.

We are solidly in favour of the process of detente being restarted. But that does not mean simply going back to what was achieved in the 1970s. We must set our sights much higher. Detente is not ultimate objective of politics in our estimation. It is an indispensable, yet no more than transitional, stage from a world crammed with weapons to a reliable and comprehensive system of international security.

The Soviet Union is prepared to proceed along these lines. Looking for every opportunity to remove the danger of nuclear war must become the highest duty of governments and responsible statesmen. I would like to repeat once more today, on this anniversary which is memorable for all of us, that the Soviet Union is resolutely in favour of a world without wars, a world without arms. We declare again and again that the outcome of historical competition between the two systems cannot be decided by military means.

Our allegiance to the policy of peaceful coexistence is evidence of the strength of the new social system and of our faith in its historic potential. This allegiance meets the interests of all

nations. It is permeated with a spirit of true humanism, with the ideals of peace and freedom which also inspired the Soviet people in the years of the last war.

To uphold man's sacred right to live, to ensure a lasting peace is the duty of the living to the millions of those who fell for freedom and social progress, our common duty to present and future generations.

* * *

Dear Comrades,

The great Soviet people, whether in a soldier's greatcoat or a workman's overalls, led by the Bolshevik Party were the main hero of the war and the architect of the Victory.

As we celebrate Victory Day, we bow to the memory of the fine, courageous sons and daughters of our country who gave their lives for the sacred cause of defending the homeland.

As we celebrate Victory Day, we honour war veterans and labour veterans, the Soviet people, whether as soldiers or working people, our heroic working class, collective farmers, and people's intelligentsia.

As we celebrate Victory Day, we honour all this country's nations and nationalities, united in the unbreakable fraternal family—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

As we celebrate Victory Day, we honour the Soviet soldier and our valiant Armed Forces.

As we celebrate Victory Day, we honour the Leninist Communist Party, the Party of the victorious people.

Let the Soviet people's exploit in the Great Patriotic War live through the ages!

Interview with the Press Trust of India

May 18, 1985

Question. On the eve of your meeting with our Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi what could you say about the state and prospects of Soviet-Indian relations in the context of the drive for peace and disarmament?

Answer. First of all, I would like to stress that Indian leaders are received with a special feeling here, reflecting the sincere sympathy and respect of the Soviet people for the great and friendly people of India. Different generations of Soviet and Indian people have written bright chapters into the history of our friendship, for whose development so much was done by Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi.

Our attitude to India reflects the Soviet Union's principled and invariable support for the struggle of nations against imperialist oppression, for stronger independence and social renovation. This course was bequeathed to us by the great Lenin and we are undeviatingly committed to it. We have inherited what can be called without exaggeration a unique, priceless asset. Indira Gandhi said that we were bound by relations not only between the governments and even not by political and economic cooperation alone, that our relations were the intertwining of the ardent hearts of our two creator-nations. Her vivid words aptly describe the level and the entire multiformity of our relations.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute once again to the bright memory of the outstanding daughter of the Indian people, whose name is forever inscribed in the history of Soviet-Indian friendship. The International Lenin Prize "For the Promotion of Peace Among Nations" which has been awarded to her

is recognition of her great contribution to the struggle for durable peace and friendship among nations.

An Indian saying has it that the shortest road is that on which people meet each other halfway. Our two peoples have been following exactly such a road for decades. This is precisely why our relations have been steadily on the upgrade. The high level, dynamism and comprehensive nature of our relations, based on the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation, is a source of satisfaction to us.

We greatly appreciate India's contribution to the common effort to preserve peace and remove the nuclear threat. Heading now the non-aligned movement, which has become a major factor in international relations, India is doing much to strengthen its unity and its beneficial influence in the world.

Soviet-Indian friendship is an asset not just of our two peoples alone. It is an important factor for peace and stability in the current tense situation and an example of how fruitfully countries with different systems can cooperate if they are guided by the ideals of peace, by the principles of mutual respect and equitable cooperation.

We are optimistic as to the prospects of Soviet-Indian relations. At our previous meeting with Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi both sides reaffirmed their desire to further strengthen our cooperation. I'm sure that the forthcoming discussion of a broad range of issues of bilateral and international relations will give new content to our traditional ties in the interests of the Soviet and Indian peoples and of peace in Asia and throughout the world.

And, naturally, I personally will be pleased to resume contacts with the Indian leader, who is greatly respected in our country.

Question. The initiatives of the heads of state and government of six countries representing four continents embodied in their declarations of 1984 and 1985 have been enthusiastically welcomed in the Soviet Union. How do you think they could be put into practice?

Answer. We have a high opinion of those initiatives. The ideas expressed in the documents of the heads of the six countries and the Soviet initiatives go in the same direction. The ultimate goal put forward in the declarations—to exclude nu-

clear weapons from the life of mankind—fully corresponds to the foreign policy aims of our country.

Entering into the Geneva talks with the United States, we agreed that their aim was to prevent an arms race in outer space, to terminate the arms race on Earth and to begin radical reductions of nuclear arms, all the way to their complete elimination.

It is possible to begin with what the Delhi Six proposed, i.e., to stop the development, production and deployment of nuclear weapons, to freeze nuclear arsenals and embark on their reduction, to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space and to conclude a treaty banning all nuclear tests.

We have proposed that as a first step further arms buildup should be stopped and that the USSR and the USA should introduce a moratorium on the development, including research, testing and deployment of space strike weapons for the duration of the Geneva negotiations and freeze their strategic offensive armaments, and that the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe and the buildup of our counter-measures be discontinued.

The Soviet Union has already unilaterally imposed a moratorium until November this year on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and suspended the implementation of other counter-measures in Europe. True to its word, the USSR strictly abides by the terms of this moratorium. We are entitled to hope for a more serious and thoughtful assessment of our initiative by Washington and its NATO partners, and for restraint in American missile deployment in Western Europe. Reciprocity in this matter could help place the Geneva talks on a practical footing.

And, finally, about ceasing nuclear weapon tests. We have repeatedly urged the US and other nuclear powers to do so. The Soviet Union proposed that the nuclear powers announce a moratorium on all nuclear explosions to be in effect until the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. It could be instituted as of August 6, 1985, i.e., on the 40th anniversary of the tragic atomic bombing of Hiroshima, or even earlier.

The Soviet Union is also ready to immediately resume the talks on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, which,

it will be recalled, were broken off through the fault of the United States. It is high time to put into effect the Soviet-American treaties on the limitation of underground nuclear weapon tests and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, which were signed in 1974 and 1976 respectively. They have not yet been ratified, again not through the fault of the Soviet side.

Of course, special responsibility for the destiny of the world rests today with the nuclear powers, and primarily with the USSR and the US. But the Soviet Union has never looked at the world in the context of Soviet-American relations alone. We are deeply convinced that all states can and must be involved in a search for realistic solutions to urgent problems and in efforts to ease international tensions. The voice of millions of people in different countries in favour of effective measures to end the arms race and reduce arms stockpiles, against attempts to use negotiations as a cover for the continuation of this race, is of tremendous importance.

Question. What could you say about the prospects of attaining durable peace and developing cooperation in Asia, specifically in the Indian Ocean area?

Answer. I would like to stress that we value highly India's contribution to the strengthening of peace and stability in Asia, its realistic and considered approach to the key problems of the region.

As for the Soviet Union, it has always advocated peace and security in Asia, as well as equitable cooperation between Asian states. This fully applies to the Indian Ocean area. We support the idea of its conversion into a zone of peace.

It is common knowledge that for a number of years now the US has been blocking the convening of an international conference on this issue. It has also unilaterally broken off the Soviet-American talks on limiting military activities in the Indian Ocean. In the meantime the US is constantly building up its military presence there.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly voiced its readiness to resume the talks. Still in effect is the Soviet proposal submitted at the Soviet-Indian summit in 1982 that all states whose ships use the waters of the Indian Ocean should refrain, even before the conference is convened, from any steps which might aggravate

the situation in the region. Specifically, the states in question should not send large naval formations there and should not hold military exercises, and those non-littoral countries which have military bases in the region should not expand or modernise them.

Now the drive for a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean has focused on the question of convening an international conference on the issue. I would like to stress our desire to work vigorously with other interested states to make such a forum possible, so that the Indian Ocean could ultimately become a sphere of vital interests of the states situated on its shores, and not of any others, a zone of peace rather than a zone of tension and conflict.

In conclusion allow me, through your agency, to wish the Indian people happiness, prosperity and peace. We wish the government and all citizens of India success in their efforts to further consolidate national unity and cohesion, in the work for the social progress and prosperity of your great country.

* * *

In the course of the conversation which took place after the replies to the questions of the PTI agency were handed to the correspondent, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that the Soviet Union attaches much importance to the forthcoming visit of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and believes that this visit will be a significant event in the life of our two states and in the development of mutual relations. Such has always been the case: each visit by leaders of our countries, each of their meetings has been a landmark in Soviet-Indian relations. In this connection we in the USSR recall with warmth and great respect the visits to our country of the outstanding leaders of India, Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi. We are confident that Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's visit will also do much to further develop Soviet-Indian cooperation and contribute to our joint struggle for lasting peace and greater international security. Good personal contacts have already been established between the Prime Minister and me, and we hope to strengthen them still further.

Friendship with India and deep respect for its great people, their rich ancient culture and their contribution to human progress—all this, I can say, is in the hearts of all Soviet citizens.

Friendship with India has also been an active tradition of our foreign policy for decades. We proceed from the premise that united, strong, peaceloving India is an integral and essential part of the modern world.

Personally I am greatly interested in your country, Mikhail Gorbachev said, and I hope that the kind invitation extended to me by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi will enable me at an appropriate time to make the acquaintance of India and its people at first hand.

Mikhail Gorbachev replied to a few additional questions put by the correspondent.

Asked to what factors he ascribes the successful development of his activity as Party leader, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed that the "secret" here is but one: our Soviet socialist way of life, the conditions which the socialist system creates for the formation and development of the individual. The labour seasoning I received in a rural family, much like that of millions of children of workers, farmers and intellectuals in our country, a good education, access to which is enjoyed by everyone, and the social and political schooling I got, first in the Komsomol and then in the Party—all these are factors typical of our way of life that enable Soviet citizens in one sector or another actively to participate in the development of the country and in the building of the new life. People with ability can be found in every country, every nation, but, we are convinced, it is precisely the socialist system that creates the best conditions for their development and for the socially useful application by them of their talents and abilities.

Some politicians in the West, said S.P.K. Gupta, noting the energy and dynamic way in which the Soviet Union is pursuing its policy, express apprehensions that the realisation of its plans in the field of foreign policy and the implementation of the measures it proposes to carry out in the sphere of social and economic development might pose a growing threat to the West and, notably, to the US. The correspondent asked Gorbachev's opinion on this score.

Replying to the correspondent, Mikhail Gorbachev directed him to apply with that sort of "apprehensions" to the Western personages from whom they originated. The leadership of our Party and state have been exerting every effort latterly to ac-

celerate the peaceful socio-economic development of the country. We have tried to make a realistic appraisal of the situation in various fields of economic life, have consulted with experts and have discussed these issues with a wide range of urban and rural workers. As a result, the contours have begun to appear of a programme the realisation of which, we are confident, will secure the achievement of the goals which the Party and the people are setting themselves. We hope to complete the work on the main directions of the strategy of our socio-economic development by the 27th CPSU Congress, and are certain that our plans will be approved by the Party and by all Soviet people.

Since the Soviet Union is undertaking major and far-reaching tasks of peaceful development, we naturally need durable peace and will do everything within our power to preserve and strengthen world peace. We are positive that here our interests coincide with the interests of all other peoples in the socialist, advanced capitalist and newly free Asian, African and Latin American countries. This probably does not suit some groups of imperialists who would like to preserve international tensions and to continue the arms race in pursuance of their narrow selfish objectives, but this is a totally different matter. As for ourselves, we believe that our policy accords with the interests of both the Soviet people and the peoples of other countries.

The correspondent thanked Mikhail Gorbachev for his clear and convincing answers to the questions submitted.

Speech at the Kremlin Dinner in Honour of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of the Republic of India

May 21, 1985

Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister,
Esteemed Mrs. Gandhi,
Dear Indian friends,
Comrades,

We are glad to welcome in Moscow the Prime Minister and the accompanying representatives of a country for which people in the Soviet Union have great respect. Meetings between Soviet and Indian leaders are always marked by warmth and cordiality, and deep trust and mutual understanding. They have a beneficial effect on the development of relations between our two countries, on the situation in Asia and the world as a whole.

Years and decades pass, generations of people in our countries come and go, but the relations of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and India continue developing on the ascending line. This is happening because these relations are built on a basis of equality and mutual respect, on coincidence or similarity in the positions of the two countries on the cardinal problems of our time.

Our cooperation with India, cooperation which has today so many dimensions, is free of all pressure, of imposition of any terms. The Soviet Union has consistently supported India at all stages of its struggle for consolidating its independence and has displayed, and continues to display, effective solidarity with that great country which is upholding its sovereignty, its dignity, its right to an independent path of development.

In any sphere of cooperation with India, we, as friends, share with it the best we have. And we feel great satisfaction that

economic ties between the USSR and India have helped solve major problems in India's progress—key problems for each concrete historical period—be it the construction of the foundation of its heavy industry or the development of its fuel-and-power complex. Among our joint projects today are such as when finished will undoubtedly make a worthy contribution to the development of India's economy and strengthening its defences on the threshold of a new century.

The successful space flight by a joint Soviet-Indian crew also testifies to the great effectiveness and, I would say, great potentialities of our scientific and technical links.

The breadth and variety of cultural exchanges between the two countries reflect the traditional mutual interest of their peoples in each other's rich culture and their spiritual affinity.

But the magnitude of what has already been achieved should not be allowed to blot out the great opportunities which exist for further advance. A desire for such advance has been expressed by both sides during today's talks. We are in just the right position to raise jointly our cooperation in many areas to a qualitatively new level.

A special place is held by the Soviet Union's and India's concurrent efforts to remove the threat of war and end the arms race. No one can ignore the fact that friendship and cooperation between our two countries are playing a more and more important and beneficial role in the entire system of international relations. By force of example, these relations are helping assert the principles of peaceful coexistence and work for stronger peace and security of all the peoples. These aims are well served by our Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation.

All peoples strive for peace and progress and none of them wants war. But there are forces which pursue other aims. They do not wish to reckon with the legitimate interests of others and the political realities of the present-day world. Chasing the chimaera of military superiority they have brought the world to the threshold of a new spiral in the arms race, a spiral of unprecedented scale, which threatens to grow into a qualitatively new phase with uncontrollable processes.

What, for instance, will the peoples get from the notorious Star Wars programme which Washington is trying, for purposes of camouflage, to pass off as a "defence initiative"? First of all,

greatly increased risks of a nuclear war breaking out. And, certainly, a sharp reduction in the chances of achieving an accord on matters of disarmament. Enormous funds will be thrown additionally into the furnace of the arms race, including the nuclear arms race. Yet these funds could serve the interests of peaceful development of mankind and, specifically, help solve such urgent problems as eliminating poverty and hunger, disease and illiteracy.

Therefore, the problem of preventing the militarisation of space affects the interests of all countries and peoples and leaves no one unaffected. We think that all peace-loving states should raise their voice against this new danger before it is too late and before an irreversible situation is created under cover of soothing statements.

One of the realities of the present-day world is the appearance in the world arena of dozens of states in Asia, Africa and Latin America, which are striving to overcome the pernicious consequences of colonialism. The overwhelming majority of them follow a policy of non-alignment. The emergence of the non-aligned movement and the fact that it has become a major factor in world politics is in the natural order of things in the present times. This patently reflects the striving of the newly-independent peoples for cooperation with other states on an equal footing, for recognition of their legitimate rights and interests by others, for elimination from international life of any manifestations of domination and diktat and claims to hegemony.

In short, the newly-independent countries do not want to be regarded any longer as objects for profit-making or as territory for installing military bases and support points. This is quite understandable and must be understood. When these countries are declared spheres of somebody's "vital interests", without so much as being asked their opinion, there can be no question of their interests being taken into account. Those interests are totally ignored.

It is needless to say how gravely dangerous conflicts in different regions of the world are under present conditions. Take a closer look and you will see that these conflicts stem, as a rule, from the imperialist powers' attempts to interfere, in some form or other, in the affairs of newly-independent countries and to

subjugate them to their influence. Those, above all, and not the notorious "rivalry between the superpowers", are the reasons behind the emergence of many of the seats of tension in the world.

We think that the assumption by every permanent member of the UN Security Council of the commitment to observe strictly the principles of non-interference and non-use of force or threat of force in their relations with the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and not to draw them into military blocs would help remove seats of tension and promote a peaceful settlement of a number of conflicts. The Soviet Union is prepared to assume such a commitment. This fully accords with the principles of our foreign policy.

The concept of "detente" came into existence in Europe. It will be ten years soon since the day when a historic document was signed in Helsinki, summing up, as it were, what the peoples imply by this great, meaningful word. Much of what was built on this basis has been destroyed by icy winds blowing from across the ocean. But many things have survived, struck firm root, and are bringing tangible benefits to the peoples.

In Asia, the problems of peace and security are today no less and in some areas even more acute and painful than in Europe.

It is understandable therefore that a number of important and constructive initiatives on some aspects of security in the Asian continent and its individual regions have been put forward in recent years. Among the authors of these initiatives are the socialist states and members of the non-aligned movement, the USSR and India among them.

The proposals remain on the international agenda. The proposal for making the Indian Ocean a peace zone, for example, was supported by the UN General Assembly and the non-aligned movement, specifically at its recent conference in New Delhi. Nor can one underestimate the fact that the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, the two nuclear powers on the Asian continent, have pledged no-first-use of nuclear weapons.

We must now ask ourselves if it isn't time, considering all these initiatives and, in some measure, Europe's experience, to think of a common, comprehensive approach to the problem of security in Asia and a possible pooling of efforts by Asian states in this direction? Of course, the way to this is complicated. But the road to Helsinki was not smooth or even either. Evidently,

several methods are possible—bilateral talks and multilateral consultations—and then at some point in the future an all-Asian forum for an exchange of opinions and a joint search for constructive solutions.

One thing appears indisputable: the peoples of Asia are no less interested in ensuring peace and peaceful cooperation than the peoples of any other continent and can do a great deal to achieve this aim.

We think that India, as a great power enjoying much prestige and respect both in Asian countries and throughout the world, can play a very important part in this process.

We highly appreciate India's contribution to the strengthening of peace and international security and to enhancing in this respect the role of the non-aligned movement.

The names of the great Indian leaders Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi will remain forever in the memory of the peoples, indissolubly associated both with the history of India and the history of the national liberation struggle on all continents. They blazed a political course by following which India has achieved impressive successes in its internal development and in strengthening its international positions. They did much for the rise and development of the non-aligned movement as an important positive factor in the present-day world.

The wide recognition of Indira Gandhi's outstanding contribution to the struggle for preserving and strengthening peace is betokened, among other things, by the posthumous award to her of the International Lenin Prize "For the Promotion of Peace Among Nations".

Soviet people will always gratefully remember Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi as firm and consistent supporters of close friendship and cooperation between our two countries and we highly appreciate, Mr. Prime Minister, the intention you have expressed to carry forward the cause of your illustrious forerunners.

I can assure you that the leaders of the Soviet Union intend to work actively towards further developing and deepening friendly Soviet-Indian relations. A peace-loving and independent India will always have the understanding and support of the Soviet Union.

Let me express to you our warmest sentiments and best wishes.

To the health of the esteemed Prime Minister of the Republic of India, Rajiv Gandhi, Mrs. Gandhi and all our Indian guests!

To the successes and prosperity of the great people of India!

To the further deepening of friendship and cooperation between our countries!

To lasting peace on Earth!

**Speech at a Luncheon Given in the Kremlin
in Honour of Willy Brandt,
Chairman of the Social Democratic Party
of Germany and Chairman
of the Socialist International**

May 27, 1985

Esteemed Mr. Chairman Willy Brandt,
Esteemed guests, comrades,

Allow me cordially to greet Willy Brandt, leader of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and Chairman of the Socialist International.

We have just had a detailed discussion and I think that we can say honestly that our talk was interesting and useful and has helped us to better understand each other's positions.

Our people have a simple but wise saying: "As you sow, you shall mow." In the recent past you, Mr. Brandt, sowed a good seed in the field of relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany, in the field of European cooperation. The signing of the historic Moscow Treaty in August 1970 is inseparably associated with your name. That treaty ushered in a stage of new constructive and truly good-neighbour relations between our two countries and peoples. At the same time it paved the way for productive cooperation in a broader context between European capitalist and socialist countries or, as they say, between East and West.

Regrettably, though it continues to a great extent to bear fruit for the peoples of our continent, the main achievement of those years—detente—has been fiercely attacked by conservative and reactionary forces. The word itself has been outlawed, as it were, from the political vocabulary of a number of Western statesmen.

Discussing the international situation today, we both stated that there is much in it that is deeply worrying all who value world peace and cherish the ideals of progress.

Indeed, the threat of war has intensified and become more acute during the years of confrontation. The world has reached a very dangerous point. The arms race is continuing and has reached unprecedented proportions. Moreover, the same forces which provoked it are now looking avidly up into outer space.

There is no people in the world that would not be worried by the US plans to militarise space. This anxiety is well-grounded. Let us take a realistic view of things: the implementation of such plans would undermine the disarmament talks. Moreover, it would dramatically increase the threat of a truly global, all-destructive military conflict. Anyone capable of an unbiased analysis of the situation and sincerely wishing to preserve peace cannot but oppose Star Wars.

Space will, of course, always attract man. Space exploration, as we have learned in practice, can do much to develop and improve our life on Earth. And it would, of course, be good if states could pool their efforts in some form and organise cooperation, but not so as to make space a source of death and destruction but to explore it for peaceful purposes, in the interests of and in accordance with the peaceful requirements of all peoples. The USSR is for such cooperation.

We have a firm political will to keep peace, avert war, and reduce arms to the extent of completely prohibiting and eliminating nuclear weapons. It is a will for detente and normal relations of good-neighbourliness and mutual cooperation with all countries regardless of their social systems. And, as you are well aware, we have been translating this will of ours into constructive initiatives and clear proposals which leave no room for contradictory interpretations. It is in this spirit that we are acting at all the current talks—in Geneva, Stockholm and Vienna.

I would like to note with satisfaction, Mr. Chairman, that your party, the SPD, has been playing a prominent role in the struggle to resolve questions of war and peace. This is evidenced by the positions expressed in SPD documents and in your statements against the Star Wars plans and in favour of curbing the arms race, reducing arms, nuclear arms first and foremost, concluding an East-West treaty on the mutual non-use of force, stopping outside interference in the affairs of sovereign countries and peoples, and ending armed conflicts and aggressive adventures in various parts of the world. These views, which you and your party

have reached by your own ways, following your own political convictions, are to a large extent consonant with our ideas about the present-day world and the tasks to make it better.

Recently we all fittingly marked the 40th anniversary of the defeat of Hitlerite fascism. That anniversary again reminded us very sharply of the importance of promptly resolving the burning question of ensuring security for the peoples of our continent today. What makes this task even more urgent is the fact that in the world, the FRG included, there are forces which have not learned the lessons of the past war. They speak openly and unashamedly of turning Europe into a "theatre of war".

We highly appreciate the firm position of your party, which does not want war ever to start again from German soil. For its part the Soviet Union, as you know, is doing everything possible to really strengthen European security.

We believe that a reliable way to reach this goal is to completely rid our continent of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons, and of chemical weapons. We are fully prepared to resolve the problem in this manner.

Progress towards large-scale measures can also be made step by step. Various options for this progress have already been proposed. What I have in mind are, for instance, the ideas to establish nuclear-free zones in different parts of Europe, and the proposal of Mr. Palme, the Swedish Prime Minister, to establish in Europe a zone free from battlefield nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union has already voiced support for such zones and we have not changed our opinion. In the same way we share the idea, actively supported by your party, on the establishment in Europe of a zone free from chemical weapons.

We are well aware, Mr. Brandt, of your attention to the problems of the relations between developed and developing states. We can quite understand that. Human conscience cannot tolerate the fact that dozens of millions of people in Africa, Asia and Latin America are dying from hunger and disease, are illiterate and live in poverty. The normal development of newly-free countries, the overcoming of the backwardness that is a legacy of their colonial past and the establishment of truly equal relations between them and the industrialised capitalist countries are important prerequisites for the normalisation of international relations as a whole.

It seems that the time is coming when the establishment of equal international economic relations with no discrimination and a new international economic order, including the problem of the developing countries' indebtedness, will have to be the subject of a broad discussion. We would be in favour of that. The world community has good reason to see to the economic security of the states and peoples.

It is apparent, Mr. Brandt, that our views on many present-day problems are close and even identical in many respects. I think that we have similar ideas and proposals because we are aware of the gravity of the danger that humanity faces and because our parties sense the mood of the masses, who want lasting peace and strongly protest against policies which escalate the threat of nuclear war.

Of course, we have had and will continue to have ideological differences. But they should not interfere with the cooperation of the Communists and the Social Democrats on the most important and acute problems of today.

Allow me to express the hope for constructive cooperation to develop successfully between our parties, between the CPSU and the Socialist International in the interests of peace and the security of the peoples.

I wish you, Mr. Brandt, your wife and all the prominent functionaries of the SPD who have arrived with you good health and well-being.

Speech at a Dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Honour of Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi

May 29, 1985

Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister,
Esteemed Mrs. Craxi,
Esteemed Italian guests,
Comrades,

We are glad to welcome you in Moscow, esteemed Mr. Craxi, all the more so since it is your first visit to our country in the capacity of head of the Italian government. Your visit to the Soviet Union is a clear sign of the desire of both sides to give an additional impetus to Soviet-Italian political contacts. We value the fact that mutually beneficial relations have been established and are developing effectively between the USSR and Italy in various fields.

We have seen on more than one occasion in Western Europe precisely Italian statesmen displaying farsightedness and a well-balanced approach, and initiating substantial moves to improve East-West relations. Nor have we forgotten the major, bold and enterprising actions in trade and economy which continue to be symbolised by the huge plant in Togliatti on the Volga River.

Neither you nor we are closing our eyes to the fact that there are differences between the USSR and Italy on certain, and quite substantial, international problems. It is important, however, that there is an obvious mutual desire for a constructive dialogue and for a joint search for ways to lessen today's dangerous tensions.

There is indeed a need for actions here. The world is living

through difficult times. The hopes which the peoples justifiably pinned on the process of positive change in international relations, initiated through the efforts of many countries during the 1970s, have not been met, for reasons which we have pointed out on more than one occasion. That process was superseded by confrontation, the mentality of which is spurring on the arms race which has gone too far as it is. An arms buildup with a view to breaking the existing military-strategic parity has in its turn been breeding in certain quarters a dangerous fondness of methods and means of aggression in foreign policy. This vicious circle, confrontation—arms race—confrontation, can and must be broken. Human civilisation just does not have any choice.

Italy, and of course not only Italy, can be sure of the Soviet Union's policy. Our people, who paid a stiff price for the right to live in peace and freedom, are devoting every effort to peaceful construction, to acceleration of scientific and technical progress, and to raising the material and cultural standard of life.

I say this to emphasise that the Soviet Union's striving for peace is determined by the very nature of our social system, by our world outlook and by our morality. Our thoughts are turning back to the experience accumulated during the 1970s precisely because at that time good political, legal, moral and psychological foundations for peaceful cooperation among states with different social systems and different military-political alliances were laid. We want to revive the spirit, the atmosphere and the essence of detente precisely because we intend to advance even farther, towards a dependable system of international law and order and security. A qualitative leap, if you wish, is needed.

At the Soviet-US talks in Geneva, the second round of which begins tomorrow, the Soviet Union is prepared to seek mutually acceptable solutions in a businesslike manner. Regrettably, we so far have not sensed sufficient readiness in our partners in the talks. There are plentiful indications that the United States would like to push through at all costs its plans to develop armaments of a new class, space strike weapons. The price of this, however, may go beyond subversion of the Geneva talks, to the ruin of every prospect for an end to the arms race.

We in the Soviet Union follow a different logic. Space, a common asset of mankind, must not become a scene of military rivalry. If space is not militarised, it will be possible to reduce

substantially both strategic nuclear armaments and medium-range nuclear systems in Europe.

The question of the latter, naturally, has a special place in our exchanges of opinion. I want to stress most definitely that we are prepared to go a very long way in that matter. The proposals made by us still stand.

If they are put into practice, there will be the lowest possible level of all, zero level, in medium-range missiles in Europe between the USSR and the USA. As for the medium-range missiles we retain in the European zone, we would not have a grain more than the French and the British have either in missile or in war-head numbers. We are prepared to scrap the missiles subject to reduction without redeploying them anywhere.

I will also point out that the Soviet Union has long stated: if an agreement on the limitation of nuclear armaments in Europe is achieved and enters into force, the deployment of SS-20 missiles in the eastern parts of the USSR will also be stopped on the condition that there will be no substantial changes in the strategic situation in the Asian region. We are reiterating this proposal today.

As for Europe, we state over and over again: the USSR would want most of all the complete ridding of that continent of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons, that is, weapons intended to hit targets in Europe. The USSR has long been prepared for this but the NATO countries prefer pretending that they do not hear that proposal of ours.

Elementary logic tells us that to turn back the arms race, it is first necessary to halt it. It is to make it easier to go over to arms reductions that the Soviet Union has proposed a freeze on the development of space strike weapons, on strategic offensive armaments and on medium-range nuclear systems for the duration of the Soviet-US talks in Geneva. To get things off to a good start, we unilaterally suspended till November the deployment of our medium-range systems in Europe. We are still awaiting from the other side a response to this initiative, one that would contribute towards accomplishing the task of scaling down nuclear confrontation in Europe.

To sum up, I would like to stress that the implementation of the Soviet Union's clear, concrete and far-reaching proposals would certainly change the entire situation in Europe and world-

wide radically for the better. It is our conviction that Italy, along with other states, could contribute a good deal to such a development.

While on the subject of strengthening European security, I want to say that we seem to have with Italy a certain similarity of approach to proceedings at the Stockholm Conference. We stand for the early beginning of substantive talks, and for the formulation of relevant documents at the Conference. It is evidently necessary to look more boldly for an accord incorporating major political measures and mutually acceptable and concrete confidence-building measures in military matters.

We think that the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, to be marked on August 1 this year, should be keynoted by the restoration and expansion of the process of detente. The historic importance of that document, pervaded as it is with the spirit of detente, should be backed in a joint action by the participating states. And of course, attempts under whatever pretext to erode the territorial and political realities in Europe should be resolutely blocked. It would be unpardonable thoughtlessness to disregard the fact that it was precisely the post-war set-up in Europe that has given the continent 40 years of peace.

I will touch upon one more aspect of European affairs. Europe is a continent where there are various multilateral organisations. Each of them has accumulated a wealth of experience and is playing a certain role both in the world economy and in international politics. I mean primarily the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the European Economic Community. It is time, I think, to establish between them mutually beneficial relations in economic affairs. Insofar as the EEC countries act as a "political entity", we are prepared to seek with it a common language on concrete international problems.

Mr. Prime Minister,

It is natural that in the course of our conversation today, reviewing the overall international situation, as it were, we could not help touching upon seats of acute tension in the world, be it the Mediterranean or Central America. And I think that the Soviet Union and Italy here have a certain similarity of approach. These dangerous seats of tension should be removed by political means. We stand for continued efforts to bring positions closer,

for a more energetic assistance to a search for ways to settle regional problems at the negotiating table, and for protection of the sovereign rights of states and peoples exposed to pressure and gross intervention in their internal affairs.

Relations between the Soviet Union and Italy have a substantive legal base. During the past decades the sides have perfected mechanisms and instruments of cooperation, such as the 1972 Protocol on Consultations and a number of bilateral documents on economic, scientific, technical and cultural exchanges. Perhaps we can learn to use these instruments even more efficiently for the good of both sides, and for peace and security for all peoples. We are prepared to contribute to such efforts. In this context we reiterate our satisfaction with your visit to the Soviet Union, with the intensive exchange of opinions we just had.

I am certain that, basing ourselves on the long-time sentiments of mutual respect and affection between the Soviet and Italian peoples, we can yet do by joint efforts a good deal of useful things for the further development of Soviet-Italian relations.

Allow me, Mr. Prime Minister, to wish you, your esteemed wife, Mr. Foreign Minister Andreotti and all the other Italian guests the best of health and well-being.

May Soviet-Italian relations develop and grow stronger for the good of our peoples and the cause of world peace!

**Speech at a Dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace
in Honour of Gustáv Husák,
General Secretary
of the CPCz Central Committee
and President
of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic**

May 31, 1985

Dear Comrade Husák,
Dear Czechoslovak friends,
Comrades,

The official visit of friendship by the leader of fraternal Czechoslovakia to our country is drawing to a close. If one is to briefly sum up the results of the visit, one can say that another important step has been taken in the development of Soviet-Czechoslovak cooperation and in strengthening friendship and relations of alliance between our parties and peoples.

We are all sincerely glad to have had this new meeting with Comrade Husák, a prominent figure in the international communist movement and a long-time and loyal friend of our country. Recently the Federal Assembly of Czechoslovakia reelected him President of the Republic. I would like to again cordially congratulate you, dear Comrade Husák, and to wish you the best of health and every success in your important party and state work.

Comrades,

At the beginning of this month of May we solemnly celebrated the anniversary of the great Victory over fascism and, simultaneously, the 40th anniversary of the conclusion of the Czechs' and Slovaks' national liberation struggle and the liberation of your country from the Nazi invaders. The entire subsequent development of Czechoslovakia has been linked indivisibly with those historic events.

Good proof of this fact is the Czechoslovakia-1985 national jubilee exposition which opened in Moscow today. It offers an

impressive picture of the accomplishments achieved on the path the country has traversed. It could be described as a report by the people's government on the transformations carried out, as clear evidence of the advantages and the inexhaustible potential of the socialist system. It is also an excellent example of how greatly socialist countries benefit by cooperation and mutual assistance and of what they can accomplish by pooling their efforts.

While the exposition makes it possible to evaluate present-day achievements, the programme for long-term economic, scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and Czechoslovakia we have signed for the period up to the year 2000 offers a glimpse of the future. It defines guidelines for our economic cooperation and major joint projects which will be important to the national economies of both countries.

Economic contacts between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia have reached considerable proportions. The Soviet Union has long been at the top of Czechoslovakia's foreign trade balance sheet, while Czechoslovakia is our country's second largest trade partner. We now plan to go much farther. I refer to the development of our cooperation in those areas which promise the greatest returns, namely, specialisation and coproduction in engineering and other industries.

Clarity of vision and confidence in the future are immensely important in today's world with its increasingly complicated conditions of economic growth, sharp market fluctuations and tough competition. It is this vision and this confidence that the fraternal countries gain by socialist economic integration and by their cooperation on a bilateral and multilateral basis within the CMEA framework. But these are assets which are not at all within easy reach. One has to work hard to make good use of them. A great deal remains to be done and a number of major problems are yet to be resolved through joint efforts.

The priority here is to work together to accelerate scientific and technological progress. Today this offers the key to intensifying social production, raising the living standards and improving the entire socialist way of life—and, of course, to strengthening the defences of the socialist countries.

Another important task is to search for the best, most efficient mechanism of cooperation among the CMEA countries and to introduce economic forms and methods that would stimulate

the pooling of efforts in material production, in research and development.

Understandably, both problems—advancing to the farthest frontiers of science and technology and developing a more flexible and efficient mechanism of economic cooperation—are closely interrelated. All the fraternal countries have an interest in resolving those problems. In the course of our talks today the USSR and Czechoslovakia reiterated their determination to make, together with the other CMEA members, a worthy contribution to that vital cause.

We are convinced that the rise to higher levels of economic integration will mean a new quality of cooperation among fraternal countries in all other spheres as well. Lenin pointed out on more than one occasion the interdependence and mutual influence of economics and politics. Practice is bearing out this idea over and over again. Objective processes of social development today make it imperative to expand the international socialist division of labour and to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the peoples following the socialist road.

This is especially important in today's acute international situation.

We cannot close our eyes to realities. Regrettably, the world situation remains complex and dangerous. US first-strike nuclear missiles continue to be deployed in Western Europe. West German revanchism is again rearing its head: the decisions of the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences of the Allied Powers and the results of the postwar development are called into question with obvious encouragement from across the ocean.

The actions of the aggressive imperialist forces in different parts of the world, their encroachments upon the norms of international law and their disregard for world public opinion are deplorable.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia along with other fraternal countries have consistently stood for putting an end to the imperialist escalation of tensions which can lead to nuclear conflict, and are painstakingly working for the solution of outstanding problems.

Our clear position and initiatives on this score are well known. We proposed to the United States at the Geneva talks taking joint measures to prevent militarisation of outer space and to end

the arms race on Earth. This would be immensely important for lessening and eventually eliminating the threat of war.

The second round of these talks opened in Geneva yesterday. The Soviet Union, as before, will work at these talks for honest and fair decisions in strict accordance with the principle of equality and equal security. Naturally, reciprocity is what is needed in this matter of vital importance.

The Soviet Union reiterates its proposal of an immediate moratorium on nuclear and space weapons. Such a moratorium would check the arms race on Earth even now and prevent its extension into outer space. Given today's rough parity of strength, a moratorium on nuclear and space weapons would not give any advantage to either side and would fully meet the principle of equality and equal security.

We view the introduction of a moratorium as merely the first step which can help strengthen mutual trust and proceed to radical reductions of nuclear armaments. We suggest that as they introduce the moratorium, the Soviet Union and the United States agree that they will make practical proposals at the talks within a specified period, say, one month or two, on all matters under consideration, including the levels to which they would be prepared to reduce their strategic offensive armaments, naturally, on condition that space strike weapons are banned.

We stand for returning to normal Soviet-US relations, to the road of detente and mutually beneficial cooperation. It is time for the US side to translate its statements of readiness to move in that direction into the language of practical action.

I would like to stress with satisfaction that our Czechoslovak friends and we have a common approach to topical international problems. We draw on unity for strength. For three decades now, the Warsaw Treaty has been ensuring for our countries security; it has enabled us to live and work in peace. Recently it was unanimously decided to prolong it. Let us continue to perfect and strengthen our defensive military and political alliance.

Comrades,

The Soviet and Czechoslovak Communists are now approaching their parties' congresses. As usual, the pre-congress period is a time to take stock of what has been done, to identify latent reserves and formulate tasks for the future. The most important

of these tasks is to strengthen friendship between allied socialist states, our associates in the struggle for common goals.

Friendship among the peoples of the socialist countries is a great achievement, one might say, a common priceless asset of ours which we should preserve and strengthen.

Let us then continue to do everything possible to strengthen comprehensive cooperation between our fraternal parties and to expand relations of comradeship and friendship between the Soviet and the Czechoslovak peoples.

Let us continue to resolutely uphold our common cause—socialism and peace.

Allow me in conclusion, speaking on behalf of the Soviet leadership, on behalf of our entire Party and the Soviet people, to wish Comrade Husák, the leaders of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and all the Communists and working people of fraternal Czechoslovakia new great successes in their work for the good of their socialist homeland.

**Speech in the Kremlin
on the Occasion of Awarding
the Order of Lenin to Todor Zhivkov,
General Secretary of the Central Committee
of the Bulgarian Communist Party
and Chairman of the State Council
of the People's Republic of Bulgaria**

June 7, 1985

Dear Comrade Zhivkov,
Dear Comrades,

I have the honour and pleasure of having been invited by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to award the Order of Lenin to Comrade Todor Zhivkov, leader of the fraternal country of Bulgaria, and prominent leader of the international communist and working-class movement. The highest Soviet award is being granted to you on the occasion of your jubilee for the outstanding role you have played in promoting fraternal friendship and all-round cooperation between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of Bulgaria, for your great services to the cause of strengthening peace and consolidating the positions of existing socialism.

The Soviet people know very well that you joined the Bulgarian Communist Party more than fifty years ago and that for thirty years now you have been at the head of the Party's Central Committee, carrying on the cause of Georgi Dimitrov. Direct involvement in the struggle against the fascist monarchy and for the victory of the revolution of September 9, vigorous efforts towards transforming the public life in the country along new lines, versatile activity in guiding the process of socialist construction—those are the highlights of the biography of the General Secretary of the BCP Central Committee and Chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

The name of Comrade Zhivkov has been associated with consolidating and expanding friendship and all-round cooperation

between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. Throughout the entire postwar period these relations have been on the upgrade. Our two countries have invariably been at one in times of all the most complicated changes in international life, joining efforts in defending the just cause and opposing the evil forces of reaction. That will forever be the case.

Today our parties and states maintain close and fruitful cooperation in literally all areas of social activity. However, life never allows us to rest on laurels. It always sets us new tasks and puts increasingly high demands on the Communists.

At the recent meeting in Warsaw, the USSR and Bulgaria together with the other fraternal countries expressed their determination to work towards greater unity and cohesion of the socialist community. We are persistently searching for the ways to enhance the effectiveness of our further cooperation, seeking to make it ever more fruitful and helpful in solving urgent problems. This, among other things, is the goal of the Long-Term Programme for the Development of Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the USSR and the People's Republic of Bulgaria for the Period up to the Year 2000, the programme Comrade Zhivkov and I are going to sign.

Allow me on behalf of the CPSU leadership, our entire Party and the Soviet people, to wish you, dear Comrade Zhivkov, the best of health and great vigour in your responsible Party and state work.

May the eternal and inviolable Soviet-Bulgarian friendship go from strength to strength for the benefit of our countries and in the interests of the entire socialist community.

The Key Issue of the Party's Economic Policy

Report at a Meeting at the CPSU Central Committee
on Accelerating Scientific and Technological Progress

June 11, 1985

Comrades,

As you know, Communists and all Soviet people have approved of the decisions of the April (1985) Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee and its programme to accelerate the nation's social and economic development. This is clear from the results of the plenary meetings of the Party committees and the numerous comments sent to central bodies.

The Soviet people welcome a frank and honest discussion of society's problems, completely support the policy of enhancing exactingness, putting things in order everywhere, and making radical improvements in economic management. They are responding to this policy with practical action. Evidence of this was the successful accomplishment of plan assignments for May 1985. A good, businesslike atmosphere is emerging in Party organisations, work collectives and the country as a whole.

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee highly values the confidence the people have in the policies of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Support, however, is also a kind of loan; it obligates us to strengthen what has been accomplished and move forward. We must also note the Soviet people's concern that efforts begun might end up being no more than another campaign. In this context, some Party organisations and managers are being criticised for their inertia, for moving too slowly, for being unable to mobilise and unite people to solve the major and important tasks in the current stage of society's development.

I would say, everyone, from the Central Committee to local Party organisations, bears full responsibility to the Party and the people for consistently implementing the April Plenary Meeting decisions.

The Party regards accelerating scientific and technological progress as the main part of its economic strategy, the main lever for boosting the economy and making it more efficient, which also means solving problems crucial to our society. The tasks in promoting scientific and technological progress are so urgent that action must be taken immediately. They encompass a broad range of current and future problems—economic, organisational and social, the development of culture and education, the activities of upper management echelons and every branch of the economy. They are relevant to every work collective, every Communist and every individual in the Soviet Union.

This is precisely the reason why the Political Bureau decided to hold this meeting just before the 27th Congress of the CPSU. The acceleration of scientific and technological progress should be the focus of the pre-Congress report and election campaign, and all the Party's political, organisational and educational work. These problems have to be dealt with by government and economic bodies, and by all the people.

I would like to invite you to the most frank conversation about the actual state of affairs and the reasons why our development has slowed down, and most importantly, about the ways and reserves we have for accelerating scientific and technological progress, and Soviet economic growth.

THE ACCELERATION OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS THE TASK OF THE ENTIRE PARTY AND ALL THE PEOPLE

Setting the aim of accelerating social and economic development, comrades, the Central Committee plans not just an increase in economic growth rates. We are talking about a new quality of growth, a transition to intensive development, rapid progress in strategic areas, the restructure of the economy, the use of efficient forms of management, the organisation and stimula-

tion of labour, and the more complete solution of social problems.

What is the reason for setting this task?

Our domestic needs primarily dictate the need for accelerating social and economic development. The Soviet economy has always been dynamic. Since 1950 the national income has risen nearly ten times. In three and a half decades thousands of major plants have been built in this country, towns and villages have changed, and standards in culture, education and public health services have risen considerably. Much has been done to improve housing and cultural facilities, and living standards in general. The per capita income has increased five times. All this is clear evidence of the advantages of socialism and its planned economy. Our successes are indisputable and commonly recognised.

Yet one cannot help but note that since the beginning of the 1970s economic development has been having some difficulties. The main reason for this, which was stated in no uncertain terms at the April Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, is that the basic change in the economic situation was not taken into due consideration and efforts were not persistent enough in restructuring the policies, forms and methods of management, and the psychology of economic activity. Much was said for many years about switching the centre of gravity to intensive factors in economic growth, but the measures taken were inadequate, inconsistent and not fully carried out. As a result the economy continued by inertia to develop primarily on an extensive basis.

The Party and all the people will have to overcome negative trends and sharply change things for the better. Any other approach is out of the question: we cannot cut social programmes. Society must urgently improve the supply of food, boost the output of goods and services to the population. It is also necessary to continue widescale housing construction, efforts to modernise towns and villages, perfect health care, further education, science, culture and the arts.

Serious external circumstances also dictate the need to accelerate social and economic development. The country has to spend a considerable amount on defence. Military-strategic parity with the United States was a historical accomplishment.

We will continue to exert the utmost efforts to stop the arms race, promote mutual disarmament and the reduction of military spending. However, in the face of the aggressive policies and menace of imperialism it is necessary to persistently strengthen our country's defence capabilities and not permit military superiority over us. That is the firm desire of the Soviet people.

It is well known that Lenin believed socialism would exert its main influence on the rest of the world through its economic policies and social and economic achievements. Progressive people around the world have always regarded the Soviet Union as an embodiment of their age-old social aspirations. This country should also be an example of superb economic organisation and efficiency.

Finally, social and economic development must be accelerated because it is necessary for our economy to become totally independent from the capitalist countries, especially in strategic areas. We are not advocating autarchy. The mutually beneficial international division of labour, primarily in the framework of the socialist community, is one good way to improve production efficiency. But we must not let our economy be dependent on Western commodities. We have learned a lot in this respect in recent years.

Thus, both in domestic and foreign affairs the objective of accelerating the country's development has become of primary political, economic and social importance.

We will have to technologically reshape our economy and qualitatively transform society's material and technical basis. This work must be launched without delay; it is the responsibility of the entire Party and all the people. It must be accomplished in the shortest possible time, which will make the nation a leader in terms of labour productivity and economic efficiency. The only way this can be done is by intensifying production on the basis of the latest achievements of science and engineering.

The problem is even more crucial because a new stage has begun in the scientific and technological revolution which will increase labour productivity many times over, help save enormous resources and improve the quality of goods produced. Figuratively speaking, we too must harness scientific and technological progress. We simply have no alternative, especially since

extensive methods of development have been by and large exhausted.

The current "spendthrift" road of economic development dooms the country to stagnation. Estimates show that if the planned growth in national income is to be ensured, as previously, largely on the basis of extensive development, it will be necessary every five years to increase fuel and raw material extraction ten to 15 per cent, the volume of investments 30 to 40 per cent, and engage an additional eight to ten million people in the economy. But we simply have no possibilities to do this. And there is no need to do so, after all, the so-called shortages are the result of extensive methods of growth. Strictly speaking, we still have more resources than any other country. We must use them economically.

As the Party prepares for its 27th Congress and as programme documents of that Congress are being drawn up, it is vital to realise that we cannot do without accelerating scientific and technological progress, without revolutionary changes in intensifying the economy. Therefore, all of those documents, above all the Guidelines for Economic and Social Development for the Twelfth Five-Year-Plan Period and for the Period Ending in the Year 2000, must define new approaches that would ensure a decisive shift towards intensification and a firm step towards scientific and technological progress.

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee recently discussed the draft Guidelines and on the whole approved the targets and objectives it outlined. But serious criticism was also voiced, which means that more work on the draft is needed. The draft does not yet include measures that would enable a number of industries to switch to predominantly intensive development, does not detail the restructure of the economy, does not ensure the necessary concentration of investments in priority areas of economic development, and does not balance all the indices.

Work on the draft must be continued by the State Planning Committee, ministries, Union Republics, production amalgamations and enterprises. They are being given the targets set in the Guidelines. The projected figures for boosting efficiency should be considered minimal. The main thing now is on a national and local level to seek ways to use all reserves to make

production more efficient, improve the quality of goods produced, and more fully meet social needs.

All our personnel should understand the vital need to reorient every enterprise and branch, the entire economy, to intensive development. This was stated in no uncertain terms a year ago at a meeting at the Central Committee of the CPSU involving the ministers. Not everyone, however, drew the right conclusions by any means. Some people let all that go in one ear and out the other, as they say; their attitudes stayed the same as they were before. Continuing to think in terms of extensive development, many heads of ministries and departments are trying to "wrest" as much money and resources as possible, while getting the lowest targets.

K. N. Belyak, Minister of Mechanical Engineering for Livestock Farming and Fodder Production, is showing enviable persistence in trying to get additional funds and have plan targets reduced. A no more commendable stand has been taken by the USSR Ministry of the Building Materials Industry headed by A. I. Yashin, and some other ministries and departments.

We will not, of course, be guided by those parasitic attitudes. Inability to understand the situation, unwillingness to change narrow, bureaucratic attitudes should not prevail over national interests. I believe we cannot go the same way as the executives who want to draw the country into extensive, unjustified spending.

In the effort to ensure the effectiveness of investments, high demands must be made on local executives as well. The desire to get more resources without considering the consequences has become a kind of style of work for some Party and government bodies. Unfortunately, there are many such examples.

Major decisions have been taken on the development of the productive forces of the Krasnoyarsk Territory at the initiative of the territorial Party committee and with the support of several ministries and the USSR State Planning Committee. The Krasnoyarsk Territory is a big and promising region which should be developed in every way possible. But apparently when these decisions were being made, and especially later on when they were being carried out, the specific features of the new construction effort were not taken into account, nor were the possibilities studied for making the best use of the billions of roubles

invested in the area. The result was enormous losses.

In the past two five-year periods huge sums have been invested in the region's development—23 billion roubles. However, dozens of enterprises and electric power stations have not been completed, the expenditures have not paid off as they should. The Sayan-Shushenskaya Hydropower Station has been under construction over twenty years now and is being built half as fast as the Bratsk Hydropower Station. For nine years the Abakan railway carriage works has had no equipment. Some 5 thousand projects are yet to be completed in the region. As a result of scattering forces, construction is proceeding slowly and resource losses are great. Meanwhile the leadership of the region and ministries are talking about building more and more major sites. We are justified in demanding from planning and management bodies, as well as from Party organisations, to put things in order there so that the huge government allocations will pay off quickly and not be frozen in Siberian ground.

Leading industrial regions should set an example of zealous management and the application of intensive methods of development. The Central Committee is depending greatly on the working class and intelligentsia in Moscow and the capital's scientific production potential. I would like to once again express my support to the important work being done by the Leningrad Party organisation to switch the economy to intensified growth. Such initiative by local Party bodies should have the understanding and support of the national leadership. I say this because such is by no means always the case.

Recently the First Secretary of the Chelyabinsk Regional Party Committee, G. G. Vedernikov, said that a programme has been drafted for modernising a number of enterprises in the area. At the Chelyabinsk Tractor Works alone modernisation will boost production 50 per cent, although it will release 10,000 workers and cut spending on metallurgical and other raw materials. Some interested ministries and the USSR State Planning Committee have officially come out in support of the Chelyabinsk initiative, but that seems to be about all they have done.

As a matter of fact, Chelyabinsk has not been too fortunate in this respect. A decision was once made about modernising the 1220 Tube Mill at the Chelyabinsk pipe rolling plant and switch-

ing it over to the production of large diameter pipes. The 150 million roubles that were to be spent on the project would have saved 150 million foreign currency roubles annually and kept us from having to buy some pipes abroad. It was a necessary and profitable project but went nowhere.

Because of red tape and inability to be concerned with national interests, it is apparently necessary to make demands, and serious ones at that, on each person responsible for complying with decisions.

The CC CPSU is justified in counting on a big contribution to accelerating scientific and technological progress and economic upsurge from such major scientific and industrial centres as Sverdlovsk and Kharkov, Novosibirsk and Donetsk, Omsk and Gorky, and others. This is necessary all the more so because the reserves of many of them are by no means being used to the fullest extent.

All this, comrades, is being said so that now, that is, in the time left for work on the Guidelines and the drafting of the five-year plan, an approach be taken at all levels that would not only ensure that targets outlined in the draft be reached but even be exceeded. Our goal must be to reach even higher targets with less expenditure in the 12th five-year plan. Such is the economic and, if you will, the political task.

The advantages of the socialist economic system are inexhaustible. Like no other country we are capable of mobilising the tremendous reserves we now have and concentrating resources in the main areas of scientific and technological progress. A planned economy and creative endeavours of the people provide enormous possibilities for economic development. But we have not learned to use all our advantages to the utmost; we sometimes hold on tight to the old. In general, comrades, we have gigantic potentials for growth and must take full advantage of them.

CHANGING INVESTMENT AND STRUCTURAL POLICY

I would like to say some fundamental things about the main guidelines of our upcoming work.

We must begin with what is most important—radical changes

in investment and structural policy. Today the emphasis should be made on the technical re-equipment of enterprises, the economising of resources and a marked improvement in the quality of products. It is crucial to discard without a moment's hesitation the economic management stereotype of the past which dictated new construction as the main way of expanding production while many operating enterprises were not modernised for many years. Everything possible was squeezed out but very little was put in. We all know the results.

By the end of the year the fixed production assets of the economy amounted to 1.5 trillion roubles, but a large part of them have become obsolete, which has an adverse effect on the entire economy. Returns on assets have been falling for many years and the number of new workplaces is growing, while at the same time mechanisation is being introduced insufficiently. Around 50 million people are engaged in manual labour: about one-third of the workers in industry, more than half in construction, and three-fourths in agriculture.

Repair work has increased excessively because the old production apparatus has become obsolete. Last year such repairs cost 35 billion roubles and used up nearly one-fifth of ferrous metals; one-fourth of the country's machine-tools and 6 million workers are in repair shops.

That is the general situation. But behind all this are concrete industries, amalgamations and plants, and their managers. It should be said quite frankly that many managers, as well as Party functionaries are used to this situation. Society pays too dearly for this.

No one disputes today that investments in technical re-equipment and modernisation yield a return approximately twice as much as in new construction. But the previous methods of economic management are very tenacious. Take ferrous metallurgy, for instance. Fifty billion roubles of investments have been earmarked for the iron and steel industry over a period of 15 years. How did the Ministry of the Iron and Steel Industry spend this money? Much of it was channelled into new, non-integrated construction projects, yet not enough attention was given to the modernisation and technical re-equipment of enterprises.

Because of the wrong technical policy of the Ministry of the Iron and Steel Industry and of its Minister, I. P. Kazanets, this

industry has failed to reach the targets of both the tenth and the eleventh five-year plans. They do not meet the economy's need for quality iron and steel. The state of affairs here calls for cardinal changes.

In short, the ratio between new construction and the technical re-equipment of plants in operation has to be radically changed. Some advances in this area outlined in the twelfth five-year-plan period by the USSR State Planning Committee and ministries cannot be considered satisfactory. The amount of outlays for modernisation compared to the total volume of capital investments in production have to be raised in the next few years from one-third to at least one half.

Naturally we cannot do without new construction but it should not be carried out unless all the possibilities have been exhausted for increasing production in existing facilities or unless they are needed to accomplish the latest tasks dictated by technological progress. The nation has too many uncompleted construction projects. Serious attention must be given to this problem: some projects should be speeded up, and others stopped altogether or temporarily. Here an approach must be taken that is in the national interests. This not only concerns the USSR State Planning Committee and the State Committee for Construction, but also the ministries, all national, republican and local bodies.

At the same time a general stock-taking of production assets should be made and a long-term programme drawn up for the technical modernisation of every enterprise, every industry. The share of obsolete fixed assets to be withdrawn, especially of their active part, should be doubled in the near future. If facilities now under construction are put into operation and added to this it will be possible by the end of the twelfth five-year period to renew the production facilities by more than one-third and supply it with up to 50 per cent new technology.

I would like to add that we do not need any kind of modernisation but only that which involves the introduction of the most advanced technology and ensures the utmost economic and social effects.

When I visited the ZIL Motor Works we discussed its modernisation. The auto workers are making preparations to manufacture a diesel engine truck. Its load-carrying capacity will be

greater and fuel consumption per 100 kilometres will decrease from 29 litres to 19. It will be tremendous saving! But it turned out that not all the plans for modernisation were correct. For instance, the plant was intending to hire another 25,000 workers. Now does that make any sense, especially in Moscow? ZIL's managers have now proposed improvements in their plans which will allow them to modernise without increasing the number of workers. That is a different matter; now such a position can be supported.

The ratio between capital investments in extracting, processing and consuming industries presents a pressing problem of investment policy. The Soviet Union has a huge fuel and energy complex, yet it is becoming ever more difficult to increase the output of fuel and raw materials. Meanwhile many countries have chosen a more rational way, that of all-round economy and widescale introduction of resource-saving techniques. This cuts costs two to three times. We, too, have gained positive experience in saving resources. Thus, the Ministry of Electrical Engineering ensured the growth of output in this industry in the eleventh five-year-plan period without increasing the consumption of basic materials. But here, too, the potential is still great.

On the whole, our economy remains in many respects wasteful. Up to eight million tons of petrol are unnecessarily burned up every year because we are changing over to diesel engines too slowly. Because of inefficient equipment at thermal power stations, we annually use over 20 million tons more of conventional fuel than necessary. The country has hundreds of thousands of primitive boiler rooms which waste fuel. Resources that can be recycled are not being used effectively.

Saving resources should be one of the main aims of investment policy. The objective is to meet 75 to 80 per cent of the economy's increased need for fuel, raw materials and other materials through saving. This will help stabilise the share of capital investments allocated for extracting fuel and raw materials.

Careful consideration, consistency and the need for quick economic results are very important in investment policy. Of course, a certain order of priorities is inevitable in carrying out any measures. But once we have set ourselves certain tasks, they

must be carried out fully, comprehensively, quickly and energetically. We must not allocate investments on the principle of "an equal piece of the pie". In the new five-year-plan period we must more resolutely concentrate capital investments.

The agro-industrial complex is supposed to carry out the Food Programme. Now when the Guidelines are being specified it is necessary to provide for the fulfilment of the programme's targets. The potential is enormous in the agro-industrial branch of the economy. The level of capital investment growth in it has reached optimum dimensions while the returns on it are still insufficient.

One reason is the poor concentration of resources in decisive areas and the imbalanced development of different branches. We have a large number of cattle but productivity is low because of an inadequate fodder base. Agriculture is given quite a lot of machinery but collective and state farms do not have enough repair and service facilities. Although there are now tangible conditions for the widescale introduction of intensive techniques for cultivation they are being used very slowly because resources and technology are scattered.

Much has been said about the efficiency of investments in the procurement, storage, transportation and processing of agricultural products. However, tangible improvements are still not in sight yet, and nearly one-fifth of the crops are lost. These are the problems that have to be dealt with first of all by the management bodies of the nation's agro-industrial complex.

Comrades, the engineering industry plays the key role in modernising the economy and in the scientific and technological revolution. We must radically change the attitude to the engineering complex.

The USSR State Planning Committee and other national bodies, while giving lip service to the engineering industry, have for a long time not allocated enough resources for its development. Of all the industrial capital investments made in the eleventh five-year-plan period only some five per cent has been for the civil engineering industry. It should be noted that twenty-eight times less resources are invested in the heavy and transport engineering industry than in the industries it makes machinery for, 18 times less in the engineering industry for agriculture, 23 times less in the production of machinery and equip-

ment for the light and food industries, and 47 times less in the chemical and oil engineering industries.

These investments, as you can see, are disproportionate. Perhaps it is possible and necessary to devise a partial redistribution of capital investments in favour of the corresponding branches of the engineering industry. This, I believe, is one of the most important areas of changing investment policy. We already have gained such experience. That is precisely what we did when we worked out measures to develop the agro-industrial complex. At the expense of agriculture, machine builders were given nearly six billion extra. Experience has shown this was beneficial. Now agricultural engineering is implementing a programme that should help to comprehensively mechanise labour in the countryside.

It would be useful to return to the question of investments so that between 1986 and 1990 we could increase capital investments for civil engineering ministries 1.8 to 2 times over the eleventh five-year-plan period. Such an approach would be in the interests of technologically re-equipping our economy.

A priority task should be to modernise the engineering industry itself. In order to do this it is necessary to sharply increase the output of modern machine tools, forge-and-press equipment, foundry, welding and other progressive technological equipment. It is impossible for the Ministry of the Machine Tool Industry to handle this problem alone. As in the defence industries it will apparently be necessary in each engineering ministry to widely launch the output of special equipment for its own needs. In general, it is necessary to follow the example of the defence industries to the utmost.

Microelectronics, computer technology and instrument-making, and the entire computer science industry is a catalyst of technological progress. They have a decisive influence on the effectiveness of the means of labour, and technological systems in all industries. For instance, in the Energy research and production amalgamation flexible automated sections equipped with Soviet processing centres and computer technology increase labour productivity by six times. The use of automated designing systems in design bureaus of the aircraft industry has helped raise labour productivity by three times and reduce the time it takes to design products by two and a half years.

This is truly new technology that has brought about revolutionary changes in production. But its effectiveness depends not only on greater output of such technology but also on its expedient and comprehensive use in the economy. So far not all is well in this respect. For instance, computer technology is produced and serviced by different ministries that do not coordinate their efforts.

In recent years the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a number of major decisions on such key areas of developing the engineering industry as flexible automated production units, rotary and rotary-conveyor lines, the development, output and application of computer technology in the economy, and systems of automated designing. They are geared to create new technological processes, including automated plants that require no personnel. In this way a firm foundation is being laid to considerably boost the Soviet engineering industry as the basis for the technological modernisation of the economy. This is the main road of our development, a road that should be unswervingly followed, now and in the future.

Comrades, from the standpoint of decisive acceleration of scientific and technological progress it is necessary to also assess the state of affairs in capital construction. This problem has been on the agenda for many years but so far no major improvements have been made.

Let us take a look at designing. Many organisations continue to put out designs that have inefficient technological solutions. For this reason many of them are sent back every year to be revised. Capital investments are still scattered. It takes so long to finish construction projects that even the best designs become hopelessly obsolete. We cannot go on building in this manner. We have to put things in order in designing and planning, ensure concentration of capital investments, compliance with the time limits set on construction, and turn construction production into a single industrial process.

Now about another important problem. Economic efficiency and our growth rates depend largely on the structure and quality of materials. We are still behind in this respect.

It is common knowledge, for instance, that we produce more steel than anyone else, yet we are chronically short of metal. The main reasons for this lie in poor quality of metal, a limited

range of metal products and wasteful use of metal. The share of plastics, ceramics and other advanced non-metallic materials in the overall volume of materials has been small so far. In the world today there is a real boom of small-volume chemical production and of the production of pure and super-pure materials which determine in many respects the level of modern technology. Therefore we need to double or triple our efforts in order not to fall behind.

The tasks of accelerating scientific and technological progress require that we should take a new approach to our external economic strategy. The world trend is such that in many countries foreign trade is increasing twice as fast as production. This is a powerful accelerator of scientific, technological and economic development. Our country's foreign trade turnover has reached a significant volume—140 billion roubles, but the growth rate can and must be speeded up. What is most important is to ensure profound structural changes, and improve the pattern of our exports and imports.

Our machinery and equipment exports have been growing slowly in recent years. Among the reasons is that they compete poorly on the market and industrial enterprises have insufficient interest in producing export goods. We must not put up with this any longer. It is important to actively stimulate work collectives, amalgamations and industries in general to increase the manufacture of export products.

In import policy we should use more effectively the opportunities offered by a mutually beneficial international division of labour. This refers, of course, first of all to our relations with the CMEA countries. The Soviet Union will also promote economic relations with other countries as well.

Because we will continue to strengthen our foreign economic, scientific and technological ties I would like to single out a problem that worries us—the use of machinery and equipment bought on the world market. This is not a new problem but so far no substantial improvements have been made. Planning of purchases is not always thorough: sometimes the purchases are not linked with plans for capital construction. Ministries and departments fervently defending their demands for imported technology do not pay enough attention to construction projects where the capacity is based on imported equipment. An example

of that is the work of the USSR Ministry of the Oil-Processing and Petrochemical Industry. Minister V. S. Fyodorov had given assurances more than once that he would rectify shortcomings in the use of purchased equipment, but it seems he has not kept his promises. Instructions have been given that the matter be thoroughly looked into and the results of the inquiry reported to the Political Bureau.

Comrades, the new technical modernisation of the national economy will require enormous investments. Where are we to find them? The basic answer to this question is: measures designed to speed up scientific and technological progress should pay for themselves. Indeed, they are being carried out in order to raise labour productivity and therefore speed up the growth of the national income. But this will take some time, while the funds are needed immediately. So we cannot do here without manoeuvring with resources and concentrating them on the key areas capable of bringing rapid benefits.

A top priority task is to mobilise organisational, economic and social factors, put things in order, enhance responsibility and improve discipline and the organisation of production and labour so as to ensure the most efficient utilisation of what the country has. Each amalgamation and enterprise, each production unit should identify the sections where maximum effect can be obtained with minimum additional outlays, and perhaps without any outlays at all. Experience has shown that by the certification of workplaces alone it is possible to reduce labour losses by five to ten per cent and boost returns on assets. The introduction of cost-accounting collective forms of organisation and labour incentives can increase labour productivity by 15 and more per cent while economising on resources. Much can be gained by systematic efforts to cut losses in all branches of the economy.

Economising is the road to our prosperity and is indeed a task of paramount importance; it is a matter of concern for the whole Party and the entire nation.

The quality of products is the most objective and generalising indicator of scientific and technological progress, of the level of production organisation, of the culture and discipline of labour.

In recent years we have seen improvements in this respect. However, we must admit that the quality, techno-economic and

aesthetic standard of products is one of the most vulnerable elements in our economy, a source of many difficulties and problems. All this does serious social, economic, moral and political damage. It is totally inadmissible when newly made equipment becomes outdated even at the design stage, is below the best standards in terms of reliability, service life and efficiency. By their parameters even products considered to be of the highest category sometimes do not compare with the best world models. There must be stricter observance of the requirements that are to be met when the State Quality Mark is awarded to a product. Output quality should be a matter not just of professional but also of national pride.

I think it is fair to consider the work done by planners and designers good only when their technical ideas are based on the latest scientific achievements, ensure a manifold increase in labour productivity, improved working conditions and sharp growth in production efficiency. On the other hand, quality is a matter of the advanced organisation of production and technological discipline. After all, their violation is the reason for two-thirds of the output of poor quality products.

The corresponding ministries must take primary responsibility for improving the quality of products and the objectivity of its evaluation. But a special role in this respect is played by the State Committee for Standards. Its direct duty is to block the production of low-quality goods.

Of course, the problem of quality cannot be solved all at once. But in this endeavour there is no justification for any delay. Nobody has the right to remain on the sideline here—not a single enterprise, not a single designer, production engineer or scientist, not a single worker or collective farmer, in short, not a single honest salary or wage earner. The Party will actively support the campaign to enhance the prestige of the Soviet trade mark and will hold responsible those who take a passive stand, those who hamper the solution of this very acute problem.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL POTENTIAL SHOULD BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND EFFECTIVELY USED

Comrades, the front line of struggle to accelerate scientific and technological progress runs through science. The country has powerful scientific and technological potential. Around five per cent of the national income is allocated for the development of science.

The accomplishments of Soviet scientists in various fields of knowledge and technological progress are universally acknowledged. We can be proud of our achievements in space exploration, mathematics, mechanics, thermonuclear synthesis, and quantum electronics. Promising work is being done in such areas as nuclear power engineering, studies of the structure of the earth's crust, including with the help of the world's deepest well, studies of the World Ocean, the synthesis of organic compounds, the creation of progressive materials and technological processes. Definite achievements have been made in genetic and cell engineering capable of revolutionising the processes of creating new highly productive plant varieties and animal breeds that have a high resistance to disease and adverse climatic conditions, and to also help public health care.

We have many first class institutes, design bureaus and creative personnel. In nearly every area highly efficient scientific and technological developments have been made. Among them are rotary-conveyor lines that boost labour productivity many times over; automated welding systems; small high pressure presses and modern forging machinery ensuring considerable reductions in metal wastes in the engineering industry; highly efficient types of polymer materials and much more.

At the same time, comrades, we can and must obtain incomparably greater results from research. We must re-examine the tasks of science through the prism of modern demands. That means science should make a resolute shift to the needs of social production, while production should turn towards science. It is from this point of view that we must analyse and consolidate the links in the chain combining science, technology and production.

The USSR Academy of Sciences, where the best scientists are

concentrated, is naturally the nucleus of Soviet scientific potential. Many of the Academy's research institutes are among the best in the world. However, much still has to be done so that all the institutes function at a level worthy of the Academy and add new discoveries to the treasure house of knowledge.

The development of fundamental science should be given foremost importance. It is fundamental science that is the generator of ideas, facilitates breakthroughs into new fields and shows ways of attaining new levels of efficiency. Fundamental research is too important for us to be satisfied with weak points, permit sluggishness and improvidence in getting projects off the ground.

It is necessary to bring about a sharp turn in the work of the Academy's institutes towards expanding research of a technical nature, and increase their role in and responsibility for the formulation of the theoretical principles of fundamentally new types of technology and techniques. In this respect we have rich traditions. Just remember the host of Soviet scientists, leaders in developing technical sciences—Academicians I. P. Bardin, S. V. Lebedev, A. N. Tupolev, I. V. Kurchatov and S. P. Korolev. Undoubtedly these traditions will continue to grow. In this context consideration should be given to setting up departments on mechanical engineering.

The creation of integrated inter-industry centres of science and technology under the Academy has proven very effective judging by the experience of the Ye. O. Paton Institute of Electric Welding. Party officials, many scientists and specialists are in favour of their creation. Such centres can be leading organisations coordinating fundamental research and all efforts in the most important inter-industry areas of science and technology. They could be headed by top scientists and specialists who have experience in scientific and organisational work. It is advisable for such centres to have design bureaus, R & D organisations and experimental enterprises. This is the way we solved the problem of exploring outer space and using atomic energy. It would be unwise to reject such valuable experience. It is time to translate the matter into action. The Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the State Committee for Science and Technology should draft and submit the appropriate proposals.

The scientific potential of universities and colleges is an important reserve. For two decades, if not more, we are talking

about the need to effectively use this tremendous scientific potential and to eliminate the lack of coordination between research institutions, universities, colleges and industry, but the situation is slow in changing.

It is estimated that universities and colleges could increase their volume of research by 100 to 150 per cent. In order to cardinaly enhance economic returns here it is necessary to alter planning, introduce new criteria, perfect the system of levers and incentives, and hand over enterprises to universities and colleges as an experimental base. The benefit would be double: on the one hand, we would increase our scientific and technological potential and make its application more effective, and on the other hand, we would create conditions for higher quality education of specialists, who would, while still students, be extensively involved in creative efforts to improve production.

Special demands should be made on industrial science. The state spends a great deal of money on supporting industrial scientific and technological organisations. More than half the nation's scientists are engaged in this work. A considerable portion of all outlays on research and development go to industrial science. Industrial ministries are in charge of hundreds of research institutions, technological and design organisations.

Unfortunately the final results of the activities of many of them, expressed in the scientific and technological make-up of the industry, are very low. The Ministry of the Chemical Industry, for instance, is literally overgrown with a multitude of various scientific establishments and experimental production facilities. But it is in that industry that major shortcomings have been revealed in the development of new materials and techniques.

Not only chemists, unfortunately, are lagging behind in scientific developments. For instance, the All-Union Aluminum and Magnesium Institute under the USSR Ministry of Non-Ferrous Metals designed powerful electrolyzers to manufacture aluminum. Now that 350 of the electrolyzers have been produced it turns out that because of some designing mistakes they use up more electricity than they were supposed to. Millions of roubles are needed now to bring these devices up to standards.

The main weak point of industrial science, as paradoxical as it may seem, is that it is isolated from production. In order

to overcome this shortcoming many of the industrial institutes, design organisations should right away be included in amalgamations and enterprises, thus strengthening research potential at the factory level. In general, we must determine to what extent the current network of industrial research centres and organisations meet modern requirements. In the current five-year-plan period the State Committee for Science and Technology has made such an attempt but has not carried the matter through.

It is very important to impart a fresh impetus to all work involved in the expansion of the network of large research and production amalgamations which should become genuine outposts of scientific and technological progress like Kriogenmash, Svetlana, the lubricator equipment facilities in Nikolayev, and a number of other organisations. So far too little attention is being paid to this important endeavour. Our huge country has around 250 research and production amalgamations only, and even they do not operate in the proper conditions.

Enhancing the effectiveness of science depends largely on the experimental and design facilities which, we have to say frankly, have, due to error, fallen behind and are holding up use of new discoveries and studies. Even in industry one-fourth of the institutes do not have the necessary base. The problem of developing the experimental base and supplying research institutions with equipment and instruments should be solved as soon as possible. Here we are also expecting concrete proposals from the USSR Academy of Sciences, the State Committee for Science and Technology and other organisations.

The technical creativity of the people should also play an important role in accelerating scientific and technological progress. It is necessary to fundamentally improve work with inventors and innovators, find means of selecting innovations, and ensure their early application in industry.

The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet government are counting on scientists and all the intelligentsia involved in science and engineering to take to heart the tasks set forth by the Party and spare no effort in accelerating scientific and technological progress.

IMPROVING THE MANAGEMENT OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS

Comrades, the acceleration of scientific and technological progress urgently requires a profound restructuring of the system of planning and management and of the entire economic mechanism. Unless we do this, all that we are talking about today will remain no more than good intentions.

For many years now we have been walking around these problems thinking about how to best tackle them. But little tangible progress has been made. What is getting in the way, apparently, is fear of making mistakes, taking decisive action, and sometimes outright conservatism. Today we are running up against essentially the same problems that developed decades ago, but they have become more acute and we see ever more clearly that inertia and skidding in this work is no longer permissible. Drawing on the experience of the past we have to make serious political and practical conclusions and, without losing any time, begin developing a highly efficient system of planning and management.

The main direction in restructuring economic management is, in principle, clear. We need to make more thorough and fuller use of the advantages of a socialist economy. We should further strengthen and develop democratic centralism. The basic essence of restructuring is to increase the efficiency of centralism in management and planning, largely expand the economic independence and responsibility of enterprises and amalgamations, make active use of the more flexible forms and methods of management, cost-accounting, and commodity-money relations, the entire arsenal of economic levers and incentives. The sure key to success is joint efforts on national and local levels, diversity and flexibility in socialist methods of running the economy, and the broad development of the initiative of the masses.

In socialist conditions the main criterion for evaluating the work of any economic link should be the achievement of the best end results and most fully meeting social needs. This should be the focus of the entire system of management and the entire economic mechanism. In short, we have to overcome the dictate of the producer over the consumer, get rid of shortages both

in the means of production and in consumer goods, make the economy dynamic, well balanced and supremely responsive to scientific and technological progress, ensure that all links of the economy have a vital stake in this, and make them inevitably responsible for introducing the latest achievements of science and technology and for attaining the best world standards.

As you know the Political Bureau of the Central Committee is working actively on solving these problems. Ever new industries are getting involved in the widescale economic experiment. But as we agreed at the April Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee, we have to make the transition from experiment to the creation of an integral management and control system.

Incidentally, when I was in Leningrad I made a note of one remark that I would like to mention specially. People see that many economic experiments are being made but there is hardly any tangible evidence that the methods tested in these experiments are being put into practice. The question arises: are not some people trying in this way to avoid solving urgent problems? If we say for a year or two, or three years that we are conducting an experiment, that we have extended it to another two or three industries but in the meantime do not develop an integral system of economic management then no progress will be made. Therefore the development of such a system should be completed in a short time so that in the twelfth five-year-plan period we can introduce new methods of management and control in all branches of the economy.

We should start from the upper echelons. The extremely important tasks connected with the scientific and technological revolution require essential improvements in planning and radical enhancement of the role and responsibility of the USSR State Planning Committee as the central link in economic management. Lenin's idea of turning the State Planning Committee into the country's scientific and economic body with a concentration of prominent scientists and leading specialists must be practically implemented so that we, as Lenin put it, would have broad plans "borne out by and based on technology and science."¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Report on the Work of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars Delivered at

For instance, it is time to change the situation in which a plan for new technology exists on its own without having any telling effect on indices of economic and social development. On the contrary, it should be the backbone of the entire economic plan. Quality indices reflecting the effectiveness of using resources, the extent of updating products, and increasing labour productivity on the basis of achievements in science and technology should take the leading place in plans.

It is necessary to complete the transition in planning to normative methods both in determining costs and targets on efficiency and satisfying social needs. Precisely that approach creates the prerequisites for invigorating the economic activities of enterprises and amalgamations, gives an impetus to the initiative and creativity of work collectives. This way it will be possible to more quickly find the correct ratio between the administrative and economic methods of management.

Another question is the place and role of the Committee for Science and Technology. The CPSU Central Committee is receiving numerous criticisms of this Committee. The Council of Ministers must clearly define its responsibilities. The Committee must apparently be made responsible for exercising control over the scientific and technological standard of industries, and see to it that our production is in keeping with the highest world standards. Without substituting for either planning bodies or ministries, it should concentrate on prognostication, selecting and giving justification for priority areas of scientific and technological development, on the formation of research and development work in advance as a base for making progressive, planned decisions. The Integrated Programme of Scientific and Technological Progress should serve this aim.

Experience shows that the principal reserves for attainment of greatest efficiency lie in those areas where industries overlap. It is illusory to hope that the State Planning Committee will be able to look into all the links of the chain of inter-industry connections and choose the optimum variant. Nor can the ministries cope with this job. All this places on the order of the day the question of creating management bodies for large economic com-

the First Session of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, Seventh Convocation, February 2, 1920", *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 334.

plexes. The role and functions of the ministries under the new conditions will have to change. They will be able to concentrate maximum attention on long-term planning and large-scale use of innovations in science and technology for raising the quality of production and products. This will make it possible to considerably reduce administrative staffs in economic branches, with unnecessary links being cut.

A great deal has to be done to perfect the structure of the republican management bodies where the number of ministries and departments is far too great and continues to grow. There the problem of integration and concentration of management is even more urgent than on the national level.

Unless the role of the main production link—amalgamations and enterprises—is enhanced and its work reoriented, scientific and technological progress will not be sufficiently accelerated. The centre of gravity of all day-to-day economic work must be shifted to work collectives, and amalgamations and enterprises must be subordinated, as a rule, directly to the ministries. In other words, a shift must be made to a double-link management system.

This should be the vantage point from which we should comprehensively examine the work of all production amalgamations, specify their structure, and single out leaders with powerful scientific and technological potential. Such amalgamations must be developed first and foremost, letting them supervise enterprises and organisations that are not working as efficiently.

Many remember that at one time directions were given that amalgamations be formed on the basis of enterprises regardless of where the enterprise was located or which department it was under. But in practice production amalgamations were formed not even within the framework of industrial ministries but all-Union industrial amalgamations. Under such restricted conditions it was naturally impossible to form a rational and effective network of amalgamations. Now everything must be done to support the development of inter-industry amalgamations. This practice has a good future, which is borne out by experience in the fraternal countries.

In perfecting the organisational structure of management we cannot be satisfied with any palliative measures or partial changes. The work we have to do does not consist of “patching up

holes", merely merging or splitting organisations, or moving executives from one office to another. We cannot tolerate any camouflage here. We must resolve matters pertaining to streamlining the organisational structure boldly, with good substantiation and, most importantly, in a comprehensive manner, from the upper to the lower echelons, both vertically and horizontally.

As you can see, comrades, life itself demands improvements in the organisational structure of economic management. At the meeting at the Party's Central Committee with the heads of amalgamations and enterprises this problem was posed sharply. The participants said that the transition to new management methods was having difficulties and meeting up with obstacles. The problem is that some ministries do not have a stake in economic experiment, in introducing the principles on which the restructuring of management is to be based.

The substance of the experiment is to expand the independence and increase the responsibility of enterprises, and create for them the best possibilities to attain high end results. However some ministries, and even with the help of the State Committee for Labour, the Ministry of Finance and sometimes the State Planning Committee, are capable of hampering the independence of enterprises and interpreting the decisions of the Central Committee and government in such a way that after all the departmental recommendations and instructions very little is left of these principles in practice.

If the ministers are also applauding then the ice has been broken.

The restructuring of the organisational structure of management will not do as much good if it is not organically tied to the reinforcement of cost-accounting, economic levers and incentives. We need a mechanism actually guaranteeing advantages to work collectives which are successful in accelerating scientific and technological progress. We need a mechanism making the output of outdated and ineffective products unprofitable.

Special advantages should be given to collectives that manufacture the best products, successfully compete on the world market with leading companies. Such enterprises and amalgamations should have more resources for developing production and providing its workers with more social benefits and higher pay.

It is necessary to considerably improve the whole system of incentives for enterprises producing high quality goods. Towards this end it is necessary, *first*, to take steps to increase the consumer's influence on the technological level and quality of products. Their possibilities to choose the best products could be expanded by organising contests between manufacturers, the development of wholesale commerce as resources accumulate, and enhance the role of direct ties and economic contracts.

Second, it is necessary to radically improve price formation to facilitate successful realisation of the economic policy, rapidly introduce all that is new and advanced, and literally force economic managers to constantly improve technology and techniques, strictly adhere to economising, and work every day on saving resources. Much is still to be done in this field.

Third, amalgamations and enterprises must be completely transferred to a self-supporting system, with the number of centrally-issued plan assignments sharply reduced.

Amalgamations and enterprises need more freedom and flexibility to make decisions in order to promote scientific and technological progress. After all, the introduction of advanced technology is organically linked with the selection of variants, rapid response to whatever is new, and a stake in the end result. So far amalgamations and enterprises do not have total control over their financial resources and cannot independently choose the most effective management methods and ways to enhance efficiency.

During the meeting at the Central Committee of the CPSU with the heads of amalgamations and enterprises some participants demonstrated from the platform list of plan indices. They are fat volumes, comrades. In fact it turned out that each ministry and even industrial amalgamations arbitrarily include in the plans many unnecessary indices. It is time to establish legislative order and strictly determine a list of indices confirmed in the plan. The activities of enterprises and amalgamations must increasingly be regulated by economic normatives.

By increasing the responsibility of amalgamations and enterprises for raising technological standards and the economic efficiency of production, for high quality products, it is necessary to give them the chance to earn for themselves the means they need and to use these funds at their own discretion, while increasing their scope and rights in using the development fund,

depreciation deductions, additional profits, and credit. For this it is important to supply them first and foremost with modern equipment, the necessary resources for construction and assembly work and adhere to the established regulations on using foreign currency deductions from the production of export items.

Something in this respect has been accomplished in the wide-scale economic experiment. Amalgamations and enterprises have gained somewhat greater possibilities. To a large extent, however, they have still not been able to realise their ideas since planning and finance bodies, ministries and all-Union production amalgamations have placed additional demands on the use of the development fund, which has essentially reduced the rights of enterprises to naught. This was already mentioned earlier.

Fourth, it is necessary to establish a close interdependence between work performance and pay. Today the system of work remuneration virtually does not depend on efficiency, on whether the product is good or bad. Here there must be a direct connection. What we are talking about is actually an extension of the principles of collective contract to the work of amalgamations and enterprises. It is important to more boldly set up enlarged integrated teams working on a cost-accounting basis and geared to the end results of production, and they should become the main form of management in enterprises and organisations in the near future.

The time has come to put in order the use of funds for bonuses to work collectives and personnel for success in accelerating scientific and technological progress and the rapid application of the latest achievements. Our system of material incentives is extremely intricate, unwieldy and inefficient. There are dozens of diverse forms of incentives operating simultaneously and causing confusion.

Often bonuses are regarded as a kind of automatic pay supplement given to everyone without exception, regardless of the contribution a specific worker has made towards the results. Many have already become accustomed to this. Thus, wage-levelling is rampant and bonuses are no longer incentives. The State Committee for Labour and Social Questions and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions should deal with this matter and submit substantiated proposals.

We must eliminate everything outdated so that an "anti-spend-

ing economic mechanism", as it were, can operate unimpeded, control and literally slap the hands of inefficient executives, those anxious to secure maximum resources and capital investment from the state while giving as little as possible back to society.

In short, there is some very serious work ahead needed to improve the system of control and economic management. This work cannot be put off because we realise that we cannot accelerate scientific and technological progress in a real way without creating new economic and organisational conditions.

PARTY WORK SHOULD BE IN LINE WITH THE NEW TASKS

Comrades, in talking today about Party work, addressing first of all the secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist parties of the Union Republics, and of Party committees of territories and regions, and all Communists, I would like to once again stress that times have changed, presenting new demands on Party activity, its style, methods and results, which means new demands on personnel, too.

Party work has to do with the human factor, the decisive factor in all changes. Hence the main task of this work today is to inspire, by all possible means, a change in the minds and mood of personnel from top to bottom by concentrating their attention on the most important thing—scientific and technological progress.

The entire experience of the Party shows that little can be changed in the economy, management and education without changing mentality and developing a desire and ability to think and work in new ways. It seems like such a simple truth but our personnel, and not only those engaged in the economy, are having a hard time understanding this, are forging ahead with caution. We are talking about a long-term political line, comrades, and none of the problems can be put off till tomorrow. We cannot wait or delay because we have run out of time for warming up; we lost it in the past. We can only move forward, picking up speed as we go along.

We must do everything to stimulate modern approaches to social, economic, scientific, technological, ideological, and educa-

tional problems, I'd even say, deepen understanding of the situation, strengthen the spirit of self-criticism and a businesslike manner. Success will depend on the attitudes and atmosphere that Party organisations can create everywhere, on how firm the Party is in blocking any kind of backwardness, departmental and local distortions and mismanagement and wastefulness.

We are all taking a test, a test of life. Now that the Party has begun preparing for its Congress it is all the more important to work with the people.

The key role here should be played by the Party committees on a district, city, regional and territorial level. But unfortunately we still have Party committees that make changes extremely slowly. Not everywhere do Party committees show initiative and persistence in overcoming shortcomings, exactingness is insufficient, and coordination is lacking.

Acceleration of scientific and technological progress calls for a cardinal change in the situation involving engineering, technical and scientific personnel. The time has obviously come for serious changes in higher and specialised secondary education. Recently this question has been posed to the CPSU Central Committee by Academicians G. S. Muromtsev, A. M. Prokhorov, A. Yu. Ishlinsky, V. M. Tuchkevich, and other comrades. They express justified alarm over the education of new scientific workers, the declining prestige of engineers, the decrease in the number of talented youth coming into engineering and science. All this is to a considerable degree linked with serious shortfalls in the education and use of specialists, and in pay.

We must develop measures to secure greater public recognition of the work done by scientists and engineers, enhance the creative foundations of this work, provide better equipment, introduce the automation of technological, development and design work. We must raise the interest scientists and engineers have in the results of their labour, encourage quality work done by fewer people and on this basis raise their pay. As you know the first steps have already been taken in this respect.

In view of rapid renovation in the conditions of modern production it is especially important to systematically provide additional training to managers and people working in science and technology. It is also necessary to improve the training and additional training of workers, especially in the new trades that are

developing in the course of scientific and technological progress. We must devise measures to solve these problems without delay. These measures should be taken in conjunction with efforts to considerably expand the application of skilled labour and reduce the use of unskilled, difficult and harmful work.

It is important to increase the Party's influence on the entire course of scientific and technological progress, strengthen the Party stratum in decisive areas, pay more attention to work in the collectives of research centres, design organisations, technological services, and science and engineering societies.

Experience shows that councils for the facilitation of scientific and technological progress under the Central Committees of the Communist parties in Union Republics, and Party committees of territories, regions and cities are a good form of Party leadership in scientific and technological progress.

I would like to say a few words about Party organisations in ministries. Apparently the reasons for many of the shortcomings and miscalculations we have been talking about are that Party committees in some ministries have lost political keenness in perceiving and solving the most important social and economic issues, and have kept away from control efforts, even though they are endowed with such powers by the CPSU Rules. It is hard to believe that the Party organisations of ministries, where things are not going so well, do not see shortcomings and the potential to improve matters.

As plenipotentiary representatives of the Party, the Party committees of ministries must become much more active, boost a sense of responsibility and enhance order in collectives. They should concretely grapple with the cardinal problems in developing one or another industry from the Party's positions. Frankly, I do not remember one case when a Party organisation of any ministry has raised a problem as a matter of principle before the CPSU Central Committee on the state of affairs in its industry.

The economy's decisive shift towards accelerating scientific and technological progress is impossible unless measures just as decisive are taken to ensure order in production and management. Exactingness, and more exactingness is what the current situation demands of us.

Communists working in people's control should also play an important role. The situation demands that the socialist system

of people's control function more actively and tackle major social and economic problems without giving peace to managers who are no longer concerned about the problems of the state.

A vast field of activities—concrete and serious—is also opening in ideological and propaganda work. To carry out all our tasks we need what Lenin talked about: “a sufficiently broad and solid base of persuasion”.¹ Millions and millions of people should feel they have a stake in these activities. Scientific and technological progress is a vital cause serving the interests of all and enabling everyone to fully display his or her abilities and talent. We count on the creative vigour and skill of our working class, peasantry and intelligentsia, our engineers and scientists. We particularly expect much from young people with their energy and searching minds and their interest in all that is new and progressive.

Ideological and political education in all its forms should be relevant to reality and the tasks in accelerating our country's social and economic development. This is the substance of the changes that must be made today in ideological work. But we must do this more energetically and without delay.

* * *

Comrades, the business at hand is formidable: it is innovative, difficult, and of great magnitude. Will we be able to cope with it? The Central Committee is confident that we will. We are obliged to do so. But this will require of each of us intensive thought, determined work, enormous concentration, consciousness and organisation. It is not in the Party's traditions, nor in the character of the Soviet people to fear tasks for their complexity, to retreat before difficulties, to slacken up and indulge in self-complacency, especially at turning points, at responsible moments in the country's life.

When the Soviet Republic was taking the first steps towards socialism in an extremely difficult situation, Lenin wrote with confidence:

“We will extricate ourselves because we do not try to make our position look better than it is. We realise all the difficulties.

¹ V. I. Lenin, “The Trade Unions, the Present Situation and Trotsky's Mistakes”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 33.

We see *all* the maladies, and are taking measures to cure them methodically, with perseverance, and without giving way to panic.”¹

Today, too, profound faith in the creative energy of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia, and in the high moral spirit and determination of the people nourishes the Party’s optimism. But optimism does not free anyone of the need to work. We will have to work hard.

The CPSU’s policies enjoy the active support of the entire society. The Soviet people lay great hopes in the ideas, initiatives and plans with which the Party is approaching its 27th Congress. It is the duty of the Party of Communists to justify these hopes, to show that we are tackling the job earnestly. Relying on the people’s creative endeavour and cementing the alliance of science and labour we will have enough energy and fortitude to ensure that our words are matched by deeds. This is the principal thing in politics, in life.

¹ V. I. Lenin, “A Letter to G. Maysnikov”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 507.

To the All-India Association of Independence Fighters

Let me warmly thank you, veterans of India's independence struggle, for your cordial, friendly message. The ideas and sentiments expressed in it confirm anew that Soviet-Indian friendship has deep and strong roots and traditions, that it faithfully serves the interests of the peoples of the USSR and India and accords with the noble goals of peace and security in Asia and all over the world.

Vladimir Lenin, Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru stood at the sources of Soviet-Indian friendship. Indira Gandhi, that great daughter of the Indian people, who determinedly and consistently pursued a course of close friendship between India and the USSR, made an immense contribution to the strengthening and development of Soviet-Indian cooperation.

The recent visit of the Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi to the Soviet Union and the Soviet-Indian talks in Moscow demonstrated forcefully that Soviet-Indian friendship is developing dynamically and growing stronger and that it constitutes an important factor of peace and stability not only in Asia but also in other regions.

The Soviet people greatly appreciate the contribution of India, a great power which enjoys well-deserved prestige on the international scene, to promoting peace and the security of the peoples. It is also to India's credit that, as the recognised leader of the non-aligned movement, it is doing much for the strengthening and development of the movement.

The rise of the non-aligned movement and its emergence as an important factor in present-day international relations are a major achievement of the peoples of the newly free countries of

Asia, Africa and Latin America. We understand the aspirations of the peoples of those countries who are waging a hard struggle to overcome the aftermath of colonial rule. The Soviet Union has invariably supported the peoples of the newly independent countries in their struggle against colonialism and imperialism, for equal and fair international relations, and against the imperialist policy of domination and diktat.

I fully share your concern over the tense world situation. As for the Soviet Union, we will continue to do everything possible to remove the threat of war, whether nuclear or space. The main principle of our foreign policy is a world without wars, a world without weapons.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, June 15, 1985

**Speech at a Dinner
in the Grand Kremlin Palace in Honour
of the Party and Government Delegation
of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam
Headed by Le Duan, General Secretary
of the CPV CC**

June 28, 1985

Dear Comrade Le Duan,
Dear Vietnamese friends,
Comrades,

It is with great satisfaction that we welcome the visit to our country of a party and government delegation from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam led by Comrade Le Duan, CC General Secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam. We are convinced that this visit will mark another important step in the all-round development and strengthening of Soviet-Vietnamese fraternity and cooperation.

Soviet-Vietnamese friendship has deep roots and solid traditions. At its source was President Ho Chi Minh, a great son of the Vietnamese people and a good friend of our country. This friendship has stood the test of time and been tempered in both the grim war years and in peaceful everyday life.

The peoples of the Soviet Union and Vietnam march hand in hand, jointly tackling the tasks of socialist and communist construction and upholding together the cause of peace and international security.

We have held detailed and thorough talks. As before, they were marked by a cordial and truly comradely atmosphere. In both the Soviet Union and Vietnam work is now under way on a large scale to prepare for the 27th Congress of the CPSU and the Sixth Congress of the CPV. This lends special political significance to our exchange of opinions.

I think we can be satisfied with the development of Soviet-Vietnamese relations. Based on such a reliable foundation as the

Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, they have now reached a high level and become an inalienable part of the social life of our two countries.

Much attention was paid in our meetings to economic cooperation. The Soviet Union and Vietnam are anxious to tap even more actively the considerable potential which they have for deepening their interaction in this field and making it more effective. We are sure that this common political resolve will be fully embodied in the implementation of practical measures to carry out jointly the long-term programme for developing economic, scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and the SRV and in the coordination of our national economic development plans for 1986-1990.

The problems of scientific and technological progress held an important place in the talks. Both sides are convinced that it is only along that road that social and economic tasks can be consistently accomplished and the positions of socialism still further consolidated. Each fraternal socialist country is making its own contribution to the fulfilment of these strategic tasks.

The talks confirmed that the fraternal ties of the Soviet Union and Vietnam rest on the firm, tested foundation of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism and meet the fundamental interests and aspirations of our peoples, the interests of world peace.

Comrades,

This year the people of our countries, all progressive people on Earth have been directing their thoughts again and again to the 40th anniversary of the great Victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism.

The lessons of World War II remind humanity of how important and necessary peace is. The value of peace is especially great now that another world war would spell disaster for humanity. That is why there is such a great need for urgent and effective measures to remove the nuclear threat from the life of the present and future generations, to prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space and stop it on Earth, and to turn international relations towards equitable and mutually advantageous cooperation.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community states, their ideas and proposals, and the broad

package of their peace initiatives are dictated by concern to preserve peace on Earth. Peaceful coexistence, equal and dependable security of the sides, lowering of the levels of military confrontation and of world military and political tension as a whole, and prevention of hegemonism in any form—that is what we want, what we are working for.

The situation in the world would undoubtedly be much improved if in its largest and most populous part, namely Asia and the Pacific basin, the political awareness of the pressing need to move towards normalising the situation prevailed. Regrettably, it so far has not.

One cannot but see that the USA has lately visibly stepped up its military preparations in that region. It is encouraging revanchist trends in the policy of Japan's ruling quarters and speeding up the forging of a militarist alliance between Washington, Tokyo and Seoul. Washington is trying to get the countries of the region to join its global military and political plans, including the notorious "Pacific Doctrine", is interfering in the affairs of sovereign nations and obstructing negotiated settlement of problems. This policy is spearheaded against the Soviet Union, Vietnam and other socialist states in Asia, against Afghanistan and Kampuchea. But by its very essence it threatens all nations in the Asian-Pacific region.

Naturally enough, these actions, which are inimical to peace, alarm the countries of the region and sometimes prompt legitimate counter-measures.

The policy of the Soviet Union meets the peoples' desire for peace and cooperation. We want to eliminate the seats of conflict and oppose the imperialist policy, which is leading to a further dangerous destabilisation of the situation.

Our country is prepared resolutely to cut knots which we did not tie. For example, we are for reducing the level of confrontation in medium-range nuclear systems. We have repeatedly declared that, should an appropriate agreement be reached in Europe, we shall scrap the number of medium-range missiles in the European part of the country on which agreement will be reached. We have also spoken of our agreement to freeze the number of missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union, provided, of course, that the US side does not take steps to change the strategic situation in the region. The Soviet Union would

not be against discussing this problem with Asian and Pacific states that have similar systems with a view to limiting and subsequently reducing these systems, needless to say on the basis of reciprocity.

We recently put forward the idea of holding an all-Asia forum to exchange opinions and jointly seek constructive solutions. The first responses to this proposal indicate that there is gravitation towards such an exchange of opinions. Of course, there are difficulties as well. Such a straightforward formulation of the question is not to everyone's liking. There are forces which have given a hostile reception to the idea. But we have enough goodwill, patience and persistence. We urge all interested countries on the continent to display the greatest political wisdom and tackle in earnest the fundamental problems of strengthening peace and security.

We are convinced that Asia can and should become a continent of peace and good-neighbourliness. It is only in conditions of genuine peace and stability that the countries of that region can successfully accomplish their difficult tasks of socio-economic development.

That is precisely the goal served by the concrete proposals of the Soviet Union, the countries of Indochina and other socialist countries, including the proposals for working out confidence-building measures in the Far East and concluding a convention on mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between the states of Asia and the Pacific. The initiatives of India and a number of other non-aligned countries have the same objective.

Normalisation of the relations of the Soviet Union and Vietnam with the People's Republic of China would undoubtedly help to fortify the foundations of peace inside and outside Asia. Both the Soviet and the Vietnamese governments have already made constructive proposals on this score. A positive response to them would help to tear down many of the real obstacles to good-neighbour and mutually advantageous relations in the region.

The Soviet Union continues to proceed from the fact that in Southeast Asia there are no problems that cannot be settled through political negotiations. That is why we fully support the consistent efforts made by Vietnam jointly with Laos and Kam-

pucheas to establish relations of good-neighbourliness and cooperation in Southeast Asia and make the region a zone of peace and stability. The Soviet Union will continue to facilitate in every way all steps in this direction.

Comrades,

The day is not far off when the working people of Vietnam will mark the 40th anniversary of Southeast Asia's first state of workers and peasants. Soviet people, too, regard this glorious anniversary as a big occasion. It is highly symbolical that on the eve of this great date it has been decided to erect a monument in Moscow to the patriot and internationalist Ho Chi Minh, the founder of the Communist Party of Vietnam and the Vietnamese socialist state.

Soviet people have always been in solidarity with fraternal Vietnam and given it all-round assistance and support. The Vietnamese Communists and all working people in the SRV may rest assured that the cause of socialist construction on Vietnamese soil, the cause of Vietnam's freedom and independence will continue to have a firm support in our solidarity. The policy of strengthening Soviet-Vietnamese friendship and cooperation is a fundamental policy of our Party and country.

Permit me to wish the Communists and all working people of the SRV, under the leadership of their tried and tested vanguard, the Communist Party of Vietnam, success in their preparations for the forthcoming Sixth Congress of the CPV and in building a powerful and prosperous Vietnam, a reliable outpost of socialism in Asia.

I wish sound health and success to Comrade Le Duan, General Secretary of the CPV CC, to the members of the Vietnamese party and government delegation and to all Vietnamese and Soviet comrades present here.

May the unbreakable Soviet-Vietnamese friendship develop and strengthen!

To Participants and Guests of the 14th Moscow International Film Festival

Hearty greetings to the participants and guests of the Moscow International Film Festival.

In the modern world, it is essential for mankind to assert mutual understanding, trust, and spiritual communication. It is very important that people should be able to cope with the complicated problems of our time, and above all with the biggest problem, the danger of nuclear catastrophe.

The 40th anniversary of Victory over fascism has reminded everybody again of the need to safeguard the peace paid for with the lives of millions of people. We firmly believe that the security of nations can be attained only by collective effort. Our ideal is a world without wars, a world without weapons.

A true artist cannot stand aloof from the vital tasks of our epoch. His art unfailingly serves light and goodness. An honest and bold cinema that reacts sensitively to the anxieties and cares of the times can do a great deal in the name of social progress, national independence, and international cooperation.

So may the voice of film-makers, those who live up to the splendid motto, "For humanism in film art, for peace and friendship among nations", resound ever more loudly.

I wish the Moscow festival every success and new creative achievements to all its participants.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Speech in the Kremlin at the Third Session of the Eleventh USSR Supreme Soviet

July 2, 1985

Comrade deputies,

We have now to elect the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

The Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee held yesterday discussed this question.

As you are aware, beginning with 1977, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has occupied simultaneously the post of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. It must be said that in the conditions of the time, the combination in one person of the two highest posts within the Party and the state was justified. In the period that was, the legislative and other activities of the USSR Supreme Soviet have been stepped up, the work of the local Soviets has improved and control over the organs of administration has been strengthened.

At the same time, the Central Committee took into account that the solution of the new tasks, which are now facing us, demands the correction of both the meaning and the forms and methods of Party and state activities, and of the placing of personnel, both in the centre and locally.

The country is now living through a responsible period. We are determining the strategic course for the near and distant future and are drafting a new edition of the Party Programme which is to be adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress. An entire complex of important tasks faces us. You know them. It is the transfer to intensive development of the economy; the structural reconstruction of production; the introduction of effective

forms of management, organisation and stimulation of labour; the further raising of the Soviet people's well-being, and strengthening the country's defence capacity.

Today, when we see our prospects better, it is the organisational work, the stepping up of the activities of all the links in the Soviet political system and the mobilisation of the masses for performing the tasks posed, that are put to the forefront. All this presupposes the further strengthening of the Party's guiding role in society and demands greater effort on the part of the CPSU Central Committee and its Political Bureau.

The Central Committee Plenary Meeting has deemed it expedient, in these concrete conditions and with account taken of the tasks of the current stage, that the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee should concentrate to the maximum on the organisation of the work of the Party's central organs and on pooling the efforts of all the Party, government and non-government organisations for the successful implementation of the planned course.

In this connection, the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Party group of the Supreme Soviet have authorised me to submit for your consideration the proposal, supported by the councils of the elders of the chambers, to elect Comrade Andrei Andreyevich Gromyko Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

The name of Andrei Andreyevich is widely known both in our country and beyond its borders. An outstanding politician, one of the oldest Party members, he greatly contributes to the drafting and fulfilment of our home and foreign policy. He combines profound knowledge and many-sided experience with an adherence to principle and consistence in fulfilling the policy elaborated by us. The Party and the people highly appreciate his services in the implementation of the Soviet state's foreign policy course. I think that we have every reason to believe that Andrei Andreyevich Gromyko will fulfil successfully the functions connected with administering the work of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

As the Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee pointed out, the Party will go on, as before, to follow the line of stepping up the activities of the Supreme Soviet, of raising the

role of the Soviets and strengthening their responsibility for the state of affairs in all fields, in every town and village. They must naturally combine the functions of adopting state decisions with the organisation of and control over the implementation of these decisions.

We stress over and over again that the Soviets at all stages are called upon to make a much fuller and more consistent use of their rights. They should keep abreast of all fields of social life. Special attention should be given now to the satisfaction of the working people's varied needs and requirements. It is necessary that the Soviets do even more for the fulfilment of the Food Programme, to solve the problem of better supplying the population in each republic, territory and region with food products through the mobilisation of local possibilities and reserves. It is important that the Soviets join wholeheartedly in the organisation of consumer goods production by all industrial enterprises, irrespective of their departmental subordination. The Soviets, both central and local, must exert even more effort for solving social problems, the satisfaction of the Soviet people's cultural requirements and the education of the working people.

We must make better use of the constitutional prerogatives and the broad practical possibilities of the USSR Supreme Soviet in dealing with the key questions in the country's life and control over the organs of administration. The Supreme Soviet will have to perform many tasks in improving existing legislation. Strict legality is an inalienable part of socialist democracy and of the strict adherence to the principle of social justice. Our society's life is characterised today, as never before, by the political activity of the people who make many proposals on questions of policy, economy and other fields of society's life and react sharply to any shortcomings. This is the expression of genuine democracy, the expression of that which we call the socialist self-government by the people.

Therefore, we still have much to do to improve the Soviets' work and strengthen legality. And the role of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and its Chairman should be weighty and active.

Taking all that into account, I put forward for your consideration, comrade deputies, the following draft resolution:

“The Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics resolves:

“to elect Deputy Andrei Andreyevich Gromyko Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.”

At the same time it is proposed to adopt a resolution on relieving Comrade A. A. Gromyko from his duties of First Vice-Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and of Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

Outer Space for Peace Alone!

Reply to the Union of Concerned Scientists

Dear Mr. Kendall,

I have received the message sent by you on behalf of the Union of Concerned Scientists calling for a ban on space weapons. I want to say that I deeply respect the opinion of prominent scientists who are more keenly aware than many others of what dangerous consequences for mankind the spreading of the arms race to outer space and the conversion of space into an arena of military rivalry could have.

The Union of Concerned Scientists has every ground to demand that a clear and irrevocable political decision be made which would prevent militarisation of outer space and leave it free for peaceful cooperation. This issue indeed requires a bold approach. The standards of yesterday, narrow, moreover illusory notions, of one-sided benefits and advantages are not applicable here. What is needed now as never before is a farsighted policy based on understanding of the realities and the dangers which we shall inevitably encounter tomorrow, if today those who can and must make the only correct decision evade the responsibility that rests with them.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership I want to make it quite clear that the Soviet Union will not be the first to step into space with weapons. We shall make every effort to convince other countries, and above all the United States of America, not to take such a fatal step which would inevitably increase the threat of nuclear war and spark off an uncontrolled arms race in all areas.

Proceeding from this goal, the Soviet Union, as you evidently know, has submitted a radical proposal to the United Nations

—a draft treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in space and from space against earth. If the United States joined the vast majority of states that have supported this initiative, the issue of space weapons could be closed once and for all.

At the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva we are trying to reach agreement on a full ban on the development, testing and deployment of space strike systems. Such a ban would make it possible to preserve space for peaceful development, research and scientific discoveries, and, moreover, to start the process of sharply reducing and ultimately scrapping nuclear weapons.

We have also repeatedly taken unilateral steps intended to set a good example to the United States. For two years now the moratorium introduced by the Soviet Union on the placement of anti-satellite weapons in outer space has been operative and it will continue to remain in force as long as other states do likewise. Lying on the table in Washington is our proposal that both sides terminate completely all work on the development of new anti-satellite systems and that such systems as the USSR and the United States already possess (including those still undergoing tests) be eliminated. The actions of the American side in the near future will show which decision the US Administration will prefer.

Strategic stability and trust would clearly be strengthened if the United States agreed with the USSR to reaffirm in binding form its commitment to the provisions of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, a treaty of unlimited duration. The Soviet Union is not developing space strike weapons or a large-scale ABM system. Nor is it laying the foundation for such a defence. It strictly abides by its obligations under the treaty as a whole and in its particular aspects, and unswervingly observes the spirit and the letter of that highly important document. We invite the American leaders to join us in this and to renounce plans for space militarisation now in the making, plans that would inevitably lead to the negation of that document, which is the key link in the entire process of nuclear arms limitation.

The USSR proceeds from the premise that the practical fulfilment of the task of preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth is possible given the political will and

a sincere desire by both sides to work towards this historic goal. The Soviet Union has that desire and that will.

I wish the Union of Concerned Scientists and all its members success in the noble work it is doing for the good of peace and progress.

Yours respectfully,

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, July 6, 1985

Speech at the Opening Ceremony of the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow

July 27, 1985

Dear friends, esteemed guests,

On behalf of the people of our country I hail you in the capital of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—Moscow. I congratulate you on the opening of the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students.

Such festivals are always a grand occasion, a major international event. An occasion because young envoys from all the continents, people with different world outlooks and national traditions come together. They meet in order to share all the best accumulated in the spiritual treasure-house of every nation and in doing so pave the shortest way towards mutual understanding and friendship. Soviet people are sincerely glad to host this meeting. Their hearts are open to you.

But naturally, festivals are not only a festive occasion. The problems of life affect and concern youth not less intensely than the senior generations. With the inherent enthusiasm of youth it rises to the battle for social justice and genuine freedom, for making the boons of the world, the boons of civilisation accessible to all, for banishing violence and racism, inequality and oppression, militarism and aggression from the life of man and mankind.

The world of tomorrow, the world of the coming century is your world, dear friends. And your thoughts and deeds today largely determine what it will be like.

Here, in the native land of the great Lenin, you can see for yourselves how deeply our youth is dedicated to the lofty ideals of humanism, peace and socialism.

I believe that all of us will agree that at the present time mankind has no more important, vital task than to safeguard and strengthen peace. Our concern for tomorrow and remembrance of the things past oblige us to do so.

Your forum is held in the year of the 40th anniversary of the defeat of Hitler fascism and Japanese militarism, of the end of the Second World War, the most bloody and bitter war. It left so much suffering and sorrow that they tell on the life of already several generations and imperatively demand that we prevent such a disaster from recurring.

The peoples shall not forget that 40 years ago the world shook from the first atomic blast. The echo of that blast appeals to the conscience and reason of every upright man. And everyone should ask himself: what he has done to prevent nuclear weapons from being put to use ever again, either on earth or in space, to eliminate these weapons completely and for good. To ask himself and to do what he can for our common home—the planet Earth.

Unfortunately—and you are aware of that—reactionary forces to which wars and the arms race bring huge profits are still actively at work. These forces would like to turn back the course of history, to retain their power and privileges, to dictate their will to peoples.

As to the Soviet Union, I would like to say once again with all certainty that a world without wars and weapons, a world of good-neighbourliness and cooperation in good faith, a world of friendship among nations is the ideal of socialism, the goal of our policy.

We set ourselves the task of doing away with the arms race; not in word, but in deed we come out for the most radical solution of the problem of nuclear weapons—their complete banning and elimination.

We come out for the strength and energy of people, human genius, to be channelled not to the creation of ever new means of destruction, but to the elimination of hunger, poverty, diseases, to working for prosperity and peaceful development. We oppose the policy of threats and violence, the trampling of human rights and, in the first place, such sacred rights as the right to life, the right to work. We oppose the turning of liberated and developing countries into a source of the enrichment of mo-

nopolies and their utilisation as sites for military bases and *places d'armes* of aggression. We say openly and clearly: the Soviet Union sides with those who fight for freedom, national independence and social justice.

Dear friends, Soviet people are engaged in peaceful creative labour. We have achieved much and built much. However, even more remains to be done. There are many spheres to which Soviet young people can apply their skill and knowledge. We highly appreciate their contribution to the present-day work of the Soviet people. And we are absolutely sure that our youth will further measure up to its noble mission—to continue the building of a new society.

You, participants in the festival, youths and girls, personify the spring of mankind, progress and aspirations of your peoples.

So, let us tirelessly work for the present and the future of mankind without wars, violence and oppression!

Let the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students become a convincing demonstration of solidarity, the allegiance to peace and friendship among nations!

I wish you success and happiness!

Statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

The continuing nuclear arms race is extremely dangerous for the future of the entire world civilisation. It is heightening international tension and increasing the threat of war, and diverts enormous intellectual and material resources from constructive purposes.

Since the very beginning of the nuclear age the Soviet Union has consistently and vigorously sought to end the accumulation of nuclear arsenals, curb military rivalry, and strengthen trust and peaceful cooperation between states, an aim served by the whole wide-ranging activity of the USSR within the UN framework and at multilateral and bilateral talks on arms limitation and reduction. The Soviet Union does not seek military superiority—it favours maintaining the balance of military forces at the lowest possible level.

It is our conviction that an end to all nuclear weapon tests would be a major contribution to strengthening strategic stability and peace on Earth. It is no secret that new and ever more dangerous kinds and types of mass destruction weapons are developed and improved in the course of such tests.

In the interest of creating favourable conditions for an international treaty on a complete and universal nuclear weapon tests ban, the USSR has repeatedly proposed that the nuclear states agree to a moratorium on all nuclear explosions from a date to be agreed. Regrettably, it has not yet been possible to take this important step.

In an effort to facilitate a halt to the dangerous competition in nuclear stockpiling and wishing to set a good example, the

Soviet Union has decided unilaterally to stop all nuclear explosions from August 6 this year. We call on the government of the United States to stop its nuclear explosions as of that date, which is observed worldwide as the day of the Hiroshima tragedy. Our moratorium is declared till January 1, 1986. It will remain in effect, however, as long as the USA, for its part, refrains from conducting nuclear explosions.

A mutual moratorium by the USSR and the USA on all nuclear explosions would undoubtedly be a good example for the other nuclear states.

The Soviet Union expects that the United States will give a positive response to this initiative and stop its nuclear explosions.

This would meet the aspirations and hopes of all nations.

Pravda, July 30, 1985

Reply to a Message from the Japanese Council of Organisations of Victims of Atomic Bombings

Dear Madam Ito,

I was much moved by your letter.

I deeply sympathise with the grief and terrible sufferings that fell to the lot of the victims of the barbarous American atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

I fully share your fervent wish that the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki should never be repeated anywhere in the world, that there should be no new victims of nuclear arms on our planet.

The Soviet Union has been pressing for the liquidation of nuclear arms ever since they first appeared. As far back as 1946 our country proposed that an international convention be concluded prohibiting atomic arms, but this was blocked by the United States. And today, too, we encounter a lack of readiness on the part of the West to agree to the complete prohibition and liquidation of nuclear arms, and this faces us with the need to search for possible interim solutions to this paramount task.

Today too the USSR is actively working for an end to nuclear weapons. We are prepared to start nuclear disarmament at any time, given agreement with the other nuclear powers. The USSR is holding talks with the United States in Geneva so as to prevent an arms race in outer space, terminate it on earth and start drastic cuts in nuclear armaments all the way to their total elimination. The position taken by the American side at these talks, however, is blocking the attainment of accord.

The Soviet Union will not start nuclear war, it has pledged

not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. If all nuclear powers took the same step, favourable conditions would be created for an international treaty banning the use of nuclear weapons.

Our new peace initiative—the decision to stop unilaterally all nuclear explosions as of August 6 this year, the anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy—is directed at ending the dangerous rivalry in building up nuclear arsenals. Our moratorium will be operative until January 1, 1986, but will remain in effect as long as the United States, for its part, refrains from conducting nuclear explosions.

The unqualified approval and broad support with which this initiative has been met by world public opinion confirm that it accords with the aspirations and hopes of all peoples. Now it is the turn of the US and other countries possessing nuclear weapons also to put an end to their nuclear explosions. This would be not only a tribute to the memory of the victims of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but a real contribution to consolidation of strategic stability and peace on earth. In this way favourable conditions would be created for concluding an international treaty on complete and universal banning of nuclear weapon tests.

Our country views with understanding the striving of many countries to create nuclear-free zones in various parts of the globe. We are for such zones being set up, for example, in Northern Europe, the Balkans, Southeast Asia, and Africa. The efforts of South Pacific states aimed at creating a nuclear-free zone in that region are praiseworthy.

On the eve of the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it is particularly urgent that nobody should contravene the non-nuclear status of Japan enshrined in the “three non-nuclear principles” which, as we understand, are an expression of the will of the mass of the Japanese people. The Soviet Union honours these principles. It is important that others should also do so—and not just in word, but in deed.

Yet we cannot disregard the growing attempts to turn Japan into a US nuclear base, increase its military role both in the system of the alliance with the USA and in the present-day world in general. Such attempts are fraught with the aggravation of tension in the Far East and in the Asian-Pacific region. Apparently, not everyone has yet drawn the proper conclusions

from the lessons of the Second World War, from the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The Soviet people, who lost over 20 million lives during the Second World War, is fully resolved to prevent nuclear catastrophe. The tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is widely known in our country. The Soviet people stand in solidarity with the anti-war, anti-nuclear movement in Japan and in other countries which favours complete and ultimate elimination of the nuclear threat all over the world. This movement will be the stronger, the more representative it is and the more united its ranks.

I wish the Japanese Council of Organisations of Victims of Atomic Bombings and all its members every success in the struggle to prevent nuclear war, to prohibit and scrap nuclear weapons.

Yours respectfully,

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, August 6, 1985

**To Mr. Willy Brandt,
Chairman of the Social Democratic Party
of Germany**

Dear Mr. Willy Brandt,

I fully share the opinion of the Moscow Treaty contained in your letter. It is one of the fundamental documents of the postwar period, and as such has defined the essential framework of relations between our countries and exercised a benign influence on the whole complex of interstate relations on the European continent by entrenching the important principle of the inviolability of the frontiers of all European states now and in the future. I should like to note in this connection that we in the Soviet Union remember your personal contribution to its conclusion.

The provisions of the Moscow Treaty have not lost their relevance today. More, as we see it, any departure from them in the setting of a deteriorating international situation and an increased military threat would be contrary to the interests of stopping the arms race and consolidating European and world peace.

As concerns the Soviet Union, I should like to confirm once more that, as before, our country is a consistent advocate of making Europe a continent of peace and mutually beneficial cooperation among all countries and peoples, the Soviet Union and the FRG included, and is prepared to facilitate the achievement of this noble goal in practical terms.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

An Interview for TASS

Question. How would you evaluate the reaction in the world to the new Soviet initiative in introducing a moratorium on nuclear explosions?

Answer. If one is to speak of the sentiments of the public at large, there would appear to be every ground to say that the new initiative of the Soviet Union, which has unilaterally discontinued all nuclear explosions and urged the United States to follow suit, has been received with approval in the world. In many countries, including the United States, prominent statesmen, political and public figures have been declaring support for the idea of a moratorium on nuclear weapon tests and urging other nuclear powers to follow the USSR's example. We have proposed a concrete, tangible measure. People see in it a hope of slowing down and then discontinuing the nuclear arms race.

I know that our initiative is not to the liking of everyone. Those in the West who have linked their policy with further escalation of the arms race and who derive considerable profits from this do not want an end to nuclear tests. They oppose the moratorium because they do not want the nuclear arms assembly lines to come to a standstill. They cling to unattainable illusions of gaining military superiority one way or another. At the same time they are busy spreading yarns about the Soviet Union's policies, some in connection with the moratorium on nuclear explosions we have announced.

This was an honest and open move on our part. We introduced the moratorium, being deeply convinced of the need for practical measures to stop the buildup and further sophistication of nuclear arms. We had no intention at all of placing the

US leadership in a difficult position. The President of the United States was notified in advance of our move by a letter in which we suggested that the American side take an analogous step. One would like the US leadership to respond positively to this call of ours. Public pronouncements by officials in Washington on the moratorium issue unfortunately create the impression that Washington is now preoccupied mostly with finding the most adroit way of evading such a response. I shall not be mistaken if I say that a different attitude is awaited by the world.

Question. President Reagan recently said that the United States could not afford a moratorium on nuclear tests because it has to complete its nuclear programmes. At the same time he asserted that the Soviet Union had completed an intensive series of nuclear explosions and could afford a respite. Is that so?

Answer. The decision unilaterally to discontinue nuclear explosions was made by the Soviet leadership after thorough study from every angle. It was not at all easy to take such a step. To introduce a unilateral moratorium we had to interrupt the testing programme, leaving it unfinished.

In the current year before the moratorium, practically the same number of nuclear explosions was carried out in the USSR as in the United States. However, if one speaks of all the nuclear tests that have been carried out to date, their number was much greater in the United States than in the USSR. And the White House knows it.

But in taking the decision for a unilateral moratorium, the Soviet Union was guided not by arithmetic, but by political considerations of principle, by a desire to help end the nuclear arms race and to induce the US and the other countries possessing nuclear weapons to take such a step. Our goal is complete and general termination of nuclear weapon tests and not some respite between explosions.

The opinion has been voiced that the introduction of a moratorium on nuclear explosions is supposedly not in the interests of the United States. But a moratorium is an important step towards ending further sophistication of lethal nuclear weapons. Besides, the longer the period without tests, the more rapid will be the process of "ageing" of the weapons stockpiled. And finally, a moratorium creates more favourable conditions for

agreement on the termination of nuclear tests and for making headway towards scrapping nuclear weapons altogether.

The question arises: what is there that does not accord with the interests of the US, of the American people? This course does not suit only those who count on power politics, who devise plans to create ever new types of nuclear weapons on earth and who have set themselves the aim of starting an arms race in outer space. But what has this to do with the genuine interests of strengthening peace and international security, a desire for which has been repeatedly professed by Washington?

Attempts are being made to explain this unwillingness to end nuclear tests by the assertion that the United States "lags behind" in nuclear arms. But this is merely a pretext. At one time there was talk there about a "lag" in bombers and later on it was missiles. However, every time that was a deliberate deception which was subsequently admitted by the people in Washington themselves. In other words, talk about a "lag" begins whenever there is a striving to achieve military superiority and when there is no real desire to solve arms limitation issues. It is precisely on these matters that decisions should be taken by the political leadership—and not on the basis of diverse myths about a "Soviet threat" but proceeding from the actual situation, the genuine security interests of one's country and the interests of international security.

Question. How do you visualise the issue of verification in the context of the proposal to end nuclear explosions?

Answer. The scientific and technical means existing in this country, the United States and other countries give sufficient grounds for confidence that a nuclear explosion, even of small yield, will be detected and will become known. Those who say the contrary know that they are wrong.

Unilateral steps to end nuclear explosions cannot, of course, resolve altogether the problem of a complete and general cessation of nuclear weapon tests. For the problem to be solved once and for all an international agreement is essential. Apart from the relevant commitments, it would also contain an appropriate system of verification measures—both national and international. In short, we are for verification of the ending of nuclear explosions but we are against cessation of tests being

substituted by continuation of these tests in the presence of observers.

It must be recalled that the issue of the complete and general termination of nuclear weapon tests is by no means new. Several years ago it was examined in detail in tripartite talks between the USSR, the US, and Britain. Verification was also discussed in great detail at that time. In many respects the sides came close to mutual understanding. But the United States broke off the talks because the limitations being worked out hindered the Pentagon's plans.

We have repeatedly proposed to the United States that the talks be resumed. And today as well we are calling on it to resume the talks and achieve complete cessation of nuclear weapon tests. The holding of such talks and the achievement of results at them would be much easier in conditions where the USSR and the US would not be conducting nuclear tests. However, the United States does not want to return to the negotiating table. And this means that the United States does not want either an end to nuclear tests or a reliable system of verification. That is the only conclusion that can be drawn.

It is sometimes said that the question of ending nuclear weapon tests should be considered at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Very well, we are prepared to discuss it there too. But in Geneva, the United States and other Western countries have been sabotaging the conduct of such talks for a long time. Therefore, the point is not where to consider the cessation of nuclear weapon tests. What is important is to consider the problem seriously and without delay, with a view, among other things, to the forthcoming Soviet-American meeting.

Question. Is it possible nonetheless, in your opinion, to expect a positive solution to the matter of nuclear tests?

Answer. Yes, I think it is. Although the present attitude of the United States to our proposal does not inspire optimism, one would not like to lose hope. The reason is this: too great a responsibility rests on the Soviet Union and the United States for them to evade the solution of major security matters.

What we suggest is a real possibility to stop the further build-up of nuclear arsenals and to tackle in earnest the task of reducing and ultimately scrapping them.

To the Conference Participants Reviewing How the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Has Worked

I greet the representatives of the states participating in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, who have gathered in Geneva at a conference to review how that most important international agreement has worked.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty, drawn up by the collective efforts of many states, has demonstrated in practice its viability. Since this Treaty was concluded, no new state, possessing nuclear weapons, has appeared. It is the broadest arms limitation accord in terms of the number of parties to it. An international non-proliferation regime has emerged on its basis and become an effective instrument for peace.

Another important result of the Non-Proliferation Treaty is that it has provided favourable conditions for broad international cooperation in peaceful utilisation of atomic energy, which for its part is so necessary to the solution of the problem of energy supply to mankind and other major economic problems of concern to all the peoples. The International Atomic Energy Agency has done good service in practical accomplishment of these tasks.

The Soviet Union resolutely stands for further expansion and development of such cooperation. It is important that atomic energy should really become an asset of the whole of mankind and serve only the purposes of peace and construction.

Respecting its commitments under the Treaty, the Soviet Union has been doing and will continue to do everything within its power to, beyond preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons, halt and reverse the nuclear arms race.

The Soviet Union has more than once taken unilateral steps, setting examples for others and thus contributing to the drafting of agreements on the limitation and ending of the nuclear arms race. The USSR has assumed a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. If those nuclear powers which have not yet done so had followed suit, it would have been on the whole equivalent to a general ban on the use of nuclear weapons.

Fresh evidence of our desire to ease the way to stopping the nuclear arms race is the proclamation by the Soviet Union of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. It is beyond doubt that a mutual Soviet-US moratorium on nuclear explosions could provide favourable conditions for an international treaty on the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapon tests and contribute to fuller implementation of the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The problem of curbing the nuclear arms race in the nuclear and space age is inseparable from the task of preventing the militarisation of space. If space is put to the service of war, the nuclear threat would be dramatically escalated. But if space is preserved peaceful and kept out of the sphere of military rivalry, an impetus could be given to the solution of the entire range of questions as regards limiting and reducing nuclear arms arsenals. Broad possibilities would simultaneously be opened for comprehensive international cooperation in various fields of human activity both on Earth and in space. This is the purpose of the Soviet Union as it tables for discussion at the 40th UN General Assembly specific proposals on international cooperation in peaceful exploration of space under conditions of its non-militarisation.

In short, we stand for energetic work to curb the arms race in every area. Measures to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons clearly continue to play an important role.

I wish the conference success in its effort to further strengthen the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

To Mrs. Jane Smith

Dear Mrs. Smith,

Accept our profound condolences on the occasion of the tragic death of your daughter Samantha and your husband Arthur.

All those in the Soviet Union who knew Samantha Smith will forever cherish the memory of the American girl who, just as millions of Soviet young people, yearned for peace and friendship among the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Respectfully yours,

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, August 28, 1985

Answers to *Time* Magazine

August 28, 1985

Question. How would you characterise US-Soviet relations at this juncture and what are the primary events that are defining that relationship?

Answer. Had you asked me this question some two months ago, I would have said that the situation in our relations was becoming somewhat better and that some hopes of positive shifts were appearing.

To my deep regret, I could not say that today.

The truth should be faced squarely. Despite the negotiations which have begun in Geneva and the agreement to hold a summit meeting, the relations between our two countries are continuing to deteriorate, the arms race is intensifying and the war threat is not subsiding. What is the matter? Why is all this happening? My colleagues and I are quite exacting and self-critical when it comes to our own activities not only in this country but also outside it and we are asking ourselves again and again if that is somehow connected with our actions.

But what is there that we can reproach ourselves with in this context? Indeed, in this critical situation Moscow is trying to practise restraint in its pronouncements with regard to the United States, it is not resorting to anti-American campaigns,

Time magazine asked the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, to reply to a number of questions and also to receive for a conversation the editor-in-chief of *Time* Henry Grundwald, its managing editor Ray Cave, the assistant managing editor Richard Duncan and the magazine's Moscow bureau chief James Jackson.

Here are given the answers of Mikhail Gorbachev and the transcript of his conversation with the US journalists.

nor is it fomenting hatred for your country. We believe it very important that even in times of political aggravation the feeling of traditional respect harboured by Soviet people for the American people should not be injured, and, as far as I can judge, that feeling is largely a mutual one.

And is it bad that at a time when the disarmament negotiations have resumed and preparations are under way for a first summit in six years we are persistently seeking ways to break the vicious circle and bring the process of arms limitation out of the dead end? In particular, that is precisely the objective of our moratorium on nuclear explosions and of our proposal to the United States to join it and to resume the negotiations on a complete ban on nuclear tests as well as of the proposals regarding peaceful cooperation and the prevention of an arms race in space. We are convinced that we should look for a way out of the current difficult situation together.

It is hard therefore to understand why our proposals have provoked such outspoken displeasure on the part of responsible US statesmen. Attempts are known to have been made to portray them as nothing but pure propaganda.

Anyone even slightly familiar with the essence of the matters would easily see that behind our proposals there are most serious intentions and not just an attempt to influence public opinion. All real efforts to limit nuclear weapons began with a ban on tests—just recall the 1963 treaty which was a first major step in that direction. A complete end to nuclear tests would halt the nuclear arms race in the most dangerous area, that of qualitative improvement. And it would, besides, seriously contribute to maintaining and strengthening the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

If all that we are doing is, indeed, viewed as mere propaganda, why not respond to it according to the principle of “an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth”? We have stopped nuclear explosions. Then you, Americans, could pay us back by doing the same thing. You could, to boot, deal us yet another propaganda blow, say, by suspending the development of one of your new strategic missiles. And we would respond with the same kind of “propaganda”. And so on and so forth. Would anyone be harmed by competition in such “propaganda”? Of course, it could not be a substitute for a comprehensive arms limitation

agreement but it would, no doubt, be a significant step leading to such an agreement.

The US Administration has regrettably taken a different road. In response to our moratorium it defiantly hastened to set off yet another nuclear explosion as if to spite everyone. And to our proposals concerning a peaceful space it responded with a decision to conduct a first operational test of an anti-satellite weapon. As if that were not enough, it has also launched another "campaign of hatred" against the USSR.

What kind of impression does all this make? On the one hand, that of some kind of confusion and uncertainty in Washington. The only way I can explain this is anxiety lest our initiatives should wreck the version of the Soviet Union being the "focus of evil" and the source of universal danger which, in fact, underlies the entire arms race policy. On the other hand, there is an impression of a shortage of responsibility for the destinies of the world. And this, frankly speaking, gives rise again and again to the question whether it is at all possible in such an atmosphere to conduct business in a normal way and to build rational relations between countries.

You asked me what is the primary thing that defines Soviet-American relations. I think it is the immutable fact that whether we like each other or not, we can either survive or perish only together. The principal question which we must answer is whether we are at last ready to recognise that there is no other way but to live at peace with each other and whether we are prepared to switch our mentality and our mode of acting from a war-like to a peaceful track. As you say, live and let live. We call it peaceful coexistence. As for the Soviet Union, we answer that question in the affirmative.

Question. What do you think will be the results of your Geneva meeting with President Ronald Reagan in November? What specific actions should the US and the Soviet Union take to improve their bilateral relations?

Answer. In fact, I have already set forth the reasons why today I look at the prospects of the Geneva meeting with more caution than I did at the time we gave our agreement to that meeting. Its outcome, after all, will depend to a great extent upon what is taking place now.

Everyone would probably agree that the political atmosphere

for talks takes shape well in advance. Neither the President nor I will be able to ignore the mood in our respective countries or that of our allies. In other words, actions today largely determine the "scenario" for our November discussions.

I will not hide from you my disappointment and concern about what is happening now. We cannot but be troubled by the approach which, as I see it, has begun to emerge in Washington—both from its practical policy and from the statements made by responsible White House staffers. That is a scenario of pressure, of attempts to drive us into a corner, to ascribe to us, as so many times in the past, every mortal sin—from unleashing an arms race to "aggression" in the Middle East, from violations of human rights to some scheming even in South Africa. This is not a state policy, it is a feverish search for an "evil spirit".

We are prepared to have a meaningful and businesslike talk—we can also present claims. I wish to assure the readers of this magazine that we have something to say about the United States being responsible for the nuclear arms race, and about its conduct in various regions of the world, and support to those who in effect engage in terrorism, and about violations of human rights in America itself, as well as in many countries close to it. But here is what I am thinking about: is it worthwhile for the sake of that to set up a summit meeting with which our nations and people on all continents associate their hopes for peace, and for a secure and tranquil life? Abusive words are no help in a good cause.

I see the concept of such an important meeting differently. We in Moscow, naturally, are well aware of how profound is all that divides us. Looking at what US political leaders have been saying in recent years, we could not disregard statements we do not agree with and which, frankly speaking, in many cases we are indignant about, but at the same time we have not lost hope that, after all, points of contact, areas of common or parallel interests can be found. Indeed, there are reasons for this. Take, for example, the statements to the effect that nuclear war must not be waged and that it cannot be won, or that the United States is not seeking military superiority. In other words, I have been reckoning on having an honest and unbiased conversation imbued with a desire to find a way leading back from the edge of the nuclear precipice. To discuss not myths and stereotypes of which we have had enough, but the real problems, the real in-

terests of our countries, our future and the future of the entire world community.

But there is every indication that the other side is now preparing for something quite different. It looks as if the stage is being set for a bout between some kind of political "supergladiators" with the only thought in mind as to how best to deal a deft blow at the opponent and score an extra point in this "bout". What is striking about this are both the form and the content of some statements. The recent "lecture" of Mr. McFarlane is a case in point. It contains not only the full "set of accusations" we are going to be charged with in Geneva but also what I would call a very specific interpretation of the upcoming negotiations. It appears that even the slightest headway depends exclusively upon concessions by the Soviet Union: concessions on all questions—on armaments, on regional problems and even on our own domestic affairs.

If all this is meant seriously, then manifestly Washington is preparing not for the event we have agreed upon. The summit meeting is designed for negotiations, for negotiations on the basis of equality and not for signing an act of someone's capitulation. This is all the more true, since we have not lost a war to the United States, or even a battle, and we owe it absolutely nothing. Nor, for that matter, does the United States us.

But if it is not meant seriously, then the bellicose outcries are all the more inappropriate. Then why flex muscles needlessly, why stage noisy shows and transfer the methods of domestic political struggles to the relations between two nuclear powers? In them the language of strength is useless and dangerous. But there is still time before the summit meeting and quite a lot can be done for it to be constructive and useful. But this, as you will understand, depends on both sides.

Question. What is your view of the strategic defence initiative research programme in the context of US-Soviet relations? Can you envisage a mutual agreement prohibiting the development of such systems, and what kinds of verification would the Soviet Union agree to in such a case? If an agreement cannot be reached what do you foresee in other aspects of arms control?

Answer. Responding to critics of the so-called strategic defence initiative, the official Washington likes to advance an argument it believes to be a clincher—it is after all the Russians that op-

pose Star Wars. If this is so, then it has to be a good and proper programme. But if this logic is followed in the nuclear age, a rather gloomy future awaits us.

Our approach, and I hope that of many Americans, to this question is different. There are, we believe, situations in which both sides are losers. Those are nuclear war, the arms race and international tensions. And, accordingly, there are situations in which they are both winners. Those are peace and cooperation, equal security and elimination of fear of a nuclear catastrophe.

As to the evaluation of the Star Wars programme, we cannot take in earnest the assertions that the SDI would allegedly guarantee invulnerability from nuclear attack weapons, thus leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. In the opinion of our experts (and, to my knowledge, of many of yours) this is sheer fantasy and a pipe dream. However, even on a much more modest scale at which the strategic defence initiative, according to experts, can be implemented as an anti-missile defence system limited in its capabilities, the SDI is very dangerous. This project will, no doubt, whip up the arms race in all areas, which means that the threat of war will increase. That is why this project is bad for us and for you and for everybody in general.

From the same point of view we approach what is called the SDI research programme. First of all, we do not consider it to be a research programme. In our view, it is the first stage of the project to develop a new ABM system prohibited under the relevant treaty of 1972. Just think of the scale of it alone—70 billion dollars to be earmarked for the next few years. That is an incredible amount for pure research as emphasised by US scientists as well. The point is that in today's prices those appropriations are more than four times the cost of the Manhattan Project (the programme for development of nuclear weapons) and more than double the cost of the Apollo programme which provided for the development of astronautics for a whole decade—up to the landing of man on the Moon. That this is far from being a pure research programme is also confirmed by other facts, including tests scheduled for space strike weapons systems.

That is why the entire SDI programme and its so-called research component are a new and even more dangerous round

of the arms race which will inevitably lead to a further aggravation of Soviet-American relations. To preclude this it is necessary, as was agreed in January by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR and the US Secretary of State, to prevent an arms race in space. We are confident that such an agreement is possible and verifiable. I have to point out that we trust the Americans no more than they trust us and that is why we are interested in reliable verification of any agreement as much as they are.

Without such an agreement it will not be possible to reach an agreement on the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons either. The interrelationship between defensive and offensive arms is so obvious as to require no proof. Thus, if the present US position on space weapons is its last word, the Geneva negotiations, and one has to be forthright about it, will lose all sense.

Question. Since the time you have become General Secretary you have made several steps to improve the Soviet economy. Couldn't you tell us about the further steps you propose to take? What in your view are the main problems of the Soviet economy? What changes in the world economy could be beneficial to the Soviet Union?

Answer. Let me start with history. There are problems whose origin was beyond our control. The old regime left the Soviet government with a grim legacy: a backward economy, strong vestiges of feudalism, millions of illiterate people.

Add to this two devastating wars which ravaged a major part of our country, leaving in ashes and ruin much of what the work of the people had created. There were irreparable losses: over 20 million perished during the years of the Patriotic War, with millions wounded and maimed. Forty years have passed but our people still preserve the sorrowful memories of the past, and of the bereavement they suffered. To heal the wounds inflicted upon human hearts and upon the land the Soviet people needed peace and nothing but peace.

It was often asserted in the West that it would take the USSR some fifty to one hundred years to restore all that had been destroyed as a result of the fascist invasion. Having restored their national economy in the shortest possible time, the Soviet people did what would have seemed the impossible. But the fact re-

mains that after the revolution we were forced to spend almost two decades, if not more, on wars and reconstruction.

Under those arduous conditions, using our system's potential, we have succeeded in making the Soviet Union a major economic world power. This has attested to the strength and the immense capabilities of socialism.

There are also difficulties of a different nature due to our own shortcomings and deficiencies. We make no secret of this. Sometimes we do not work well enough. We have not yet learned to run the economy in accordance with the requirements of today and our enormous resources, i.e., raw materials and skilled manpower, advanced science (especially basic science), the support and, as we can now see, the readiness and willingness of people to work better, to improve quality and efficiency.

The imperative of our time is to decisively improve the state of things. Hence the concept of accelerated social and economic development. Today it is our most important, top-priority task. Ways to accomplish the task have been determined following comprehensive discussion. We are planning to make better use of capital investments, to give priority to the development of such major industries as engineering, electrical engineering and electronics, energy production, transport and others. Attention remains focused also on the agro-industrial complex, especially as regards processing and storage of agricultural produce. In short, we will do all that is necessary to better meet demand in high quality food products.

To improve the functioning of the national economy it will be necessary to further strengthen centralisation in strategic areas of the economy through making individual branches, regions and elements of the economy more responsive to the needs of economic development. But at the same time we are seeking to strengthen democratic principles in management, to broaden the autonomy of production associations, enterprises, collective and state farms, to develop local self-management and to encourage initiative and a spirit of enterprise, naturally in the interests of society and not to its detriment.

In short, we seek the most rational methods of managing the economy. Large-scale economic experiments are underway, which are aimed essentially at developing a more efficient mechanism of management that would radically accelerate the rate of scien-

tific and technological progress, and make better use of all resources. Our objective is that, in solving this task, all levers of material and moral incentives and such tools as profit, pricing, credit and cost accounting of enterprises should be put to work. That is the thrust of our work of radical improvement in the entire system of management and planning.

In addition, we are bringing into play other potentials for speeding up economic development. I mean greater discipline and order, demanding more from everyone—from worker to minister, a drive against irresponsibility and red tape, instilling labour ethics, ensuring greater social justice throughout the whole of society.

So we have enough economic problems and things to attend to, and indeed what country hasn't? We are aware of our problems and we are confident of the capabilities inherent in our social system and our country. I have recently visited various regions, had meetings with many people—workers and farmers, engineers and scientists. And what was common to all those meetings? Need for a drastic change, the necessity to radically improve performance are not only supported by the people, but becoming its demand, the real imperative of our time.

I want to emphasise this: the attention we have recently been devoting to the economy is due not to an intention to set new records in producing metals, oil, cement, machine tools or other products. The main thing is to make life better for people. There is no goal more important to us. This year alone the decision was made to raise the salaries of several categories of employees in public health and science and of engineers and technicians, to improve the material status of a considerable number of retired people, to allocate annually free of charge about one million plots of land for planting orchards, for people to have what you call a "second home". We are planning many other steps as well. Their scope will naturally depend on progress in the economy. Of late, positive changes have become evident: the rates of industrial production and labour productivity have increased.

You ask what changes in the world economy could be of benefit to the Soviet Union. First of all, although this belongs more to politics than economics, an end to the arms race. We would prefer to use every rouble that today goes for defence to meet

civilian, peaceful needs. As I understand, you in the United States could also make better use of the money consumed nowadays by arms production. This is not to speak of the problems generated by the budget deficit and public debt. The problems of other countries should also be taken into account. While insisting on cessation of the arm race, we also believe it immoral to waste hundreds of billions on developing means of annihilation, while hundreds of millions of people go hungry and are deprived of the elementary essentials. We, all of us, just have no right to ignore this situation.

As to the world economy, we are of the opinion that the Soviet Union, and other countries too, I believe, would benefit from a more stable general economic, monetary and financial situation, from an equitable solution to the problem of indebtedness, from progress towards a new economic order. And, of course, the removal of discriminatory restrictions, of all other obstacles to world trade, and further development of the international division of labour in which we and our friends and allies intend to play a more active role. All nations of our planet would stand to gain from such changes. By way of example, the establishment of broad trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States would help create hundreds of thousands of additional jobs in your country.

Question. The Soviet Union is anxious to gain better access to advanced technology developed in the United States. How badly is this needed by the Soviet Union, and primarily for what purpose? If the United States does not provide greater access, where do you intend to turn to obtain this technology?

Answer. The very way you are framing the question gives food for thought. Indeed, is there anyone who is not anxious nowadays to gain access to advanced technology? Everyone is, including the US—even primarily the US. I mean not only the legal purchase of licences and science-intensive goods or illegal industrial espionage. The US practises its own specific methods as well. The “brain drain”, for example, and not only from Western Europe but from the developing countries as well. Or take the activities of transnational corporations which through their subsidiaries are laying their hands on scientific and technological achievements of other countries. Now they are trying to

use the so-called Star Wars research programme for the same purpose.

As for the Soviet Union, it uses the achievements of foreign science and technology in a much more modest way. Though we have never concealed our desire to participate on a broader scale in the international division of labour and to develop scientific and technological cooperation—all the more so since we are going to this “market” not as supplicants, not empty-handed.

Those selling the idea of the USSR allegedly being consumed with a thirst for US technology forget who they are dealing with and what the Soviet Union is today. Having won technological independence after the revolution, it has long been enjoying the status of a great scientific and technological power. This enabled us to make it through World War Two, to be the first to blaze the trail in space and to undertake space research on a large scale, to acquire a reliable defence potential, and on the whole, to successfully develop the country’s productive forces. Incidentally, how are we to understand the following inconsistency in the US reasoning? To substantiate increased military spending, all they do in the US is talk about the fantastic achievements of the USSR in the field of technology. When, on the other hand, they need an excuse for prohibitive measures, they portray us as a backward country of yokels with which to trade and, moreover, to cooperate would mean undermining one’s own “national security”. So where is the truth? What is one to believe?

We speak openly about our dissatisfaction with the scientific and technological level of this or that type of products. Yet, we are counting on accelerating scientific and technological progress not through “technological transfusions” from the US to the USSR, but through “transfusions” of the most advanced ideas, discoveries and innovations from Soviet science to Soviet industry and agriculture, through more effective use of our own scientific and technological potential. That is the thrust of our plans and programmes. At the same time, we would, naturally, not like to forego those additional advantages which are provided by reciprocal scientific and technological cooperation with other countries, including the United States.

The 1970s have seen fairly broad development of such cooperation in the energy field, including nuclear power, in chemistry, space research, cardiology, oncology, and other fields. The bene-

fit was mutual and US scientists are well aware of it. This cooperation has by now come to naught. We regret it but let me assure you that we will survive because we have first-class science of our own, and because the United States is far from having a monopoly on scientific and technological achievements.

By the way, the US, being aware of this, is trying to apply growing pressure on its allies so that they, too, should not trade with us in science-intensive products. What is more, the United States, under the very same "national security" pretext, places a ban on deliveries of some types of such products to Western Europe and ever more frequently denies access to US laboratories and scientific symposia to representatives of Western Europe.

This is, of course, intended to cause damage to us. But it is not the only objective. The bogey of a "Soviet threat" is also used more and more broadly by the United States in its competitive struggle with its allies to slow down their scientific and technological progress and thus to undermine their competitive positions in the world market. Those designs are becoming increasingly clear. But I do not think that others will put up with the status of non-equal partners who would serve as a source of technology while being restricted to a subsistence diet themselves. Overall, this is short-sighted and futile practice.

Yet I would not wish to end our interview on a negative note. It is quite obvious that should such two countries as the United States and the USSR, with their immense scientific and technological potentials, continue to cooperate in this area on an equitable basis, this would benefit, besides our two peoples, the whole world.

I should like to take this opportunity to convey to the readers of your magazine wishes of good endeavour, happiness and a peaceful future. On behalf of the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people, I would like once again to tell Americans the most important thing they must know: war will not come from the Soviet Union, we will never start war.

* * *

Mikhail Gorbachev. I would like to express some views which, I believe, are of great importance for a correct understanding of the problems dealt with in the text.

I must say that lately I have received quite a few requests for statements and interviews from the mass media in various countries. Why was the decision taken to respond to the request precisely of *Time* magazine?

When I read your questions I thought that their very wording expressed a certain concern in connection with the nature of the relations now taking shape between our two countries. It is not often that we hear an expression of alarm on this score from representatives of American political and other circles. I thought that such a nature of the questions received (if I understood it correctly) is a very important element.

There is yet another reason, a no less important one. It is connected with our assessment of the situation that has taken shape in the world today. This situation is complex, tense, and I would even say explosive. In addition, it has a tendency to become still worse. I will not speak here about the causes of this process. You know very well our point of view on this matter. I would rather answer the question of where all of us are at present, what kind of world we are living in. I don't want in the least to dramatise the situation. But I intend to be frank with you because much depends on its assessment by both sides. We believe that with regard to the leaders of such powers as the US and the USSR, their analysis of the situation and their practical policy should be permeated with a sense of the tremendous responsibility that lies with them in regard to their own peoples and the whole of mankind.

It is a reality of our time that the level of development in science and technology makes it possible for a totally new situation to arise and a totally new stage of the arms race to begin. I tried to reply frankly to your questions and I ask you not to regard my replies as a new dose of "propaganda". It is a fact it is already very difficult for the United States and the Soviet Union to come to terms, to take some steps towards each other. The mutual mistrust is so great. And if the arms race enters a new stage, if the latest achievements in science and technology are used in practice for these purposes, will not one of the sides feel tempted to use its imagined superiority over the other side in order to get a free rein and to take the fateful step? This is a stage filled with the gravest responsibilities.

But however acute our bilateral relations are, some limitations

nevertheless continue to operate today—the existence of military-strategic parity that ensures for both sides a certain degree of security, the ABM treaty, the SALT-II treaty that is being observed in practice, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, and the treaty banning nuclear tests in three environments. These limitations do exist and exert their influence. But, as is known, attempts to undermine them are already being made: forces have been brought into play that strive to remove these limitations impeding a further spiralling of the arms race.

Were all these restraining factors to vanish the competition in the development of ever newer and newer types of weapons would proceed with unprecedented force. For all the steps taken in this respect by one side would be countered by steps taken by the other side. The appearance of a poison is followed by the appearance of an antidote. This is a lesson of history that must not be ignored.

At what then will we arrive?

I would put it this way: time is running out, the train might leave if we do not act fast enough. This is the second motive behind my consent to reply to the questions of *Time* magazine.

All people want to live, nobody wants to die. So it is necessary to muster political courage and stop the sinister process that is developing. It is necessary to stop the arms race, to start disarmament and the improvement of relations.

During the conversation with the delegation of the United States Congress headed by Speaker O'Neill that visited Moscow, I already had the opportunity to say that we are resolutely for an improvement in Soviet-American relations. This is our leadership's point of view. We draw sober, realistic conclusions from the existing situation. It is an indisputable fact that we not only call for an improvement of the situation, for an improvement of relations but that we make absolutely concrete proposals and also take practical steps in this direction. Naturally, in so doing we expect an appropriate response from the American side.

Unfortunately, in response to all our attempts to break out of the vicious circle of the arms race and mutual suspicion we hear only a negative answer: "No No! No! Propaganda! Propaganda! Propaganda!" But really that is not the way serious politicians behave with their partners.

Nevertheless we hold that all that we have heard from Washington about the latest steps of the Soviet Union, including our proposals designed to revive the deadlocked talks on the non-militarisation of outer space, on strategic nuclear arms and on medium-range arms, our decision to stop nuclear explosions, etc., is not the American Administration's final word. We hope for this.

Gentlemen, I regard this part of our conversation, when we are talking here looking one another in the eyes, as the most important one. We hope that the American public will be clearly and honestly informed of our understanding of the situation existing in the world and in Soviet-American relations, of our understanding of how one must act in this situation.

Our countries simply cannot afford to allow matters to reach a confrontation. Herein lies the genuine interest of both the Soviet and American people. And this must be expressed in the language of practical politics. It is necessary to stop the arms race, to tackle disarmament, to normalise Soviet-American relations. Honestly, it is time to make these relations between the two great peoples worthy of their historic role. For the destiny of the world, the destiny of world civilisation really depend on our relations. We are prepared to work in this direction.

The situation is also becoming especially acute because the political atmosphere in Washington, judging by the information that reaches us, is being inflamed further every day. Statements are being made that cannot but give rise to surprise and indignation.

The White House and some representatives of the American Administration are intimating that any accords with the Soviet Union on the limitation of the arms race are out of the question. The most that can be counted on, they declare, is the mutual acquaintance of the leaders of the two countries and the drafting of an agenda for discussion in the coming years and even decades. For example, an interview by such representatives of the US Administration as Armacost and Tower, published a couple of days ago, is couched in this spirit. In short, everything is being done to ward off in advance any possibility of accords between the US and the USSR on ending the arms race and preventing the militarisation of outer space. It is stated in Washington with utter frankness: whatever the Soviet Union does, the

US under any circumstances will create space strike weapons and anti-satellite systems. That's really "nailing" something: first you break off the nailheads and then ask somebody to pull them out with his teeth.

What is to be done in this case? It is necessary to stop this process. That will be in the interests of both the Soviet Union and the United States.

Countless attempts were made in the past to force the Soviet Union to its knees, to exhaust it. All those attempts failed and all such attempts in the future will fail too.

As far as we are concerned, we are not declaring the US an "evil empire". We know what the United States is, what the American people are, and what their role in the world is. We are for a new, better stage in our relations. But if matters reach the qualitatively new stage in the arms race, to which I have already referred, it will be much more difficult, if at all possible, to solve such a task. That is why we call on the United States seriously to reach agreement with us on strategic nuclear arms, on medium-range arms and on problems of outer space.

Well, it seems I have said what was the most important. I would like now to hand over to you the signed text of my replies to the questions of *Time* magazine so that nobody could accuse you of printing anonymous replies. I draw your attention to the fact that the cover is green, so there is not even a hint of any export of revolution.

Henry Grunwald. Mr. General Secretary, we are happy to be here to get this interview. We are grateful for the time you generously have given us to state your thoughts in connection with your written replies. We, too, are concerned about US-Soviet relations, and not only we.

You have spoken just now about certain people in Washington who want to undermine US-Soviet relations. But President Reagan himself has said on a number of occasions that he is not hostile towards the Soviet Union, that he is seeking to improve relations with it and not to achieve superiority over your country. Do you accept these assurances? And generally, what is your impression about President Reagan?

Mikhail Gorbachev. To a certain extent I have already mentioned this in written replies. We took note of a number of the

President's positive pronouncements in 1983 and 1984, including his speech in the United Nations. We took note of his statements that nuclear war is impermissible, that there will be no victors in it. This is very important. We also paid attention to his words that the US does not seek to attain military superiority over the USSR. These and other positive elements in the President's remarks, it seems to us, offer the possibility to peer jointly into the future, to overcome the present negative phase in our relations. We believe that it is still possible to set many things right by going halfway down the road towards each other. That is why we consented to the meeting with the President in Geneva. For the same reason we react so acutely to what is being said today in Washington in connection with that meeting. As an American woman journalist put it, it is intended to work up the American public to such a state that even if the accord reached in Geneva will only be on an exchange of ballet companies, people will applaud.

We are in a serious mood and are preparing serious proposals for that meeting—whatever is said by right-wing and other personalities around President Reagan. We would not have agreed to the meeting if we did not have faith in the possibility of its positive outcome. This is our position.

You have also asked about my personal opinion of the President. I have not met with him and it is difficult for me to express any opinion of him in human terms. In political terms, however, we proceed from the fact that the President was elected by the American people, which is respected by our people, and we are prepared to do business with him.

Henry Grunwald. Let me ask a question concerning space weapons. Both in your written replies to our questions and in the conversation with us you said that the Soviet Union is for reaching accords in three areas—strategic offensive arms, medium-range nuclear arms and space-based arms. Yet, from the commentaries coming from Moscow, there is an impression that you leave no room for talks on the problem of space weapons because you insist on completely stopping all activity with regard to this type of weapons, beginning with research. So I want to ask if the Soviet Union is prepared to conduct talks on space weapons. It is known that you have conducted and are conducting extensive research in this field and, therefore, evidently realise that it is im-

possible to stop this activity entirely on the strength of talks. It is possible only to reach accord on some agreed-upon levels or limits.

Mikhail Gorbachev. A very fundamental question. If there is no ban on the militarisation of outer space, if an arms race in space is not prevented, then there will be nothing left at all. This is our firm position. It is based on our exceedingly careful appraisal, which takes into account both our interests and those of the United States. We are prepared to conduct talks not on space weapons, not on what specific types of these weapons will be allowed to be deployed in outer space, but on preventing an arms race in outer space.

The Soviet Union proposed in Geneva that agreement be reached on the prohibition of the development of space strike weapons, including research, testing and deployment. It is necessary for a ban to embrace every phase of the inception of this new class of armaments. Research, indeed, is a part of the programme to develop space weapons and when we see that the United States allocates tens of billions of dollars for this research, we absolutely clearly understand the real intention of the authors of those programmes, and the eventual goal of the policy on the deployment of weapons in space that stems from those programmes.

When we speak about research and the need to ban it, we naturally do not mean basic research. This research is going on and, obviously, will continue. What we refer to is the development projects in the USA carried out under assignments and contracts from the Defence Department; moreover, we have in mind those which have reached a point when models and experimental prototypes are bound to appear and when out-of-laboratory field experiments and tests are to be conducted. In short, we refer to everything necessary for the subsequent stage of designing and producing appropriate systems. When the US asks us if it is possible to verify compliance with an appropriate ban, we say that it is. Verification with the help of national technical means is possible at the stage I have just described. If we now can discern car licence plates from space, we will most certainly be able to monitor out-of-laboratory field tests. The main point is that if the process is stopped already in the initial phase of this so-called research, any interest in the subsequent stages of

the development of space weapons will disappear. Who will then be willing to squander resources?

However, if tens of billions of dollars are spent on research, no one, naturally, would like to stop halfway. And when weapons are ultimately deployed in space, the process will get out of hand altogether. We will reach a situation, as I have already said, whose consequences it is even impossible to predict.

And you can be certain that the other side will not be sitting on its hands.

Talk about the purely research nature of the SDI is basically meant to conceal the extensive process of the development of space-based weapons systems.

The fact that the United States is already planning to test second-generation ASAT systems is fraught with serious consequences. We will have to react to this adequately. In fact, what it amounts to is the testing of certain components of space-based ABM systems. Moreover, we have to take into account Washington's negative attitude to our proposal that the USA join our moratorium on nuclear explosions.

The US government also refuses to stop tests because it needs them to develop nuclear pumping for ABM laser systems. But these are components of a future space-based ABM system. And what will happen if the programme is put into top gear? Let America think seriously about the consequences of this.

Perhaps, someone in the USA has decided that there has appeared a possibility to overtake us, to put the squeeze on the Soviet Union. But this is an illusion. It was unsuccessful in the past, and it will be unsuccessful now. We will find a response, and quite an adequate one at that. But then all talks will come to an end and I do not know when it will be possible to resume them. Perhaps this prospect is to the liking of the US military-industrial complex but we, at any rate, are not going to play into its hands.

Our proposals meet the interests of both the Soviet people and the people of the USA. And this is precisely what irritates representatives of the military-industrial complex most of all. One must say that there are many of them in the USA, quite a few in the government too, and we are obviously sensitive to this. But I must say that we have a huge reserve of constructiveness. We will continue to urge the US government to take a different

approach. Great opportunities would then be opened up for reducing strategic nuclear arms and medium-range systems alike and the way would be clear for the serious process of improving relations between our countries and for resolving other international problems.

When I was in Dnepropetrovsk recently, a worker asked: What are these Star Wars plans made by President Reagan? Won't the USA deceive us? I replied: Don't worry, we will not let ourselves be deceived. But if our partners in the talks show readiness to look for mutually acceptable solutions, we will make every effort to reciprocate.

I think our position is humane and unselfish: it fully meets the interests of the Soviet Union, the USA, and all other peoples as well.

Don't you Americans have any better use for your money? We know that you have problems which must be solved. Perhaps, we do not know them as well as we do our own, but we do know them.

Ray Cave. I would like to ask two questions. I have sensed concern in your words about certain events related to US statements and actions during the past few weeks. I have in mind, specifically, the announcement of the forthcoming ASAT test and also the very strange case involving chemicals, with which Americans were allegedly sprayed in Moscow. Apparently, these two events cannot be considered auspicious in the context of intensive preparations for the forthcoming US-Soviet summit. Have these two events come as a surprise to you and have they seriously damaged summit preparations?

Mikhail Gorbachev. As for the Geneva summit, I can assure you that we are seriously preparing for it, attaching immense importance to that meeting, and pinning great hopes on it. Admittedly, we hear our partners' pronouncements, which show that Washington attaches a more modest importance to the summit, characterises it as a mere "get acquainted" meeting where it might be possible to draw up an agenda for some future, distant talks. But it is too great a luxury for the leaders of two states, such as the Soviet Union and the USA, to go to Geneva merely to get acquainted and then admire Lake Geneva and the Swiss Alps. When the international situation is so tense, this would be an unpardonable extravagance.

In short, we are seriously preparing for the meeting and will do everything possible for it to yield tangible results for the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the USA.

Ray Cave. In a magazine article published this week, former President Nixon says, in particular, that an agreement limiting or reducing arms, but not linked to restraints on political conduct, would not contribute to peace. In a word, Nixon probably thinks that the first priority is not the problems of arms control, but potential strained points between the US and the Soviet Union. What do you think about this?

Mikhail Gorbachev. It was interesting to hear from you about Mr. Nixon's point of view. We are working in contact with the US Department of State and the White House on the specific issues we will discuss with President Reagan in Geneva. This process is going on and I would not like to go into details at this stage.

But I have associations of a different nature with Nixon's name. There was a time when, despite a complex situation, we managed to find possibilities and ways for developing cooperation with the US government under Nixon. Very important decisions were taken at that time.

Recall the 1960s. The international situation was not simple at that time either. But it was in 1963 that a very important treaty was concluded that banned nuclear tests in the three environments. This treaty is still in effect today.

All of this belongs to history. But history is meaningful only when its lessons are not wasted. So now we must look at the situation from the responsible positions of statesmanship and find ways to improve the situation and to smooth out Soviet-US relations.

Henry Grunwald. Let me ask you a personal question. You have initiated quite a new style of leadership in the Soviet Union. You have gone out and met many people, and been very visible. Do you enjoy such a style of work and what benefits does it bring?

Mikhail Gorbachev. First, it was Lenin who taught us this style. He constantly spoke about the need to live in the midst of the masses, to lend an ear to them, sense their sentiments and reflect their aspirations in practical politics. So the priority in this belongs to Lenin, and such personalities appear only once in a century.

Second, this practice is not new to me. I behaved this way when I was working in Stavropol Territory, and here, in Moscow, before I was elected to my present post. Many people among us work in the same way. Perhaps, the press is now giving more publicity and more extensive coverage to my trips and meetings with people.

On the whole, we have a need for precisely this style of work. We are faced with problems, and rather big ones, too. They should be solved and solved in a new way. In the course of recent years we have been analysing the present stage of our development, and there is a need to acquaint the working people with conclusions at which we have arrived, to check them out on the attitudes of people, and then submit them to the upcoming congress of our party.

So the point is not so much whether I like this style or not, but rather that it is impossible to work in a different way now if we wish to achieve practical results in the policy we have worked out.

Henry Grunwald. Another personal question. You have initiated rather deep changes in Soviet society. Many officials have been replaced in this process and obviously this will continue. Are people afraid of you?

Mikhail Gorbachev. I don't think so. What is being done in our country now has not been conceived by myself alone. It reflects the consensus of our entire leadership. We are convinced that we are acting correctly. These problems are ripe and must be solved. The main conclusion one arrives at as a result of talking to people is that our proposals and practical steps are wholeheartedly supported. Moreover, in the Party and among the population, there is a desire to act at a still faster pace. We believe it is necessary to show courage and resolution, but at the same time also caution. We shall continue acting in the spirit of high responsibility to our people. And people demand from us a firm policy, so that words should not differ from deeds. In this sense we are strictly controlled. The fact that we are now acting in an atmosphere of greater openness puts our democracy into a still greater relief. So it is not a matter of people being afraid. Quite the contrary, they welcome our approach.

I don't want you, however, to think that I am trying to present everything in a rosy light. A profound process is taking place in our country. It requires much readjustment from all of us.

Naturally, this affects people, administrative personnel, and has a bearing on everyone's work methods. The replacement of some officials does not mean that we have an extraordinary situation. This is a natural process and it is bad only when this process stops.

So the point is not that some of the personnel changes reflect a political struggle around the questions we are solving now. We believe that readjustment is required from everyone and everywhere—from us, in the republics, in the regions, in every work collective. This will, naturally, require vast efforts from the Party. But since the line we have taken reflects the needs that have arisen, it is resolutely supported by our people. This gives us confidence that we are acting correctly.

In conclusion I would like to express an idea which can be regarded as cardinal to our entire conversation. It was said justly that foreign policy is an extension of domestic policy. Since this is so, I would ask you to give some thought to the following: since we are undertaking such challenging domestic plans, what external conditions can we be interested in? I leave it to you to provide the answer.

Henry Grunwald warmly thanked Mikhail Gorbachev for the reception and the conversation.

**Speech at the Dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace
in Honour of J. Batmunh, General Secretary
of the Central Committee
of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party
and Chairman of the People's Great Hural
of the Mongolian People's Republic**

August 29, 1985

Dear Comrade Batmunh,

Dear Comrades,

Our working meeting is drawing to a close. I think there is every reason to be satisfied with its results. It has been yet another indication of complete mutual understanding and confidence between the leadership of the CPSU and the MPRP.

In the conversation we have had we told each other, like comrades, about the work and plans of our brother Parties and countries. The Soviet Communists and all Soviet people are glad that the working people of Mongolia, under the MPRP's leadership, are successfully carrying out the resolutions of the 18th Party Congress and of the subsequent Plenary Meetings of its Central Committee and are working hard to accelerate their country's social and economic progress. With all our hearts, we wish our Mongolian friends further success in confidently advancing towards new frontiers in the construction of socialism.

In the course of our meeting, we have substantially reviewed Soviet-Mongolian relations. It is well known that the friendship and alliance of our Parties, countries and peoples have deep historical roots and a sound internationalist foundation. Close cooperation, which the great Lenin and the leader of the Mongolian Revolution, Sukhe-Bator, called on us to maintain, has been invariably on the increase. It embraces literally every area of life today. One distinguishing feature of Soviet-Mongolian relations at the present stage is that it involves the widest sections of the working people united by an understanding of the community

of the historical destinies of our peoples and by a mutual feeling of sympathy and respect.

While giving its due to what has been achieved we are now concentrating our efforts on enhancing the effect of Soviet-Mongolian cooperation in the political, economic, social, cultural and other fields.

An important step toward this has been taken today with the signing of the Long-Term Programme for the Promotion of Economic, Scientific and Technological Cooperation between the Soviet Union and Mongolia for the period ending in the year 2000. It is a document of great political importance. Its implementation will make it possible to make fuller use of the potentialities and reserves of Soviet-Mongolian relationship, pool our efforts and experience, our resources and knowledge more rationally for building up the economic potential and advancing the well-being of the working people. And that responds not only to the basic interests of the peoples of our two countries but also to the common objectives of strengthening the positions of the socialist community.

Today's meeting proves once again that we are at one with our Mongolian friends in the assessment of the present international situation. Through the fault of imperialism, it remains tense and demands the vigilance of all those concerned with the present and the future of humanity.

What I said applies in full measure to the Asian and Pacific region, the developments in which are of close concern both to the Soviet Union and to Mongolia. The militarist activity of imperialist states there is acquiring growing dimensions. There are hundreds of American military installations in the Far East at present and the second strongest overseas grouping of the US Armed Forces.

Japan, whose government has been voicing its readiness to cooperate in the American Star Wars programme, is increasingly hitching itself up to the US war chariot. This course of events means aggravating instability in the region, enlarging the old hotbeds of military-political tension and breeding more conflict situations.

The need to oppose the intrigues of imperialism and reaction in Asia should be particularly stressed now when the peoples in the Asian-Pacific region together with progressives all over the

world are marking the 40th anniversary of the victory over Japanese militarism. The growing activities of the anti-war forces in that region are a convincing indicator of the mounting concern felt by public opinion in the Asian countries for the destinies of the world.

The Soviet Union, Mongolia and other socialist countries have in the recent period put forward a series of specific initiatives aimed at normalising the situation in Asia and the Pacific area. The decision taken by the Soviet Government to unilaterally cease all nuclear explosions as of August 6, 1985 meets the vital security interests of all peoples in the world. This decision is of particular significance for the Asian-Pacific region: it is here that both American atomic bombs were dropped.

Recently this country has come forward with a proposal that a general and comprehensive approach be elaborated to security problems of Asia. Its substance is that all Asian countries should combine their efforts, regardless of their social system, to ensure peace and stability. This proposal stems from the fundamental principles of the Leninist foreign policy followed by the CPSU, which was the first in history to proclaim the idea of peaceful coexistence. This proposal takes into account the entire totality of experience accumulated in various parts of the world in the efforts to ease tensions and achieve detente.

We realise, of course, that there are difficulties, and considerable ones, in the way of consolidating peace in the Asian-Pacific region. They are due to contradictions between states of the region and to their different approaches to existing problems. But peoples of Asia are linked by common vital interests and tackle largely similar tasks engendered by the past and facing them as they look to the future, and this is more important. It is this which dictates the necessity of cooperation and good-neighbourly relations built on a broad-based concept of security which would conform to the interests of all and each country in the region.

As we see it, such a concept could incorporate the five principles of peaceful coexistence formulated previously by Asian countries, the ten principles of Bandung, a number of the initiatives of the Soviet Union, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the countries of Indochina, India and other states of the region on the problems of

security in Asia, on transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace, and others.

Asian security would no doubt be strengthened if the nuclear powers ceased all nuclear weapon tests everywhere, including Asia and the Pacific and Indian oceans, and if the states of the region refused to take part in the plans to militarise space.

Needless to say, these provisions can be developed and supplemented by collective efforts. Noteworthy, for example, are proposals on the non-use of force, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries in the region, on the implementation of confidence-building measures in the military-political field, and some others.

Elaboration and putting into effect of a concept for Asian security is obviously a long-term task. Its implementation needs a stage-by-stage approach—from the simpler to the more complicated. As for the Soviet Union, it will treat with understanding any proposals prompted by genuine concern for peace and security in Asia.

Dear Mongolian friends, we are meeting in a momentous period when preparations have begun in our countries for Party congresses. These preparations are keynoted by the adherence of the working people of the Soviet Union and Mongolia to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. These ideas, which have united us forever, are inspiring us to tireless work in the name of socialism and peace.

Allow me to wish you, dear Comrade Batmunh, the leadership of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, and the entire fraternal Mongolian people fresh and great successes in this work, happiness and prosperity.

**To the Participants in the International Conference
“Forty Years of the Victory
over Japanese Militarism
and the Tasks of the Peace Movement
in the Countries of Asia and the Pacific”**

I cordially greet the participants in the international conference who have gathered in the city of Khabarovsk, a major centre in the Soviet Far East, for an exchange of views on topical questions of peace and security in the countries of Asia and the Pacific.

Your meeting is timed to coincide with a red-letter date—the 40th anniversary of the rout of Japanese militarism and the victorious conclusion of the Second World War. The great victory that was attained at the cost of tremendous sacrifices delivered many peoples of the Asian-Pacific region from odious foreign occupation and created the prerequisites for a powerful upsurge of the anti-colonial struggle and for their attaining political independence and state sovereignty. It also rid the Japanese people of the tyranny of the fascist military clique and provided them an opportunity for peaceful development.

Five principles of peaceful coexistence (Pancha Shila) were formulated and proclaimed in the ancient Asian land on the basis of the tragic experience of the past war; they have won worldwide recognition as a norm of relations between states with different social systems. It was here that the spirit of Bandung emerged, initiating the Afro-Asian solidarity and the non-aligned movements, which have today become an important element of international politics.

Today, with the threat of a worldwide nuclear catastrophe hanging over the planet, there is no task more urgent than safeguarding peace on Earth. The militarist circles of imperialism are pursuing an aggressive policy in this vast region; they are

hatching plans to turn it into an arena of military-political confrontation with the socialist and many non-aligned countries, and are working towards the remilitarisation of Japan and the formation of an aggressive Washington—Tokyo—Seoul grouping.

These dangerous plans and aggressive preparations are being countered by the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries and by the growing dedication of the Asian peoples to the idea of turning Asia into a zone of peace and security, a zone of equitable and mutually beneficial international cooperation. This goal is also pursued by the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions effective August 6—the day of the barbaric atomic bombing of Hiroshima by American aviation.

The Soviet Union has advanced many specific proposals to defuse the situation on the Asian continent and to establish there the spirit of peaceful coexistence and good-neighbourliness, and respect for the sovereignty, and non-interference in the affairs of other states.

The USSR values highly and supports the constructive peace initiatives of other Asian countries dealing with various aspects of the security of the continent as a whole or the improvement of the situation in its separate regions. It is our hope that the Asian states will pool their efforts to elaborate a joint, comprehensive approach to the problem of security throughout Asia and the adjacent waters of the Pacific and Indian oceans.

I am certain that the socio-political forces and organisations in the countries of Asia and the Pacific together with all the progressives of the planet will be more vigorous in their fight to halt the arms race, eliminate the threat of a world nuclear war and nuclear weapons, and to ameliorate the international situation.

I wish your conference every success.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, September 5, 1985

To the Indian Institute for Non-Aligned Studies

Sincere thanks to the executives of the Indian Institute for Non-Aligned Studies for their warm, friendly message, and their ardent expression of support for the peaceful foreign-policy initiatives of the Soviet Union, designed to relieve international tensions and remove the threat of nuclear war.

I would like to remind you that to create favourable conditions for the conclusion of an international treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, the Soviet Union has repeatedly offered countries possessing nuclear arms to agree on a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Unfortunately, this has not been achieved so far. Our latest initiative on this score did not please all people in the West. The US Administration shows no inclination to follow the example of the Soviet Union, which has unilaterally stopped nuclear explosions until the end of the year. Washington is carrying on with its policy of escalating the arms race, and is continuing nuclear testing. Yet, if the USA joined our initiative, this would extend the moratorium we have set, and greatly improve the chances of settling the whole issue of a nuclear test ban.

I would like to stress that the Soviet Union has been insistent-ly working for the destruction of nuclear arms ever since they appeared. We will continue our steady search for ways of eliminating the nuclear war threat and our drive for world peace.

Practical disarmament measures would release colossal resources that could be put to use for the peaceful advancement of mankind, including the solution of such acute problems as poverty, hunger, disease, and illiteracy, which are still unresolved in many

countries that only recently were targets of colonial exploitation and plunder.

Soviet people hold in high esteem India's contribution to the struggle for peace and international security. The voice of the peaceloving 700-million-strong people of India is heeded not only in Asia but also far outside it. A recognised leader of the non-aligned movement, India is doing a good deal for its consolidation and growth.

We are deeply convinced that the dynamically developing friendship and cooperation between the USSR and India, their commitment to peace, are an important factor working for the prevention of thermonuclear war and the maintenance of life on Earth.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, September 7, 1985

Address on French Television

September 30, 1985

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen,

Good evening, dear friends,

I am glad to have an opportunity to meet the French television viewers on the eve of the visit to your country. I must say that I am looking forward with much interest to this new meeting with France, its people, political leaders and public figures.

I share the opinion of the President of the Republic that the forthcoming meeting is of a special character for many reasons. We will, certainly, judge it by its results, but now I will say that we are preparing for the meeting with a sense of great responsibility, and, on our part, will do our utmost to make it a fruitful one.

As far as bilateral relations are concerned, we are convinced that development of Soviet-French cooperation accords with the vital interests of both peoples. The best proof of that is historical experience. When Russia and France, and the Soviet Union and France cooperated, this served the best interests of both countries, as well as the interests of Europe as a whole and of the entire world, for that matter. And, reversely, alienation and enmity were detrimental to our national interests and adversely affected the international atmosphere.

Mikhail Gorbachev received Yves Mourousi, Alain d'Anvers and Dominique Bromberger, correspondents of the French TV company TF 1, in Moscow in connection with his official visit to France.

This is the text of Mikhail Gorbachev's address to French TV viewers and his replies to the questions TF 1 representatives put to him.

One cannot blot out of history the fact that Soviet people and French people were brothers-in-arms in the struggle against fascism. We would betray the memory of the fallen in that sacred struggle if we forgot how French pilots of the Normandie-Niemen regiment heroically fought against the fascists in Soviet skies and how Soviet partisans fought in the ranks of the Maquisards on French soil. Over twenty million Soviet people died in that terrible war, and they died for our and your freedom. French people, too, sacrificed their lives for your and our freedom. More than twenty thousand Soviet anti-fascist fighters are buried in France. I know that their memory is revered in your country. The Soviet people are grateful to you for that.

But it is not only that joint victory that brings the Soviet and French peoples closer together. Our cooperation in many fields—in the economy and trade, literature and the arts—has had deep roots down the ages. All this indicates that our relations rest on good foundations and good traditions and have deep roots. Development and strengthening of these relations, and I say this with great confidence, serves our common interests. It is most important not only to continue, but also to deepen the dialogue, accord and cooperation between the USSR and France.

On the whole, as it seems to us, our relations are shaping up fairly well. The volume of our trade has grown fourfold in the last ten years. We are gratified by that. And I believe this also serves the best interests of France. But our economic relations could be more active and diversified. This is how we consider the matter. The same applies to cooperation in science and technology, an impressive symbol of which was the joint flight of Soviet and French cosmonauts. The exchanges in the fields of culture and education, tourism and public contacts are fruitful.

I hope that the forthcoming Soviet-French meeting will give a fresh impetus to the development of political, trade, economic, scientific, technical, cultural and other relations between the Soviet Union and France. But we regard this meeting as a major event not only in bilateral relations. Accord and cooperation, as was written down in the Principles of Soviet-French Relations in 1971, are to become a "permanent policy in their relations and a permanent factor in international life".

Another reason for the urgency of my meeting with President Mitterrand is the aggravation of the international situation. There is little comfort in what is happening in the world today. At any rate, judging by deeds and not by words, international tensions are growing. The threat of nuclear missile catastrophe is not decreasing. We must face this bitter truth. Mountains of arms have been stockpiled. Yet their production and modernisation are being stepped up. Europe is literally crammed with military bases and deadly weapons. Today it is an understatement to say that it is a "powder keg". It is a much more explosive centre of the latest means for the destruction of human beings. But even this does not seem to be enough: new gigantic armament programmes and the most dangerous strategic concepts are being feverishly drawn up and put into practice, although Europe is too small and too fragile for power politics. As is the whole of our planet Earth, for that matter.

I am saying all this because I believe that today nobody has the right to be a passive observer of what is going on. So much distrust and suspicion have accumulated in the world that it will apparently take quite a lot of effort and time to clear away the barriers. But without that, without an appropriate—I would say—psychological change and, certainly, without political will it will be difficult, if not impossible, to change the situation for the better. The destiny of every nation, of every person, whether an ordinary citizen or a political leader, is being decided in the foreign policy field now.

To survive and ensure a future for our children and grandchildren we have to curb the forces of madness, the forces of war and militarism. The flames of war should be doused before they flare up.

Can it be done? We believe it can. We already have positive experience on which we can rely—the success of detente. And that success has preserved its vital force. Consistent observance of all provisions of the Helsinki Final Act can again improve the climate in Europe and disperse the clouds that have gathered over the continent.

Voltaire dreamt of the triumph of reason as an indispensable condition for normal human relations. This call by the great son of France is particularly timely today when the cross-bow and sword have been replaced by nuclear weapons. We will

have time enough to find out whose ideology, whose views and laws are more ethical, whose economy is more rational. History will have enough time for a peaceful competition of ways of life which will give people an opportunity to make a choice voluntarily, on their own, to determine what social system is more to their liking. Yes, we are different, but nothing can be done about that; such is the will of history.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is doing and will continue to do everything in its power to live in peace with the states belonging to other systems. Moreover, this is precisely the principle which underlies our approach to the solution of international problems. We are guided by that also in our domestic policy.

Now I will speak briefly about our domestic affairs. About 277 million people live in the Soviet Union today. Historical experience has convinced us that the peoples of Russia made the right choice in 1917 when they accomplished the revolution and put an end to exploitation and social and national oppression. Soviet people are proud of their country's achievements and, in particular, of the fact that for more than 50 years now there has been no unemployment in the country, and the right to work is enshrined in the Constitution and guaranteed by a system of corresponding social and economic measures. There is no deficit in the state budget.

Our people, like any other, want to have a better life and are gratified that in the past two decades real per capita incomes have doubled and that staple foodstuff prices have not increased. More than two million flats are built in the Soviet Union every year. Housing is provided free of charge, and the rent accounts for an average three per cent of a family's budget. The health of people and their spiritual development will remain our major concern. And we have achieved a good deal in this field. There are nearly 6 million engineers, 1.5 million scientific workers, and more than a million physicians in our country. A system of free education and health care has been established and is functioning.

The Soviet Union unites more than a hundred nations and nationalities. The affirmation of the principle of equality of nations in all spheres of society's life was one of the principal gains of the revolution. Of the 15 Union Republics and 38 autono-

mous administrative units, many were backward outlying regions at the time of the revolution. Today they not only enjoy equal economic and political rights, but have created powerful economies of their own and have made great strides in science, culture and education.

Soviet people are aware not only of their achievements and successes but also of their weaknesses and shortcomings. You probably know that all that is discussed in our society widely, openly and on a democratic basis. We consider it important to focus attention precisely on unsolved problems and are making every effort to accelerate the economic and social development of the country and to improve living standards. We respond decisively to negligence and irresponsibility. And, of course, we devote prime attention to seeing to it that the norms of social justice, the democratic rights of citizens and Soviet laws are strictly observed.

All these efforts are approved of by our people, moreover, the people demand of us, leaders, that we pursue precisely such a line. I know this from the many thousands of letters and from personal meetings and contacts with hundreds and hundreds of Soviet people.

To put it in a nutshell, we know the existing problems well. Some questions have been or are being solved while others require time, resources and persistent efforts. We are now dealing in a fundamental way with the questions of scientific and technological progress, and of improving methods of economic management. We have the resources to carry out the new tasks. These include highly-qualified personnel, natural resources, and a scientific and production potential. And the main thing is that our political course is widely supported by all sections of the population. We intend to submit further improvement measures for nationwide discussion.

Generally speaking, we shall come to our Party's forthcoming 27th Congress with a definite programme of action to better Soviet society, with plans for the coming five years and until the end of the century. We will peer with our mind's eye into the third millennium. The prospects that are opening up are vast. Suffice it to say that the amount of work to be done in industry alone in the forthcoming 15 years is equal to that which we have done over the almost seven decades of Soviet power.

I am saying this not only to acquaint French TV viewers with our everyday work and concerns. It seems important to me that in France and other countries people should have a clear idea of our system of priorities. If the main thing for us, Soviet people, is to develop the economy, social relations and democracy, this also determines our interests in the international arena and our foreign policy interests, above all our interest in peace and in a stable international situation which would make it possible to concentrate attention and resources on peaceful creative work.

We are determined opponents of the arms race on earth and of extending it to outer space. It is essential to stop this dangerous process and to get down to disarmament without delay.

I want to emphasise that we are not only making statements but are also acting precisely in that direction. We have unilaterally renounced first use of nuclear weapons and introduced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. We have suspended the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. We have told the whole world that we shall not be the first to go into outer space with weapons. Our country is ready for other radical solutions as well.

Well, just try without prejudice to think what is being done and said in reply to our initiatives. New nuclear explosions have been carried out, an anti-satellite weapon has been tested and a feverish drumming up of distrust for our initiatives is under way. I cannot help but feel that some people have been frightened by the very possibility that accords may be reached in Geneva, by the prospect that the production of weapons may have to be curtailed and military appetites moderated. But as the saying goes, we'll wait and see. Our patience will suffice us. But I want to be frank—all this is very far from a search for ways of improving the international situation.

As you see, quite a number of issues have accumulated in the world—issues that are disquieting and urgent. I intend to discuss them with the President of France most seriously. I hope our dialogue will be a fruitful one. I am convinced that the Soviet Union and France have a real possibility of making a tangible contribution to the cause of mutual understanding and cooperation among peoples. It is with this hope that I am going to France.

On behalf of the Soviet people I wish all TV viewers, all men and women of France, and all French families happiness, prosperity and peace.

The best of wishes to you all.

* * *

A. d'Anvers. Please accept our thanks for receiving us, Mr. Gorbachev. We are glad to meet you here regardless of the views you profess. You are a man of the modern age, a man of your time.

M. S. Gorbachev. I hope our meeting will take place in a spirit of mutual understanding and the traditional friendship which is characteristic of relations between our countries.

Question. You know that not everything will be easy during your visit to France. You are awaited in Paris both with interest and with, I would say, a certain wariness. They want to see what kind of man Mr. Gorbachev is. Also, questions of Soviet-French relations will be discussed both with regard to defence policy and human rights. What do you think on this score? Will you now have to revise some positions?

Answer. Why am I going to France on my first trip abroad, that is to the West? I have already tried briefly to answer this question in my address to TV viewers.

We are aware, of course, that there are likely to be people in France who may even frown at the way our relations are shaping up. And those relations are becoming dynamic, they are making progress and gaining momentum. What I have in mind is both the political dialogue and the broadening of economic ties and traditional cultural contacts. We proceed from the belief that this meets the vital interests of the Soviet people and the vital interests of the French people. This is the decisive thing and the rest are details. There are probably those in France who criticise us. Perhaps those critics would even like to lessen these good tendencies in the development of Soviet-French relations. But it is not to them that we are looking. I repeat, we are going to France because we think that this meets the vital interests of our countries, the goals of improving the international situation as a whole, and hence the interests of other peoples. Today we need more than ever before an active

political dialogue to remove the overlays of past years. We are different, true, and have different political systems and different views of human values, but we also have much in common. First of all, I think, what we have in common is a desire to live in a real world and to find ways of working together and cooperating in different fields, all the more so since all of us are worried today by the growing threat of nuclear conflict, by the arms race. We feel it is necessary and even essential to have such exchanges and discussions. And I think that France is a very important partner for the Soviet Union in this respect. We are going to France proceeding from these considerations and this understanding.

Question. Mr. General Secretary, there had undoubtedly been a period of coolness in Soviet-French relations—I mean the years 1983 and 1984. Was this an interim, which has become a thing of the past, or will something of it survive?

Answer. Let us look ahead and add new content to our relations, our political dialogue, our economic and trade cooperation and our cultural exchanges, let us broaden our cooperation, find and identify common interests and possibilities for joint or parallel actions in the interests of France and the Soviet Union, in the interests of the other nations.

You know, back in 1922 Vladimir Lenin said something which I have written down and decided to quote today. Perhaps I should have done so when I answered your first question as to why we are going to France. Lenin said in 1922: "Any rapprochement with France is something we very much desire. . ."¹ I think that the significance of these words by Lenin and of the idea they contain is fully preserved today.

Question. Regardless of what government France will have?

Answer. You know, every nation decides for itself what government to have and, respecting the sovereignty, the sovereign right of every nation, we must reckon with it in our foreign policy. We regard the friendly people of France with a great deal of trust and respect and will seek to maintain and develop rela-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Interview Given to Michael Farbman, *Observer* and *Manchester Guardian* Correspondent", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, 1973, p. 383.

tions with the present government, and with any possible future government.

There are periods in relations between states when something darkens. In our case, when we discuss Soviet-French relations, I would rather concentrate on what brings our peoples closer together. I think that this is the capital which enables us confidently to build today's relations, confidently to look ahead and invigorate our relations. This, I think, will promote both the interests of our countries and the cause of peace. Let us look forward.

Question. You met M. Marchais recently. Is it not paradoxical that at a time when the French Communists have withdrawn from the government and when they are criticising the French government, you are paying your first visit to M. Mitterrand in France?

Answer. I do not think it is. What is taking place in France is the business of the French, their internal affair. I know that those political forces which are governing the country today—I mean the Socialist Party and those who are allied with it—and also those who are in opposition are in varying degrees in favour of the development of Soviet-French relations on the basis of traditions, on the basis of experience accumulated over the years. I think that it is a responsible position. Our approach is the same.

Question. It seems you have excellent relations with all the Social Democratic governments in Europe, don't you?

Answer. We have been actively cooperating with Social Democratic parties during the past few years on questions which are worrying the peoples of the world today—I mean questions of war and peace. You must have noticed that meetings with delegations of Socialist and Social Democratic parties have accounted for a sizeable share of my meetings and talks during the past few months.

We think that our ideological differences are not an obstacle to cooperation in tackling such urgent problems as those of war and peace, and we for our part openly say so. We have good relations and maintain useful contacts with the Social Democrats in West Germany, Sweden and Finland and with the Socialist parties of Japan and Austria. Generally speaking, we are ready to cooperate with all forces which are interested in re-

versing the dangerous tendencies in the world situation and in leading the world onto the road of cooperation, interaction and mutual understanding.

Question. You seem to have been showing a special interest in Europe lately. Is this a correct impression?

Answer. The Soviet leadership has always kept in sight our relations with West European countries in pursuing its foreign policy. I would even say, it has kept them in the focus of its attention.

This is understandable. We all live in this continent of Europe. I think that West European countries have no less interest in developing relations with the Soviet Union and that the Soviet Union holds no less a prominent place in their foreign policies than they do in Soviet foreign policy. We have certain traditions. We have history from which we draw certain lessons, from which we are learning. Anyway, the Europeans are not wanting in wisdom. Whatever aspect of the development of human civilisation we take, the contribution made by the Europeans is immense. We live in the same house, though some use one entrance and others another. We need to cooperate and develop communications within that house. I think it is natural that the Soviet Union attaches much importance to this cooperation.

Question. A Gaullist approach?

Answer. I will not now debate with you over who set the precedent. The question of interaction, cooperation and promotion of relations with West European countries has always occupied an important place in Soviet foreign policy. That was long before de Gaulle, that major political figure, emerged.

Question. But reaction to steps taken by Western countries at times varies. Indeed, when some employees of Soviet organisations were accused of spying and asked to leave France, no special reaction came from the Soviet Union. But when the British recently charged a group of Soviet employees with spying, the reaction of the Soviet side was strong and energetic. One gets the impression that the Soviet side acts according to the principle of "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth". Do you divide the Europeans into good and bad ones?

Answer. I think you will recognise the sovereign right of the Soviet Union to take decisions in each case as it sees fit. In so

doing, we take into account both the interests of the Soviet Union and the overall situation.

Question. What do you think of the European project known as the Eureka project?

Answer. I want to go to Paris and to learn in detail about the Eureka project. Maybe later in Paris we will continue an exchange of opinions on this question.

Question. Do you a priori prefer the Eureka project to the Star Wars plans of the Strategic Defence Initiative?

Answer. A priori, we prefer non-militarisation of space to its militarisation. This is the main thing. If the Eureka project is pursuing peaceful goals—and this is just what we want to find out in our conversations with the President and other French officials—we will think over our attitude to that project.

Question. You have written a letter to Reagan. Have you put forward any new proposals?

Answer. Yes, we have.

Question. Could you tell us anything about these new proposals?

Answer. I think the Americans have already spoken about the main things. They always call on us to do everything in a confidential manner, but their patience lasts only as long as a meeting lasts. As soon as a meeting is over, the whole world learns within ten minutes what has taken place at the “confidential” meeting. At any rate the world gets to know the gist of it. That is why you must already have an idea of the matter. But I think we will still have discussions on this subject in France.

Question. What all this amounts to is a 40 per cent reduction in nuclear arms arsenals, doesn't it?

Answer. I don't think I'll answer this question now. These problems are now being presented in Geneva, and I would not like to answer your question before our delegation at the Geneva talks has presented our proposals in their entirety.

Question. Do you think that your forthcoming meeting with Reagan in Geneva in a few weeks' time can become something more than just a get-acquainted meeting?

Answer. It would be too great a luxury for the leaders of such countries as the Soviet Union and the United States of America in the present tense situation, with the peoples of the

world expecting definite, constructive steps primarily from the great powers, to go to Geneva just to exchange a handshake, to look at each other and to smile pleasantly in front of TV cameras. We ask our partners—I mean the President of the United States of America and his colleagues—to make thorough preparations for our meeting in Geneva so as to lay already during those preparations and at the meeting itself solid bricks in the edifice of future peace. We must build peace—but a different peace and different relations—proceeding from realities. We have our interests, France has its interests, and the United States of America has its interests. But who will say that the other states of the world have no interests of their own? And all those interests are colliding with each other on the world scene. To think that only one country or group of countries can act on that scene is to have a wrong idea of today's world. I think that much is caused by this lack of understanding. Realities must be reckoned with, they are a serious matter.

Question. Mr. General Secretary, you have lately been showing some signs of pessimism. You said in your address to the French people that the threat of nuclear catastrophe is not decreasing. You also said in one of your interviews earlier that it might become too late and that the world situation was becoming explosive. When talking in this way, you had in mind mostly the SDI. But the SDI is still a thing of the future. Why then do you think that the threat to peace now is graver than it was before?

Answer. This is the most important question and it must be answered precisely now.

When we say that we have reached a point beyond which events may get out of hand, it is not a sign of pessimism. It is a manifestation of the responsibility the Soviet state and its leadership feel for the future of the world. There are those who stand to lose if the peoples understand the situation as it actually is. But we have now reached a point as a result of scientific and technological progress when the arms race can spill over into space. We have reached a point when new types of weapons, not even nuclear ones, but no less powerful and efficient, if we may talk about efficiency in such a case, can be developed.

Frankly, it is very difficult to begin talks even now. You must

have noticed that a kind of militarisation of political consciousness is taking place. And what happens if the militarisation of space begins tomorrow and if space strike weapons are developed? What should the logical answer of the other side to such actions be? Surely not steps that would mean the beginning of disarmament in strategic weapons and other nuclear systems. We should face realities squarely and see how the situation is shaping up. These are very serious matters and they must not be camouflaged with demagoguery, if you'll excuse my saying so. As a matter of fact, the future of the peoples, the future of the world are at stake. There may emerge processes which will altogether block possibilities for seeking a peaceful settlement of problems. Ways must be looked for to counter that challenge.

If anyone introduces weapons to space, such constraints as the anti-ballistic missile treaty, the agreements on the limitation of strategic weapons and others will go overboard. That is why we have really reached a very critical point in the development of the international situation. It is not a pessimistic position but a realistic appraisal of the actual situation. And this gives rise to a need to look for solutions so as to lead the development of international relations onto a different road, onto the path of peaceful cooperation, to stop the arms race, to begin reductions in nuclear armaments, and eventually to eliminate them. And I should point out that the matter hinges not only on the position of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, that the responsibility rests with other countries as well. Today one must not sit it out on the sidelines—one must take a stand. The times demand that every responsible government or politician destined, so to speak, to lead a state today should take a clear stand on these issues.

Question. You have been General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee for several months now. Some people regard you as a leader for the next quarter of a century. What would you like to change in the Soviet Union right now?

Answer. I can hardly add anything to what I have already said and what is known in France. We view the situation in the country as follows. On the one hand, we have travelled a great road and have made immense economic, social and political progress. We have managed in an historically short period to carry out major plans and introduce deep-going changes

in a vast country, once backward from the point of view of the economy and education and populated by many peoples. But we can no longer be satisfied with this. This is probably understandable if we bear in mind that as man develops his material, cultural and intellectual needs keep growing. Our society must change so as to meet these needs to an ever increasing extent. The socialist system enables us to ensure greater dynamism in the economy, in the social and the cultural and intellectual spheres. This is the main goal towards which we are working now.

Question. You are regarded by many as a man who favours changes. Why then are there no changes in the Soviet Union on a matter which, we believe, is somewhat damaging to the reputation of the Soviet Union abroad, namely human rights?

In France the names of Sakharov and Shcharansky are mentioned and a campaign is being conducted so that Soviet Jews could leave the country if they wish. Why not take all this into account?

Answer. I would put it this way: we in the Soviet Union shall manage our affairs and you in France shall manage yours. But nevertheless I will answer your question. The issue of human rights presents no difficulties for us and we are ready to debate it anywhere, with any audience and with any representatives. We have plenty to say on this issue which is now being artificially played up by Western propaganda and is being exploited for the purpose of poisoning relations between nations and states.

As regards economic and social rights, in the first place, we could demonstrate how matters stand in that sphere in the most developed Western countries, including France, and the situation in our country. The relevant facts are well known. As for political rights, I could point out that our Supreme Soviet has more worker and peasant deputies than all the parliaments of the developed capitalist countries put together. An interesting experiment would be to include workers in the parliaments of your countries, for at least half a year or a year. We would then see what happens. But workers, as a rule, are kept away, while in our country they are in key positions everywhere, from rural Soviets to the Supreme Soviet.

Of course, we have people who by some logic or another are at odds with the Soviet form of government, with socialism, and

profess some different ideology. Problems in such cases arise when one individual or another comes into conflict with the law. That was what happened to Shcharansky whom you mentioned. He broke our laws and was sentenced by court for that.

You mentioned the "Jewish question". I would be glad to hear of Jews enjoying anywhere else such political and other rights as they do in our country. The Jewish population, who account for 0.69 per cent of the entire population of the country, are represented in its political and cultural life on a scale of at least 10-20 per cent. Many of them are well known in the country.

When it is a question of reunification of families, we agree to this and settle such questions. There are exceptions when the persons in question know state secrets. But doesn't France have legislation protecting the interests of the state? I know it does. We will continue to resolve these questions calmly, taking a humanitarian approach.

Question. And a last question, just in passing: Is it true that there are four million political prisoners in the Soviet Union?

Answer. This is absurd! It calls to mind, you know, Goebbels's propaganda. I am amazed that you, M. Mourousi, an educated and knowledgeable man, could ask such a question. I repeat: it is absurd.

Question. Mr. Gorbachev, you seem to be practising a new method of communication, a new method of leadership. Is there a "Gorbachev style"? If so, how would you define that style?

Answer. I think there is no such thing as a "Gorbachev style". I have already said so. As for our methods of work, particularly my style of work, it is not something which appeared yesterday or a month, two months or three months ago. This is how I have worked all my life. And this is exactly how many of my comrades work.

We define the style we are cultivating in our Party as the Leninist style of work. It is characterised, among other things, by extensive communication with the working people, publicity of our work, and analysis of the real processes which underlie policy-making. This is what Lenin taught our Party. I am an enthusiastic champion of precisely such an approach. The example set by Lenin is the best possible example. We are following the road of Lenin and following his style.

Question. A new generation of Soviet leaders have risen to power together with you, Mr. Gorbachev. For instance, at the end of last week we learned that a new head of the Soviet government had been appointed. What could this new generation of Soviet leaders give your country in addition to style?

Answer. I think what is taking place is a normal process. There is nothing out of the ordinary in it. Every generation makes its contribution to progress, to moulding political and cultural values. I think that the present generation of leaders in the Soviet Union will make their own contribution. This will concern primarily large-scale work to perfect socialism. We know what is to be done to bring out more fully the best aspects inherent in that social system. And it is man with his needs that is in the centre of all our aspirations.

I should point out that we do not regard socialism as a consumer society; we will not follow the standards of the Western way of life. But we will utilise what is useful.

Every effort will be made to render our economic system, our political system, and the system of socialist democracy more dynamic. Our attention, our greatest attention, will be devoted particularly to letting the human factor fulfil its potential.

Question. You are coming to Paris the day after tomorrow. If you have an evening off, what would you like to do? Go to the Picasso Museum, see Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, go to a concert or an opera? In short, what is your preference?

Answer. Since I know the programme and it does not give me an evening off, let alone a day off, for me such a problem does not arise.

Generally speaking, when one visits a country, it is always interesting to learn about its past too. But I must say that I have no less interest—or even more interest—in the present-day life of every society, every country, every people, their problems, traditions and interests. Perhaps this is natural for a politician.

Y. Mourousi. Mr. General Secretary, we would probably have a thousand other questions but we must conclude our interview. We want to thank you again for granting this exclusive interview to French television.

M. S. Gorbachev. It was a pleasure to meet representatives of French Television. I think our conversation too shows that we can meet and calmly discuss all questions.

We are interested in the further development of relations with the friendly people of France. This is a matter that requires reciprocity. We must move towards each other. It is from such a point of view that we regard our forthcoming visit too. This is a good opportunity for raising our relations to a higher level and showing their prospects for the future.

To the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions

I convey my heartfelt greetings to the participants in the session of the General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions, held on the eve of the 40th anniversary of the WFTU. Born in the context of an upsurge in the working-class movement brought about by the defeat of Hitlerite fascism and the victorious end of the Second World War, the Federation has traversed a long and glorious path, making a weighty contribution to the international cohesion of the working people.

Today, the WFTU is the biggest international association of working people within whose ranks the trade unions, operative under different social systems, cooperate on a class basis. The organisations incorporated in the WFTU consistently safeguard the rights of the working people, resolutely oppose imperialism, neocolonialism, racism and the predatory policies pursued by international monopolies, and work for peace, democracy, freedom and social progress. In the socialist countries, they have an increasingly important role to play in social and political life by being actively involved in the construction and development of the new society and undertaking a large-scale and all-round effort in the interests of the working people.

In the context of the continuous aggravation of the international situation, the peoples are increasingly concerned over the fate of the world. The arms race launched by the more aggressive imperialist quarters, by the military-industrial complex, has an adverse effect on the position of working people and puts the very future of mankind in jeopardy.

The alternative consonant with the working people's interests is the resumption of detente and channelling manpower and ma-

terial resources involved in the arms race to solving acute socio-economic problems, such as eliminating mass unemployment, economic backwardness, starvation and illiteracy and establishing a new international economic order. The success of the effort to achieve these goals largely depends on trade unions and on the international working class as a whole.

The Soviet Union resolutely comes out in favour of this course. Our goal is to radically improve the international situation, remove the war danger, stop the arms race on Earth, preclude its transfer to outer space and reduce deadly nuclear arsenals up to their complete elimination.

I am convinced that the Soviet trade unions, which participated in setting up and promoting the World Federation of Trade Unions, will remain active participants in that representative international organisation, contribute to the greater efficiency of its work and promote unity of action in the world trade union movement. In the future, too, they will firmly adhere to proletarian internationalism and support the just struggle of their class brothers abroad. The working people's solidarity is a powerful source of the strength of the trade union movement.

I wish the World Federation of Trade Unions every success in its activity for the benefit of the working people, in the struggle for social progress, peace and friendship among nations.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, October 1, 1985

To the First International Congress of the Association of Space Explorers

I would like to convey my friendly greetings to the first International Congress of the Association of Space Explorers. The holding of your Congress is in itself symbolic. It shows that mankind has entered the space era. The cohort of those who know about outer space not by hearsay, who have taken our beautiful planet in at a glance, is growing. It is only natural that your voice is listened to whenever space matters are discussed. And it is certainly important that your voice be raised in favour of peace both on the Earth and in outer space.

It is not a secret that man's entry into outer space, which signalled the realisation of his cherished dream, may spell, no matter how paradoxically it sounds, a mortal threat. The Soviet Union firmly stands in favour of precluding a tragic course of events. The alternative we offer is close international cooperation in the peaceful exploration and use of outer space for the benefit of entire humanity.

You have already become part of 20th-century history. This lends all the more weight to your contribution to the cause of peace, cooperation and mutual understanding among nations.

With all my heart I wish the participants in the Congress every success and happiness.

Mikhail GORBACHEV,
General Secretary
of the CPSU Central Committee

For a Peaceful, Free and Prosperous Future for Europe and All Other Continents

Speech at a Meeting with French MPs

October 3, 1985

Esteemed Presidents,
Esteemed Deputies and Senators,
Ladies and gentlemen,

I am glad to have an opportunity to address the French Parliament, and to meet with you—the elected representatives of the French people. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the President of the Republic for his kind invitation to visit your country.

Today is the second day of our delegation's visit and important meetings have been held. An exchange of views has begun on topical questions of bilateral relations and international affairs. Of course, it is still early to sum up the results of the talks with President Mitterrand and other French statesmen. But it is already clear that both sides are showing their desire to impart a new impetus to the development of relations between our countries and to bring closer our positions on international problems, taking into consideration the existing realities.

In my talks with the President of the Republic and in addressing you today I naturally strive for France's better and more complete understanding of the essence and main direction of the Soviet state's foreign policy. Like the foreign policy of any state, it is determined first and foremost by internal requirements.

Permit me to dwell briefly on this question. I believe you know what a long and in many respects difficult road our country has traversed in the years of Soviet government. From tsarist Russia we inherited extreme economic backwardness. Three-quarters of

the population were illiterate. Within a very short period in history the USSR has turned into a mighty and in all respects modern power with a high level of culture among the population. We did away with unemployment and provided the population with such social benefits as free housing, medical services and education. I will cite a few figures to illustrate the country's economic development. In the postwar years alone our national income has grown more than 16 times and industrial output 24 times. In the same period the real incomes of Soviet people have risen six times.

Pride in our successes does not make us complacent. We see that at the present stage society's increased maturity sets before us much more far-ranging tasks which are in many ways new in content. We are also fully aware of those shortcomings which are present in our work, and of the existing difficulties and problems that are at times rather serious. The main goal we set before ourselves today can be expressed in a brief formula: to accelerate the social and economic development of society.

To accomplish this, much must be raised to a higher level—the scientific and technical base of the national economy, the methods of management, and people themselves, their awareness, skills and qualifications. In short, we have set off on a road towards the achievement of a qualitatively new condition of society.

Our main task is to make the economy more efficient and dynamic, to make the lives of people culturally richer, fuller and more meaningful, to develop socialist self-government by the people.

It is not difficult to understand that not only stable peace but a calm, normal international situation are paramount conditions for attaining these ends. These are the priorities that determine our foreign policy, a policy in which we naturally strive to take into full consideration the interests and requirements of other peoples, all the realities of the modern era.

Our world, multifaceted and contradictory, is quickly approaching the end of the century and the millennium. It has more than its share of complex political, economic and social problems. The coexistence of two social systems on our planet, each of which is living and developing according to its own laws, has long been a reality.

But one must see the other reality as well—the reality that the interconnection and interdependence of countries and continents is becoming increasingly closer. This is an indispensable condition for the development of the world economy, scientific and technological progress, the acceleration of the exchange of information and the movement of people and things on earth and even in space, in short, for the entire development of human civilisation.

Unfortunately, the gains of civilisation are not always used for the good of people. All too often and too vigorously the achievements of science and technology are also being used for the creation of means for annihilating human beings, for the development and stockpiling of ever more horrendous types of weapons.

In these conditions Hamlet's famous question, "To be or not to be", is not just confronting a single individual but the entire human race. It is becoming a global problem. There can be only one answer to it—mankind and civilisation must survive at all costs. But this can be ensured only if we learn to live together, to get along on this small planet by mastering the difficult art of respecting each other's interests. This we call the policy of peaceful coexistence.

We are strong enough to deal a crushing rebuff to any attempt at encroaching on our people's security and peaceful work. Yet we maintain that it is not by force of arms but exclusively by force of example that one should prove the correctness of one's ideology, the advantages of the system that each people has chosen of its own will. Such is our unshakeable conviction.

I spoke yesterday to the President about our perception of the main axis of contradictions, the struggle of two trends in world politics. We regard the view that the tasks facing the international community can be solved by the creation and stockpiling of ever new and more destructive types of arms—both on earth and in space—as extremely dangerous, whatever argument is used to justify it. We also see as dangerous those actions that preserve and aggravate international tension, already acute as it is, so acute that it has now become extremely difficult to reach agreement not only on complex matters whose solution brooks no delay but even on relatively simple problems. If we do not stop the present trends, tomorrow we will not be able to

overcome their monstrous inertia. It will become even more difficult to talk.

That is why we consider it so important right now, immediately, before it is too late, to stop the "infernal train" of the arms race, start reduction of arms, improve the international situation and develop peaceful cooperation among nations. This is in mutual interests, it is everybody's task. No one can permit himself to sit it out on the sidelines.

The Soviet Union, as you probably know, has not only been issuing calls but also takes action in this direction.

We have unilaterally discontinued further deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and called upon the United States to respond in kind. We have stopped all nuclear explosions and called upon the United States to respond in kind. Of course, we address this call to the other nuclear powers as well.

The Soviet Union proposes that both sides begin reducing their armed forces and armaments in Central Europe—starting with a reduction of Soviet and American troops. Moreover, we are prepared to reduce a greater number of troops than the Americans.

As for space, we are for its exclusive use for peaceful purposes and persistently call for an agreement thereon since an extension of the arms race to space will make reduction of nuclear arsenals objectively impossible. As you know, we have submitted to the United Nations a proposal on international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space.

And now I would like to inform you of the new steps being taken by the Soviet Union. They pursue the same aim: to stop the destructive process of the arms race and eliminate the war danger hanging over mankind.

First. A few days ago we proposed to the government of the United States of America agreeing on the total prohibition of space strike weapons for both sides and reducing radically, by 50 per cent, nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory.

In other words, we are proposing a practical solution to the very same tasks that were agreed upon by both sides early this year as the aims of the Geneva talks: not only to stop the arms race but to drastically lower the level of armaments and at the same time prevent an arms race in space.

There is hardly any need to explain how all this would strengthen strategic stability and mutual trust.

I can inform you that our delegation in Geneva has been instructed to submit concrete proposals on this matter and authorised to give the partners exhaustive explanations.

I say all this because a multitude of different versions and false rumours are already circulating in the West concerning our proposal, and it is time for some clarification.

Second. Concerning medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. With a view to facilitating agreement on their speediest mutual reduction (as we are often told, in Western Europe there is also great interest in this), we believe it is possible to conclude a corresponding agreement separately, without making a direct linkage with the problem of space and strategic arms. We think this road may turn out to be practical.

In this context I feel it is important to explain our stand on such an issue as the place of the nuclear potential of France and Britain in the European balance of forces. This potential is rapidly growing and we can no longer ignore it. The French side has pointed out that France's nuclear forces are not subject to discussion without her participation. This stands to reason. Hence it follows that it is time to start a direct dialogue between us on this subject and try to find an acceptable way out through joint effort. The Soviet Union is prepared for such a direct dialogue with France, just as with Britain, of course.

I want to stress at this point that we will consider the security interests of France most carefully. And today, as it appears to us, the question of a reduction in her armaments is not on the agenda.

Third. You know that we have announced moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. The number of SS-20 missiles the Soviet Union is keeping on stand-by alert in the European zone is now 243. This means that it corresponds exactly to the level of June 1984 when the additional deployment of our missiles was begun in response to the deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe. The additional SS-20 missiles that were deployed in the process have been withdrawn from stand-by alert, and the stationary launching facilities for these missiles will be dismantled within the next two months. This is verifiable. As to our counter-measures in respect

to the territory of the United States itself, they continue to remain in force.

I would also like to explain the meaning we give the term "European zone" in this case. This is the zone in which medium-range missiles capable of striking targets on the territory of Western Europe are deployed.

It should be added that we have already totally retired the old, and very powerful, SS-5 missiles and are continuing to retire SS-4 missiles. This means that on the whole the number of medium-range missiles in the European zone of the USSR is now much smaller than it was ten or even fifteen years ago. In imposing this self-limitation we proceed from the broad interests of European security. I think Europe is now entitled to expect a move in response by the United States—the termination of further deployment of its medium-range missiles in the European continent.

You see what serious steps the Soviet Union is taking. In combination with our previous actions, our latest proposals, we feel, provide a package of constructive and realistic measures which would bring about a genuine breakthrough in the development of international relations, a breakthrough in favour of peace, security and cooperation among nations.

This is our programme for diffusing the explosive international situation threatening peace. We expect that in response to our proposals the West will do its part of the road.

I would like to stress that the realisation of the programme we have proposed would also signify substantial advance towards an aim so desired by and important to all nations—the prohibition and total elimination of nuclear arms, and the total delivery of mankind from the threat of nuclear war.

There can be no victors in a nuclear war. It seems that all politicians who are aware of their responsibilities are in agreement on this. It is time to draw a practical conclusion from this—to stop the nuclear arms race. And we believe that this demand will be supported by all honest, realistically thinking political forces, public figures, and all people who cherish their homeland, their lives, and the lives of their children and grandchildren.

The task of totally banning chemical weapons and eliminating their stockpiles is becoming ever more urgent. At the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva the Soviet Union is actively

participating in the drafting of a relevant convention. We are meeting our partners in the talks half way on a number of substantial aspects including verification. I am sure that it is quite possible to reach agreement on reliable verification.

Incidentally, one cannot help thinking that if an agreement was reached on the non-proliferation of nuclear arms, why not apply the same method to chemical weapons? This would work in the general direction of a total ban on these weapons. The Soviet Union would be prepared to take part in the drafting of an international accord on the non-proliferation of chemical weapons. We are also prepared to do everything in our power towards the creation of a zone in the centre of Europe free from chemical weapons.

As I speak here in Paris, in the heart, one might say, of Western Europe, I cannot but speak about some substantial problems of European security, about how we in the Soviet Union perceive them.

I will start with the most general question. After all, what is security in Europe? It is absence of war and any threat of war. The interdependence and intertwining of the destinies of peoples, regardless of the difference in the roads of social development chosen by them, is felt in Europe with particular intensity. Because of geographical density and oversaturation with armaments, Europe is more vulnerable to armed conflict than any other continent, nuclear even more so.

This means that European security cannot be ensured by military means, by military force. This is an absolutely new situation which signals a departure from traditions, from a mentality and manner of action that took centuries, even millennia to form. Human thought does not adjust immediately to everything new. This applies to everyone. We feel this. We have begun a reassessment, are adjusting many customary things, including those in the military and, naturally, the political sphere, in full conformity with the new realities. We would like such a reassessment also to take place in Western Europe and beyond.

Fear of certain retribution is still an obstacle to war, to the use of military force. Everyone understands, though, that one cannot build lasting peace on fear alone. But the entire question is where to look for an alternative to fear or, to use military language, deterrence?

We see what attempts are now being made to find a way out—by using new arms in the so-called Star Wars programme. This is an illusion, and an extremely dangerous one at that. It is naive in general to look for a solution to the problem of security in the perfection of shield and sword. Security in Europe, as well as international security as a whole, can only be achieved on the path of peaceful coexistence, relaxation of tension, disarmament, strengthening of trust and development of international cooperation.

This is a long and difficult road, even more so since it requires the overcoming of mutual suspicions, mistrust and prejudices accumulated over decades. But there is no other road if we want to live. And like any long road, it begins with the first steps which are often the most difficult to make. We understand this and want to help ensure solution of the task—for ourselves and for you. It is this that motivates the proposals I have already mentioned.

This also applies to the Stockholm conference where the important matter of mutual confidence in the military field is discussed. It appears to us that the contours of future accords are gradually beginning to take shape there. They include making the principle of non-use of force more concrete and imparting maximum effectiveness to this principle. They comprise a definite set of confidence-building measures in the military field, what we might call safety fuses to prevent an erroneous interpretation of actions of the other side in conditions of an aggravation of the military confrontation. A number of states, primarily neutral states, propose that agreement be reached on mutual exchanges of annual plans of military activity subject to notification. We are willing to reach such an accord in the hope that it will help overcome suspicion and impede covert preparations for war.

The ideas of establishing nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, including our continent—in the North of Europe and in the Balkans—are becoming increasingly widespread. We support these ideas and are ready to take part in the appropriate guarantees wherever necessary. We think the idea of creating a corridor free of nuclear arms along both sides of the line dividing the two military-political groupings is useful. We also maintain that states which do not possess nuclear arms nor

have them on their territory are fully entitled to reliable guarantees of their security based on international law, guarantees that nuclear arms will not be used against them.

Many aspects of European cooperation are recorded in the Helsinki Final Act. We believe it is a great achievement which fully retains its importance. When the 10th anniversary of the Helsinki accords was marked, all the participants in the European process spoke out in favour of its continuation. The Soviet Union is prepared to take a most active part in this. Every European country has contributed a share of its national experience to the Helsinki process. This is a common asset of the peoples of Europe, and it should be protected and expanded by joint effort.

The political climate in Europe depends in no small measure on the development of economic ties between East and West. Here too an innovative approach is needed. Attaining the targets for industrial, technical and scientific progress that face each country today could be made much easier by effective use of the international division of labour. We in the Soviet Union are ready for this, and ready to look for new forms of cooperation. It goes without saying that this implies principles of mutual advantage, equality and a serious approach.

We think the establishment of more businesslike relations between the CMEA and the EEC would also be useful. The countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance have displayed a constructive initiative in this respect which appears to have been met favourably. It is important for it to produce concrete results. Here, as has already been stated, in the measure in which the EEC countries act as a "political entity", we are prepared to look for a common language with them with regard to concrete international problems as well. This could be done in various ways, including parliamentary ties, for one thing with those who represent the European Parliament.

Without all European countries joining efforts, it will also be impossible to really solve such an acute problem as preserving and improving the environment on our continent. In many of its areas, figuratively speaking, the ground is beginning to burn under foot, the rain falling from the sky is, if not fiery, then acid, while the sky itself is hidden by smoke. European rivers and seas are reaching a pitiful state. In our time, it seems, none

of us acted with sufficient farsightedness, thus creating problems that now simply defy solution within national frameworks. This is truly a field in which we must all become aware of the continent's common destiny.

Much can be done in that broad sphere called "humanitarian". The preservation by common effort of the cultural values of the past, cultural exchanges that mutually enrich one of the cradles of mankind's spiritual values—Europe—does this not deserve very close attention? It is with enthusiasm that we are preparing for such an extraordinary event as the cultural forum that will open in a few days in Budapest. In this sphere also lies the extension of information about one another's life and the cultivation of feelings of mutual sympathy and respect. The mutual study of one another's language is of much importance from this point of view. Extensive exchange of schoolchildren, students and teachers is promising. It is very important for young people to have correct perceptions of each other, for it is up to them to build a peaceful Europe. The pooling of efforts in the struggle against diseases—old and new—is a task of immense significance.

The Soviet Union attaches very great importance to ensuring human rights. It is only necessary to free this issue from hypocrisy and speculation, from attempts at interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Such problems as the position of migrant workers, mixed marriages and reunification of families are rather acute in present-day Europe. We are for approaching such problems in a positive and humane spirit with full respect for the sovereign rights of all states.

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that in the present situation it is especially important not to emulate medieval fanatics and not to extend ideological differences to inter-state relations. Stability in these relations, their reduced susceptibility to political ups and downs will likewise consolidate stability in Europe as a whole.

We do not think, for instance, that there is an eternal taboo on contacts in some form between the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic alliance as organisations, not to mention the elimination of Europe's division into opposing groupings in the more or less foreseeable future. As is known, this is precisely what we and our allies are proposing. But as we see it, even with the

existence of the two blocs, it is possible to create such a *modus vivendi* that would blunt the acuteness of the present confrontation.

And, of course, it is more important today than ever before to develop more intensive political dialogue between East and West, to use all of its already established forms—regular meetings at various levels (including, of course, the highest), political consultations, and broad contacts between scientific and cultural communities.

We regard the development of parliamentary ties as a very important matter as well. I would like to stress this particularly as I speak within these walls. This includes, naturally, the development of parliamentary ties with France. The Deputies to the National Assembly and Senate of France can rest assured that they are welcome guests in Moscow. I state this on behalf of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Such, in most general outline, are our views on how it is realistically possible to achieve, in a relatively short period at that, an improvement in the situation on our continent and to enhance Europe's role in overcoming the present confrontation.

I will add yet another point. The need for more vigorous interaction to eliminate the seats of conflict and tension existing in various areas has never been greater than at present. The fact that the Soviet Union and France, despite their belonging to opposing military-political groupings, have much in common in their approach to a number of existing regional problems and situations, is one of the examples of opportunities for such interaction. These problems and situations include, for instance, those in the Middle East, Central America, South Africa, and so on. Our contacts with the French leaders confirm this.

In proposing the expansion of goodneighbourliness and cooperation with Western Europe we have no intention at all of belittling the importance of the possible contribution of Canada, which belongs to NATO and at the same time has signed the Helsinki Act. Neither does our European policy have any anti-American bias.

Since one hears much speculation on this subject, allow me to examine it in greater detail. The very idea that by improving relations with Western Europe we want to drive a wedge, to set it at loggerheads with the United States, is absurd. First, we

want to have good relations not only with Western Europe but also with the United States, and for that matter with China, Japan and other countries. We are not pursuing a Metternich type of "balance of forces" policy, of setting one state against another, knocking together blocs and counterblocs, creating "axes" and "triangles", but a policy of worldwide detente, of strengthening world security and developing universal international cooperation. Second, we are realists and we understand how strong the historical, political and economic ties are between Western Europe and the United States.

Esteemed Deputies, the best minds of humanity have warned of the danger of our consciousness lagging behind rapid changes in social being. This is especially relevant today. Man is beginning to explore the galaxy. Yet how much remains undone on Earth! No nation and no state can solve the existing problems alone. Yet the old baggage of disunity, confrontation and mistrust impedes joint action.

I realise that far from everyone in this hall accepts our world outlook, our ideology. As a realist, I am not trying to convert anyone to our creed. Individuals and nations come to a philosophy on their own, agonising over it and accepting it with mind and heart. But despite all differences in political and philosophical views, in ideals and values, we must remember one thing: we are all keepers of the fire of life passed down to us by previous generations.

Each had its own mission and each in its own way enriched world civilisation. The giants of the Renaissance and the Great French Revolution, the heroes of the October Revolution in Russia, of Victory and the Resistance—they have all fulfilled their duty to history.

And what about our generation? It has made great discoveries but has also found recipes for the self-destruction of the human race. On the threshold of the third millennium we must burn the black book of nuclear alchemy. May the 21st century become the first century of life without the fear of universal destruction.

We will fulfil this mission if we pool our efforts. The Soviet Union is prepared to make its contribution to ensuring a peaceful, free and flourishing future for Europe and all the other continents. We will spare nothing for this.

Statement at the Joint Press Conference with François Mitterrand in the Palais de l'Élysée

October 4, 1985

M. President,

I think at this point I can take over from you. I would like to mention once more our reasons and goals in coming to France. We in the Soviet Union proceed from the premise that the present situation in the world has reached the stage when responsible decisions and responsible actions are needed, above all, by countries with considerable international weight. I have in mind the Soviet Union, the United States, France, Britain, and other countries. The realities of the world today are such that we can build a better and safer world, ensure progress, and achieve an improvement in the international situation if all this becomes our common concern.

Despite all the differences in our political systems, ideologies, and world outlooks, we all are faced with the need to find a way to make a world that would be characterised by trust, mutual understanding and cooperation. We are for dialogue. In any case, the Soviet leadership believes that all this is simply a demand of common sense.

For the Soviet Union, France is an important partner for discussing such questions. This is explained first of all by traditions. And these traditions nourish our present-day relations. I think they will nourish our relations in the future as well. When I speak of traditions I have in mind not only contacts of a political nature, on the level of state leadership. I have in mind above all what has already united our peoples for decades and centuries. I refer to the solid foundation that has always enabled Russia and France, and the Soviet Union and France to meet

at the most difficult periods in human history and discuss the most acute, vital problems, to engage in a search for solutions to such problems. It is precisely for this reason that we accepted President François Mitterrand's invitation to visit France. I want to express to you once again my heartfelt gratitude for your hospitality.

To what you have said I would add that our countries, both before and during the visit—and it is already nearing its end—had and continue to have their own socio-political systems, profess their own ideology, and belong today to the same military-political alliances to which they belonged yesterday and to which they will belong tomorrow. Neither the President nor I ever set ourselves the task of converting each other to one's own creed in the course of the talks. But does the fact that we belong to different systems and military-political organisations diminish the importance of the dialogue in which the Soviet Union and France, the General Secretary and the President are engaged?

I think that in a certain sense this, perhaps, even has its advantages. And this conclusion is confirmed by what the President has said on the talks and meetings held during these days—and we had three meetings with the President face to face, let alone the conversations with other French politicians. It is very important that this echoes the President's thoughts. The leaders of the Soviet Union and France, each in his own concrete situation, have managed to rise above the existing differences and analyse the processes taking place in the world, compare their evaluations, exchange views on the possible contributions by the Soviet Union and France to make the events in the world and the international situation change for the better. I think this is evidence of the existence of a strong sense of responsibility for the destiny of the world both on the part of the Soviet leaders and the leaders of France. And this, I think, is quite important for conducting a dialogue and outlining joint or parallel ways of improving the situation in the world.

On the whole, we have a high opinion of the talks of the past few days with President Mitterrand and other French statesmen and politicians. These were substantive conversations that were markedly constructive. They were frank and proceeded in a spirit of mutual respect and goodwill.

The President has already touched upon the problems covered

in those conversations. They focused on the burning issues of the present dangerous international situation. We have quite understandable differences on a number of specific issues. But there also emerged a common understanding of the need to do everything possible to improve the situation, to remove the threat looming over the peoples, and to contribute to a shift from confrontation to detente. Our meetings convinced me that the President shares this point of view.

The President has said that the word "detente" appeared in our talks not because we indulged in reminiscences of the past. I would say, this is the result of a specific lesson from the process of detente. We will not now go into the reasons why the process has been weakened and subverted to some extent. All of us have realised the urgent need to return to detente if we want to deal with things on a large scale and approach the problem of safeguarding peace with great responsibility. In this context, the realistic possibility of returning to detente was mentioned here and also in the course of our talks.

The issue of how to put an end to the unprecedented arms race was the most important part of our discussions. In Paris, we informed the President, the Parliament, the public, and the people of France of the proposals that we made to the leadership of the United States of America and that are already being studied at the Geneva talks. This issue is of concern not only to the leaders of France and the Soviet Union; it is of concern to all nations, all sober-minded political leaders, all those who have not become insanely obsessed with the arms race, confrontation, and hostility.

I am not going to repeat our new proposals now. You are familiar with them. I would merely like to say that after our exchange of views, and a very substantial one at that, the leaders of France, and the President personally, expressed an understanding of the importance of our proposals, of their constructive potential. When we made these proposals we implemented what the Soviet leadership has been stating over the past several months. The Soviet Union is prepared for drastic reductions in nuclear arms on condition that space strike weapons are kept out of space. This is the crux of the problem. This view is in line with the January agreements between the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and of the United States.

Several weeks and months ago our partners in the Geneva talks were asking: Where are your radical proposals? We heard about this. Now we hear from the same sources: Why are you pressing so hard with your proposals?

This reminds me of a story about Hodzha Nasreddin. The story has it that he was riding his donkey in Bukhara and people were calling out to him, saying it was the first time they had seen an old donkey carrying a young one. But when Nasreddin put the donkey on his shoulders and continued on his way he again heard reproaches, but now for the opposite reason.

We think that the time has come for definite actions. Why? Because we have reached a point where it is no longer enough to say: yes, we stand for a better world; yes, we shall take the road towards normalising the international situation. Unless such words are matched by definite acts, this is political demagoguery and deception of the peoples.

In addition to the measures that the Soviet Union earlier took unilaterally, we have put forward new radical proposals so as to impart a constructive character to the Geneva talks. We know, perhaps better than anyone—at least not worse than the Americans—what is in store for the world if the arms race is not stopped now. This awareness adds to our responsibility.

The situation is very tense as it is, and if another round, a space round, of the arms race is initiated, I do not know if we will be able to conduct talks. How could they be approached? This complexity should be evident to everyone. Incidentally, the press, too, should come to an understanding of the seriousness of the situation in present-day international affairs. You journalists serve not only editors and those who finance your publications. You should serve primarily the people. As we in the Soviet Union understand and see it, the general demand is that we all stop, gather our wits, think of where we are, and begin to act, to take concrete steps. It is a simple formula, a simple plan. But we believe that it is based on a sense of responsibility for the destiny of one's own people, for the destinies of other nations. It contains a proposal, a constructive search. We are ready for this.

What I know about the results of the meetings of the Soviet Foreign Minister with US President Reagan and Secretary of

State Shultz is encouraging to some extent. We did not hear the typical, stereotyped reply, "No, this is propaganda".

I think that sober, realistic ideas are taking root in public opinion in the United States of America, in the political community, and in Congress. Naturally, I can hardly speak for the United States. But we hope that both in Geneva, where another round of talks has begun and where our proposals have been put on the table, and the forthcoming meeting with President Reagan, the United States will approach that problem with a sense of serious responsibility. In this sense I share the view of M. Mitterrand that there are problems that directly concern the Soviet Union and the United States and that the process of the talks should move from stalemate towards normalisation.

The Soviet Union seriously intends to change the world situation.

In the talks in Paris we also touched upon the issue of medium-range missiles. We would like to move this issue away from its present state, where it is hard to come to grips with it. This issue is also being discussed in Geneva with the American side. It is a fact that Pershings and Cruise missiles are being deployed in Western Europe.

In developing our position we have made new proposals on medium-range missiles. We believe—and I said this to M. Mitterrand—that this is creating a new situation. Generally speaking, we do not count and are not going to count French nuclear forces in the "Soviet-American roster".

We now maintain that this problem should be discussed with France, and also with Britain. An opportunity is being opened for an exchange of opinions with France that at some point may lead to talks.

We are not asking France to reduce her nuclear potential, to stop fulfilling her military programmes. This is a matter for France. As we understand it, France will approach this question from her own positions, taking into account all processes occurring in the world. But we maintain: let us start talking, let us start studying this problem in connection with others. Perhaps there is some flexible equivalent for corresponding nuclear systems. In any case, this is the first step. We had an in-depth exchange of views on this score with François Mitterrand. As I

understand it, the President is not against continuing an exchange of views on this problem. We, too, support this.

Through our Ambassador in London we have addressed a similar proposal to Mrs. Margaret Thatcher.

We have also explained the essence and significance of the unilateral step that we have just taken and as a result of which the number of Soviet SS-20 missiles in the European zone now does not exceed the number that we had in June of last year. The SS-20 missiles that were additionally deployed have been withdrawn from stand-by alert, and the stationary facilities for these missiles will be dismantled in the coming two months. Those who would like to verify this can take photographs. It is being suggested that we allegedly intend to relocate these missiles to Asia. These are unscrupulous suggestions. When the Soviet Union undertakes a commitment, it does it seriously.

We have as many missiles in Asia as we need to balance the corresponding potential of the United States in that region—neither more, nor less. If the United States does not increase it, we shall not do so either. If the situation changes for the better, we shall react accordingly.

The President and I devoted much time to questions of European security. We have the experience of joint efforts with France in this field. This experience has enabled us to build up a substantial potential for cooperation, which can be used to carry on the European process based in the Helsinki accords and to fill it with an even more meaningful content.

Addressing the Parliament yesterday, I presented our position on the entire range of these problems. I shall not repeat it. The crux of the matter, I think, is that both sides, the USSR and France, remain committed to the cause of expanding and deepening the European process, and the President has reiterated it now. Like France, we support the implementation of the provisions of the Helsinki Act in all its parts. Moreover, it is my strong conviction that an improvement of the situation in Europe would be of enormous importance to the whole world. In Europe military-political groups stand face to face. Its peoples have learned major lessons from their own history. Since the Helsinki Conference, there also exists a legal base making it possible to advance along the road of cooperation and security.

The USSR and France together were initiators of the Stock-

holm Conference. We believe that the time has come to turn it more resolutely towards drafting agreements. As we see it, and in the view of France too, there are opportunities to invigorate the search for mutually acceptable solutions.

In our talks with President Mitterrand we devoted due attention to studying a number of regional problems and sites of tension. We understand each other in our evaluations of some of these problems. On other problems, we differ both in analysis and approach. But we agree that such sites of tension have to be eliminated by political means and with full respect for the independence and sovereignty of each country. Within such an exchange of views we dealt with the situation in the south of Africa, the Middle East, Central America, and with other problems.

We came to Paris with the desire to give a new impulse to bilateral Soviet-French relations. As I understand it, the President's position coincides with our aspiration. The results of the discussion of these issues give reason to hope for an intensification of the political dialogue and the growth of economic and trade cooperation between the USSR and France.

We consider it a positive fact that the pace of development of economic and trade ties has quickened in recent years—they have doubled. But what we have today does not accord with the scope of our countries' potentials. That is why we have agreed to step up the quest for new opportunities in trade and economic cooperation and to impart more initiative to our relations in this sphere. An agreement has been just signed on these matters.

Many specific, interesting projects have come into being, among them several major ones. We welcome this. We think that this, too, will facilitate an improvement in the overall situation.

As I have already stressed, we have agreed to build up our political dialogue. On behalf of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet I have invited the President to pay a visit to our country. He will be a welcome guest in the Soviet Union. When intervals between visits become shorter, perhaps there will be fewer problems. We have also exchanged opinions on the following idea: there is a project known as Tokamak. The Soviet Union, France, the United States, Japan, and other countries

have contributed to the development of this project in thermonuclear synthesis. It is tempting to think that this project might be carried out by joint efforts in the present-day situation and might provide the possibility for guiding our research in the direction where we could obtain a practically inexhaustible source of energy. It is a very tempting idea. It would be most timely since it is a peaceful idea—and there are people who advance very different suggestions. Our specialists have told me that there are realistic hopes for implementing this proposal of ours.

On the whole, the results of the talks, in our view, are not only positive, but I would say even impressive. They serve the interests of both the Soviet and French peoples, as well as the broad interests of European and international security.

In conclusion, I would like to avail myself of the opportunity to express my gratitude to President François Mitterrand, to the government, politicians, and public figures of France, to all the French women and men we have met these days, for their hospitality and for affection and respect they expressed for our country and the entire Soviet people.

* * *

Question (French Television Antenne 2). Mr. General Secretary, you said that the Soviet Union cannot close its eyes to the development of the French nuclear forces. Do you prefer that the level of the French nuclear forces not be built up, or that it be built up moderately? In other words, should the modernisation of the French nuclear forces become, in your view, a subject for discussions with the Soviet Union?

Mikhail Gorbachev. I think I have made quite a definitive statement on this question. We suggest that a process for the direct exchange of opinions be established. All concrete questions can be discussed in the course of that process.

Question (Soviet Television). M. President, do you think it is possible to achieve an international agreement on banning the arms race from outer space?

François Mitterrand. I am no clairvoyant. The arms race has been rising to qualitatively new levels for a long time and has now reached the level of space. If reason has not prevailed up to now, who can say that common sense will prevail from now

on? I do not make forecasts. I have expressed a wish, taken a political stand: yes, there is a need for a compromise that will be acceptable to both sides and beneficial to all. I do not want to go into technical details about the nature of such a compromise. As to France's position, I have already said: we do not participate in it, we are not seeking it, we want to devote ourselves to the peaceful exploration of space. Naturally, as a great power with a population of 55 million, we have an interest in everything that bears on questions of war and peace.

Question (Italian newspaper *Secolo XIX*). Mr. General Secretary, as I understand, you have announced the dismantling of all Soviet SS-20 missiles in excess of 243. I would like to know if you confirm this. As to a separate agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe, do you believe it possible that the basis for such an agreement can be found in what was termed in 1982 as the "agreement during the walk in the woods"?

Mikhail Gorbachev. I confirm that 243 missiles are on stand-by alert in the European zone. This is exactly as many as there were in June 1984. The other missiles have been withdrawn from stand-by alert and within the next two months their stationary launching facilities will be dismantled.

Our counter-measures which concern specifically the territory of the United States remain in force. Concerning the further process of talks on medium-range missiles—in order to invigorate it and impart a realistic direction to this process we have proposed a separate agreement on this type of weapon. And, at the same time, we proposed a direct exchange of views with France and Britain. In our opinion, this makes it possible to start taking practical steps. We are prepared to move in this direction as far as our partners are prepared to go—I refer to the United States, and, where it concerns French and British missiles, to France and Britain.

François Mitterrand. I would like to clarify a point: France will not refuse an exchange of views on any issue, especially to such a country as the Soviet Union. But at present I do not see a possibility for talks, although I told the General Secretary this morning that we must determine precisely the subject of discussion. I shall add concerning the issue of how to count our forces that the United States has not distanced itself from France's position on this matter, and France has no reason to

separate her position from the American one when it comes to counting forces in the world and in Europe. This position, of course, must take into account everything that I have already said about outer space and the fact that France retains full freedom of expression and thought. We are an independent country that has its own independent strategy and that speaks out accordingly.

Question (BBC). Mr. General Secretary, I would like to touch on the Soviet Union's relations with Mrs. Thatcher. Why, in your opinion, should the British Prime Minister take a different position concerning Britain's medium-range nuclear systems than France concerning her own? Secondly, have you resigned yourself to the Thatcher Government's decision to expel Soviet diplomats?

Mikhail Gorbachev. I reply to the first question. I think that until now Britain's position of medium-range missiles was formed under one set of conditions. Today I invite the President of France—and I have already done this—and Mrs. Thatcher to take a new approach in connection with the radically new proposals made by the Soviet Union. This indeed cardinally changes the situation. And if the situation is new, there should be new approaches as well. I agree with President Mitterrand—we have already discussed this with him—that it would be strange if we had begun to discuss this issue only yesterday and would have entered into talks and reached accord already today. But I also remember that M. Mitterrand, in particular, during his last visit to Moscow, when he presented his position on the French nuclear forces, said that France was committed to a search for peace and to the process of disarmament. In his view, today the Soviet Union and the United States should be the first to make their contributions, which does not at all rule out that at some stage France will join this process. A new situation is taking shape today and new opportunities are opening up. It was natural on my part to invite the President to exchange opinions on this situation.

Now I shall answer your second question. Every embassy in the country to which it has been assigned has instructions from its home government to study certain processes, and to supply information on processes taking place in that country so that there should be nothing unpredictable in relations, either in

bilateral relations or on international problems. This is, I believe, a natural process. It involves all countries. But some people want to spoil relations and prevent their improvement; as soon as there are signs of an international dialogue or of a thaw, certain forces that have their own social task immediately come to the fore. They are always ready. These are Rapid Deployment Forces, which are intended to spoil the international situation. But I do not know who has involved Mrs. Thatcher in these affairs, as a result of which all the representatives of the Soviet Union are en masse charged with spying.

Our point of departure is that the Soviet Union is interested in maintaining relations with Britain to no greater extent than Britain is interested in maintaining relations with the Soviet Union. I repeat, we support the development of relations and a political dialogue, as well as economic relations with Britain, which is also our partner of long standing. I believe this question is already exhausted.

Question (GDR Television). Comrade Gorbachev, I believe that since the Second World War the Soviet Union has made more than a hundred proposals directed at strengthening peace and achieving disarmament. Are they still in force?

Mikhail Gorbachev. It would really be an excellent idea to return to some of the good old proposals: on general and complete disarmament, which was driven gradually into a corner and is now in the position of Cinderella. And that is a fundamental issue. Had attention been given to this proposal of ours in time, I am sure we would not be living through the present situation in the world. These proposals were of a long-term nature, and did not arise as a reaction to some current process, to some current situation. All such proposals of ours remain in force.

Question (Correspondent of Dutch Television). Mr. General Secretary, could you name the number of SS-20 missiles deployed throughout the territory of the Soviet Union? As you know, the Dutch government is to adopt a decision on American missiles by November 1.

Mikhail Gorbachev. Your leadership is informed of our steps and it has the chance to consider our proposals. As to information on the number and types of missiles—I am afraid it would take a lot of time for me to answer this question. The

more so since this concerns Europe and the entire European zone—which extends even beyond the limits of the Urals to the 80th meridian. I think this is enough for the Netherlands.

Question (Israeli Radio). You have insisted on the need for concrete steps to solve problems of regional conflicts. With regard to the Middle East, wouldn't the restoration of diplomatic relations with the State of Israel be one such concrete step by the Soviet Union? If not, why?

Mikhail Gorbachev. You can sense by the reaction of the hall that I do not even have to answer this question because my answer may be obvious in advance. Still I shall answer. The situation in the Middle East is a serious one and the President has already stated it. This gives rise to concern both in the Soviet Union and France. We shall exchange views with the French leaders in our search for the best solution to this problem. The Israeli leadership is pursuing a myopic policy if it wants to ensure its national interests by way of separate deals. These can be only temporary successes. The issue must be solved fundamentally. The Soviet Union has always taken part and will continue to take part in the search for a fundamental solution to the problem, in improving the entire situation in the Middle East. We will act with a sense of great responsibility in this direction so that the situation in that region does not get out of control. There must be search for political approaches to a settlement. There are some people who have no interest in the participation of the Soviet Union. But the presence of the Soviet Union in the Middle East is an objective fact and we shall not renounce our role. We support collective efforts, and I share the President's view in this respect.

As for the restoration of relations with Israel, I think that the sooner the situation in the Middle East returns to normal, the quicker we shall be able to proceed to a consideration of this matter. There will be no obstacles for us then. We participated in the establishment of the State of Israel, we recognise the sovereignty of that state and its right to exist and to be secure. But there are enormous differences in the ways we and the ruling circles of Israel understand the issue of security.

Perhaps, you would like to ask the President further questions?

François Mitterrand. They see you here less often.

Question (American CBS TV). Why not allow all Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union if they wish to do so? Could you say how many political prisoners there are in the Soviet Union?

Mikhail Gorbachev. I answered these questions in my interview with French Television. I have nothing to add.

Question (French TV company *TF 1*). You said in your speech yesterday that the world economy and technological progress call for exchanges of people and ideas. Are you planning in the near future to open wider the doors of the Soviet Union and to give Soviet people the possibility to travel freely to the West and Westerners a possibility to come to the Soviet Union?

Mikhail Gorbachev. We feel that the Helsinki process embraces all problems, including humanitarian ones and the exchange of ideas, information and tourists. We fully support all this. And I believe that the more the situation improves, the broader the contacts will be. On the other hand, the broader the contacts, the sooner the situation will improve. At any rate, when it is not a question of attempting to use exchanges for political, provocative purposes, to poison the atmosphere and intervene in our internal affairs, the doors of our country are always open to everyone. Here is an example: a group of Americans recently decided to make a journey down the Volga. They came from different cities of the USA. I learned about it when they had already returned to America and were sharing their impressions of the journey. Two ships with Americans on board made a cruise all along the Volga. You know what they said: everything we had known about the Soviet Union proved to be hogwash. What we saw in the Soviet Union, both the people and what the Soviet Union is like in general, convinces us that they are the same people as we, with the same goals, thoughts, friendliness, and aspirations. Hence, if certain centres do not use the channels of human contact to introduce elements that poison relations and interfere in our internal affairs, the Soviet Union is in favour of developing exchanges on the basis of equality. But the Soviet Union cannot be talked to in the way that some quarters take the liberty of talking to dozens of states and governments, treating them as worthless. The Soviet Union will put anyone in his place, should it be necessary.

Question (French radio broadcasting company *Europe 1*).

Mr. General Secretary, when we see you, we always get good news about the Soviet Union. I would like to ask what you have told the President about Sakharov, Shcharansky, and Nudel.

Mikhail Gorbachev. When it comes to the reunification of families, mixed marriages, and other humanitarian issues, these issues are decided by competent agencies in a most careful manner. I said this to the President.

Question (Radio Canada). Mr. General Secretary, does the Soviet Union have a chance to avenge itself in Lebanon or to protect its citizens, or is it as helpless as the Western countries?

Mikhail Gorbachev. I think there is no reason to speak about helplessness. The influence of the Soviet Union and of other countries, including France, is tremendous in all instances, including this matter. I shall only say that we are firm opponents of terrorist methods. That is unacceptable. We have resolutely expressed ourselves on this score and we have now put everything that we have at our disposal into motion to find a solution to this question. I think that those who embark on the road of terrorism will not achieve their aims.

Question (GDR Radio). I also have a question to the General Secretary. Here in Paris you have spoken at length about the non-militarisation of outer space. But what about peaceful cooperation in outer space? Are there new concrete plans for joint space flights, such as three years ago?

Mikhail Gorbachev. Yes, we shall continue to cooperate with France along these lines. We have had good experience in this respect. We have even thought about the possibility of carrying out a joint flight once again. We exchanged views on this matter with the President. We support the policy of peacefully using and exploring outer space. Big successes can be achieved here. I suppose you are aware of our proposals at the UN in this respect. It would be possible to set up an organisation, situate it in Paris, and launch peaceful studies of outer space.

Question (American ABC TV company). Mr. General Secretary, you hinted in your statement this morning that there were elements of political demagoguery in the American reaction to your proposal on arms cuts. Do you mean President Reagan? If so, does it not contradict your statements to *Time* magazine that rhetoric should be softened during preparations for the Geneva meeting?

Mikhail Gorbachev. I want to reiterate everything I said in the interview to representatives of *Time* magazine. I would like to note right away that the remark I made was based on information I had received. It would be, I think, irresponsible to create the impression that all this is a propaganda shootout. Concerning the position of Mr. Reagan, I said that for the first time we—I was informed of this by Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze—sensed a serious attitude to our proposals on the part of the President and those who participated in the conversation—I refer to Mr. Shultz, Mr. McFarlane and others. We hope that this will prove to be really so. We do not want to do damage to the security of the United States. This is not part of our plans. We do not want to outplay the United States of America, and advise it not to try to do so either.

Question (French journalist). MM. President and General Secretary, have you found points of agreement in your positions on the Middle East and what are they?

Mikhail Gorbachev. The President spoke about this. We are prepared to participate in an international, collective search for ways to improve the situation in the Middle East. I welcome this search.

Question (*The Guardian*, London). Do you make reducing strategic arms dependent on agreement by the United States to discontinue the development of space arms, that is to say, do you consider these issues to be interdependent? To what extent are you inclined to reach agreement with President Reagan during the meeting in Geneva?

Mikhail Gorbachev. I think that at this press conference we should not anticipate the meeting in Geneva. That is a serious matter after all. Both we and, I believe, the American side understand this and are preparing accordingly. As to the concrete part of your question I shall say that in our opinion we must reach agreement on the non-militarisation of space and on a drastic reduction of strategic nuclear arms on earth.

Question (BBC). Mr. General Secretary, President Mitterrand has said that he is not prepared to start talks with the Soviet Union on medium-range missiles. Why?

Mikhail Gorbachev. I do not understand why you have this impression. What I said was that our steps impart, so to say, movement to this process, impart dynamism to it, begin to get

it off the ground. Possibilities are opening up for contacts both with the Americans and with France and Britain on this issue.

Question (journalist from Lebanon). The capitals of the Middle East are awaiting your meeting with President Reagan with hope and even with alarm. They fear its possible consequences. What place does that region occupy in your priorities? What would your reaction be if the American delegation refused to discuss with you the future of that region, which the United States regards as its preserve. We know your principled stand on the question of Arab territories occupied by Israel, but what would your concrete position be in practice if Syria again took to arms?

Mikhail Gorbachev. Everything taking place in the Middle East worries us. We have never been aloof in the search for ways to settle the situation in the Middle East on a just basis. This means that troops must be withdrawn from occupied territories, that the Palestinian problem must be resolved on the principle of self-determination, and that the territorial integrity of Lebanon and its peaceful development and the legitimate rights of the Israeli people, the Israeli state must be ensured. It is in this direction that a solution must be looked for. I believe that other approaches—by separate deals and flanking manoeuvres—can only lead to a temporary settlement, but will not produce a solution to the problem that would permit a lasting peace in the Middle East to be established. That is why collective efforts are needed in order to find truly realistic ways out of the situation. And if the Americans think of the Middle East as a sphere of their “vital interests”, as you put it, who knows what else they think. The Americans claim “vital interests” now here, now there. Let the Americans think about that formulation.

This, by the way, is one of the factors that leads to misunderstandings and acute situations. If everything in the world is announced to be a zone of “vital interests”, what is left for the rest of the world? For two hundred countries? Are they to be vassals? This does not at all accord with the concept of equal development of the nations and with the possibility for every people to exercise their sovereign rights and to make their own choices. This process often proceeds painfully.

We make no secret of our position. We welcome it when people in one country or another choose the road of progressive

change and seek to formulate an independent policy, to mould their own outlook in the cultural field, and to establish their own economic institutions. We are on the side of those peoples. But as soon as we say so, voices cry out: "the hand of Moscow!", "the hand of Moscow!"

International relations are practised in a changeable and multifaceted world in the context of political, cultural and economic development at different levels of progress. We should take every step with great responsibility. It is inadmissible to proceed from an imperial point of view. This applies also to the Soviet Union. We have never allowed and will never allow this to happen.

Address to the Perugia-Assisi Peace Marchers

My heartfelt greetings to the Perugia-Assisi peace marchers.

Soviet people hold close to their hearts your desire to achieve progress in safeguarding peace and stopping the dangerous development of events in the international arena.

The Damoclean sword of nuclear catastrophe and Star Wars has been raised now over mankind. But we have faith that through the common, concerted actions of all nations and all peaceloving forces, it is still possible to ward off this threat and commence a real reduction in armaments.

It is with these aims in mind that the Soviet Union proposed the comprehensive programme of constructive measures for an improvement in the international situation and an end to the arms race.

The Soviet Union has just proposed to the US government that we come to terms concerning a full ban on space strike weapons for both sides and a drastic reduction, by 50 per cent, of nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory. We have shown our goodwill convincingly and palpably. It is now the turn of our negotiating partners.

As for your very pressing slogan concerning freezing military expenditures, I shall recall that back in 1984 the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty member states suggested to the NATO countries that the two sides start talks on mutual non-increase in military expenditures and their subsequent reduction.

The anti-war movement has an important word to say in resolving the destiny of mankind: should there be peace or a war of annihilation. Political and ideological differences recede when life on Earth is put as stake.

Your march and other actions by peace campaigners are a sizable contribution to the lofty struggle against the launching of the arms race into space, for a peaceful life for all nations.

I wish you and the entire anti-war movement in Italy great success.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, October 6, 1985

**Speech at the Dinner
in the Grand Kremlin Palace
in Honour of the Leader
of the Libyan Revolution
Colonel Muammar Gaddafi**

October 12, 1985

We are happy to welcome again representatives of the friendly Libyan Jamahiriya on Moscow soil.

Your arrival in our country, Comrade Gaddafi, confirms once again the close and firm nature of relations existing between the Soviet Union and Libya. These relations have long traditions and abound in manifestations of profound sympathy and respect between our peoples.

Together with you we rejoice at your country's successes achieved in the building of a new life after the revolution of September 1969. We follow with much interest Libya's search for its own road of development, of building a new society free from social inequality and exploitation. Throughout the centuries these ideals have inspired the best minds of mankind. We understand these ideals well and they are close to us.

The Soviet people has achieved impressive successes on the road of building socialism. Relying on them, we are confidently advancing to the 27th CPSU Congress which is called upon to open the road to a qualitatively new stage in Soviet society's development.

In the course of our meetings and talks we discussed with you, Comrade Gaddafi, a wide range of questions. That was a useful and constructive exchange of views. It enabled us, as we see it, to advance still further along the road of strengthening understanding and political cooperation between our countries.

The positive results of our multifaceted cooperation and the

outcome of the talks that we have had instill confidence that in the future too Soviet-Libyan relations will develop along the ascending line in all fields.

Our exchange of opinions has confirmed the extensive coincidence of our views on the most important and acute international problems, first of all on questions of the situation in the Middle East and in Africa. It showed that our two countries are unanimous in their resolve further to come out from positions of strengthening peace, universal security and respect for the rights of all peoples struggling for their political and economic independence.

The present tense and explosive international situation cannot but cause the concern of those who sincerely adhere to peace, who strive to do everything possible to improve this situation.

During my recent visit to France I presented in detail the Soviet Union's viewpoint on this and set forth our new proposals directed at ending the nuclear arms race and drastically reducing nuclear weapons, renouncing the creation of space strike arms, strengthening security in every way and developing mutually advantageous cooperation in Europe. In short, we propose a drastic turn from confrontation to the easing of tension.

It is not by chance that I have mentioned Europe. That continent was the seat of two world wars and now again it has found itself harnessed into a militaristic chariot filled this time with nuclear munitions. For this reason I believe the situation in Europe cannot leave indifferent the states directly adjoining it. I have in mind first of all the non-European Mediterranean countries. As I see it, understanding is growing there of the interconnection between security in the Mediterranean and the situation in Europe.

Among those countries Libya holds a special place. Its anti-imperialist policy, its contribution to the solution of acute international problems, the important role it plays in the non-aligned movement are highly appreciated in the Soviet Union. As a Mediterranean state Libya exerts a steadily growing influence on the state of affairs in that region.

It now comes out strongly against the aggressive imperialist policy in respect of the Maghrib and the Arab world as a whole, against plans to turn the Mediterranean into an arena of con-

frontation. This obviously is not to the liking of some people and it is not by chance that lately Libya became more than once the target of military provocations and rude pressure.

Guided by the general principles of its foreign policy the Soviet Union sincerely strives for the seats of tension in the Mediterranean to be liquidated by peaceful political means. We stand for continuing the drawing together of positions, for facilitating more actively the search for a settlement of regional problems at the negotiating table, for protecting the sovereign rights of states and peoples subjected to pressure and flagrant interference in their internal affairs.

Together with other Warsaw Treaty member states the Soviet Union comes out for the renunciation of the deployment of nuclear arms on the territories of non-nuclear Mediterranean countries, for the adoption by nuclear powers of the commitment not to use nuclear arms against any Mediterranean country that does not allow the stationing of such arms on its territory. We have long declared for the withdrawal of nuclear-capable ships from the Mediterranean Sea.

The Soviet Union also comes out for spreading to this area the military-technical confidence-building measures in accordance with the Helsinki Final Act that have already proved their worth in world practice. A limitation of naval activity and naval armaments in the region would, as it appears to us, play a positive role.

The question of banning chemical weapons has lately been high on the agenda and agitating minds. The idea of creating a zone free from chemical weapons in Central Europe is now being discussed as a step in this direction.

But perhaps this idea is applicable to the Mediterranean area as well, and then to the African continent as a whole? It is obvious, for instance, that the use of chemical weapons in the Mediterranean, one of the most densely populated areas of the world, would pose a tremendous danger.

The situation in the Middle East is one of the worst bleeding wounds in the present-day world. Having the support of the United States, Israel now no longer limits itself to aggressive actions against neighbouring states. Cynically flouting all norms of international law it made a bandit raid against the capital of Tunisia, a sovereign Arab country, a member of the United

Nations, situated more than 2,000 kilometres away from Israel's borders.

As we see it, the question of the unity of action of Arab countries acquires special importance in conditions of such arrogant actions by Israel in respect of Arab states and the increasingly intensive attempts by its patrons to replace a genuine search for peace in the Middle East with all sorts of separate deals. By acting separately it is hardly possible to count on a settlement that would meet the interests of all Arabs, on the attainment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

We continue to be convinced that this aim can be achieved only by collective efforts.

Why is the Soviet Union so persistently upholding the proposal to convene an international conference on the Middle East? Not at all because we, as some are contending, hope to outdo somebody at that conference and get some one-sided advantages. The Soviet Union has no such designs.

We are for the conference for the simple reason that it is actually the only sensible and effective way of putting an end to the perennial state of war in the Middle East and establishing lasting peace there. Moreover, of achieving this without further bloodshed, without intrigues and secret deals by some behind the backs of others, with due account for the lawful interests of all sides concerned without exception. Such is the real essence of our stand on this question.

Dear friends,

Permit me in conclusion to express confidence that our meetings and talks will promote the further deepening of the friendly Soviet-Libyan relations, the strengthening of the unity of action of forces of progress in the struggle for peace and international security.

**On the Drafts of an Updated Edition
of the CPSU Programme,
Changes in the CPSU Rules,
and the Guidelines
for the Economic and Social Development
of the USSR for 1986-1990
and for the Period Ending in 2000**

Report at the Plenary Meeting
of the CPSU Central Committee

October 15, 1985

Comrades,

We shall examine the drafts of an updated edition of the CPSU Programme, of the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for the 12th Five-Year Plan and for the Period Ending in 2000, and of changes in the CPSU Rules.

These are documents of immense political significance. They deal with our programmatic objectives, with key questions of the general line of the Party, its economic strategy, forms and methods of work among the masses in the present, exceptionally complex and important period of history which in many ways, both on the domestic and on the international plane, is one of fundamental change.

As you know, the April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee and then the Meeting on Accelerating Scientific and Technological Progress made a thorough analysis of the existing situation, set forth and substantiated a broad concept of accelerating the country's social and economic development and achieving on this basis a qualitatively new condition of Soviet society. This is the crux of the matter and herein lies the whole essence of our problems.

Today our Party sets forth before the people the concept of acceleration and with this concept it is proceeding to its next, 27th Congress. This is the core of all the three documents that have been submitted for consideration by the present Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. The acceleration of the country's social and economic development is aimed at en-

sureing a materially and culturally rich and socially dynamic life for the Soviet people in conditions of peace, at bringing out even more fully and vividly the potentialities and advantages of a historically new type of civilisation embodied by the socialist system.

First of all, about the updated edition of the CPSU Programme which has been drafted as instructed by the 26th Congress. In the course of serious and thorough work on it there arose far from simple questions of both a theoretical and a political nature, connected with analysing the results of the road traversed and defining the prospects for the country's further development.

In the past quarter of a century, and we can see it, far-reaching economic and social changes of an objective nature have taken place in our country. Such changes required profound analysis, updating current and long-term goals, definition of ways of attaining them and new approaches to the Party's organising, socio-economic and ideological activity. The international situation, too, called for more precise definition of guidelines in the Programme. We had to work out a new conception of those changes in the alignment of forces that are taking place both on the class and social plane and around the struggle for the affirmation of the principle of peace as a universal norm of inter-state and all international relations.

In other words, what was needed was not only to sum up the results of what had been done and accomplished but to draw up a clear and well-substantiated programme of action for the sake of man and peace on Earth.

What would I like to draw your attention to in this connection?

First of all, to the continuity in the CPSU's basic theoretical and political guidelines. We attach fundamental importance to this. Life itself has confirmed the correctness of the main content of the Party's third Programme. By following it, our country has moved far in all areas of communist development. The basic theoretical and political provisions of the third Programme are retained in its updated edition.

The question of continuity in the development of theory and of the Party's programmatic objectives is a question of its adherence to theoretical principle and consistency, of its loyalty to Marxism-Leninism. The CPSU would not enjoy such high

prestige in the world communist movement and such trust of the Soviet people if it treated its own theoretical conclusions and political appraisals without a proper sense of responsibility.

At the same time, consistency and continuity in theory definitely presuppose the creative development of that theory, its enrichment with provisions of fundamental importance in accordance with historical experience. This is quite natural. Today we have a better, more precise idea of the ways of perfecting socialism, of achieving the goal stated in our Programme—communism. It goes without saying that all this has to be and is reflected in the Party's main theoretical and political document.

In enriching and developing the content of the Programme, we have at the same time critically reassessed those of its formulations which have not stood the test of time. This accords with our Party's traditions. As Lenin pointed out, "criticism of individual points and formulations is quite legitimate and necessary in any live party".¹

In the whole of this work we proceeded from the Leninist principles of drawing up the Party Programme. It should be an exact formulation of the actual process; it should explicitly spell out the basic views and political tasks, and be free of both excessive detail and groundless fantasy, bookish subtleties, and of play with definitions. The Programme is an explicit and precise statement of what the Party seeks to achieve and what it works for.

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee believes that the document which has been submitted meets these demands on the whole. It is based on Marxist-Leninist theory, a realistic analysis of the processes taking place in the country and in the world arena, and gives a clear and comprehensive description of the strategic directions of the work of the Party, the Soviet state, and the whole people, proceeding from the communist perspective of the country's development.

The third Party Programme in its present wording is one of planned and all-round improvement of socialism, of a further advancement of Soviet society towards communism on the basis of accelerating the country's socio-economic development. It is a programme of struggle for peace and social progress.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "The Reorganisation of the Party", *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, 1978, p. 31.

We firmly steer a course towards communism, proceeding from the belief that there is not, nor can there be, any sharp divide between the two phases of the single communist formation. It is impossible to go over to the highest stage of communism directly, bypassing socialism, just as it is wrong to present socialism as a social formation in its own right. The growth of socialism into communism is determined by the objective laws of society's development. Any attempts at rushing ahead, introducing communist principles without taking into account the level of society's material and intellectual maturity are, as experience has shown, doomed to failure. Neither is sluggishness permissible in carrying out necessary transformations, in implementing new tasks.

The updated edition of the Programme contains a more comprehensive description of the historic achievements and advantages of socialism as a stage in mankind's progress that excels capitalism, and outlines the goals in the economic, social and political spheres and in the intellectual life which our society should achieve as a result of the implementation of the Programme. To attain a qualitatively new condition of Soviet society through acceleration of the country's socio-economic development—such is the formula expressing the substance of the Party's policy today.

The Programme proceeds from the decisive role of the economy in society's development. The Party's economic strategy has been determined with due account taken of a further deepening of the scientific and technological revolution. It is aimed at carrying out transformations on a truly historic scale—accomplishing a new technical reconstruction of the economy, transferring it to an intensive path of development, and raising the Soviet economy to the highest level of organisation and efficiency. And all this is for the sake of the people, for their benefit.

Considerably more attention is given to the social sphere. Our Party must have a socially strong policy, one embracing the whole spectrum of human life—from conditions of work and everyday life, health and leisure to social, class and ethnic relations. In pointing out the need to pay attention to social issues, science and culture, Lenin wrote: "That will be the best policy. That will be the most economical management. Otherwise,

while saving a few hundred millions, we may lose so much that no sum will be sufficient to restore what we have lost.”¹

It is precisely from this point of view that our attitude to the social sphere is determined in the draft. The Party regards social policy as a powerful means of accelerating the country's economic development and bringing about an upsurge in the labour and socio-political activity of the masses, as an important factor in ensuring political stability in society, in moulding the new man and in consolidating the socialist way of life.

We attach fundamental importance to the draft's provisions on the development of Soviet society's political system, ever fuller attainment of socialist self-government by the people.

I wish, comrades, to stress most emphatically that without a comprehensive broadening and deepening of socialist democracy, i.e. without providing conditions for active and effective day-to-day participation of all the working people, their collectives and organisations in resolving matters of state and public life, we will not be able to forge ahead. Lenin regarded as a most important source of strength and vitality of socialism the initiative, energy and creative effort of the people, their conscious attitude to and stake in the tasks of building the new system.

The development of genuine power by the people is assuming ever greater significance today when we are going to carry out most difficult tasks in the fields of production, culture and administration. Every real step in ensuring greater openness and publicity, in strengthening control from the grassroots level, in deepening democratic principles in the activity of all state and public organisations is valuable. In short, we should make maximum use of the democratic nature of socialism, its vital need to draw on the creativity of the masses.

The programmatic tasks in ideological work are also inseparably linked with the acceleration of socio-economic development. It is necessary to educate people on the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, educate them by word of truth and real deeds, by combining political education and ideological influence with ever growing participation of working people in the solutions of economic and social problems, in the administration of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 1977, p. 181.

state, production and public affairs. Only through a well-considered economic strategy, a strong social policy and purposeful ideological and educational work, taken in their inseparable unity, is it possible to activate the human factor, without which none of the tasks put forward can be accomplished. This is how the issue stands today.

The updated edition of the Programme also reflects fully enough the main trends in world development. These include a further strengthening of the positions of existing socialism, growth of its prestige and influence, the increasing role of the popular masses calling for a renewal of life on the principles of justice; growing opposition to positive changes in the world on the part of the reactionary, aggressive forces of imperialism; and a strengthening of the peace potential which unites the countries of socialism, the international working-class and communist movement, scores of newly free independent states and broad anti-war democratic movements. It is their interaction that determines the general trend in world development in our time.

We can all see that the policy of the major capitalist powers has taken a very dangerous turn. With the passage of time, the practical actions of imperialism, especially US imperialism, ever more clearly reveal the essence of this policy, which is one of social revenge on the basis of achievement of military superiority over socialism, suppression of the progressive and liberation movements, and maintenance of international tensions at such a level as would justify the development of ever new types of mass destruction weapons and militarisation of space.

As a result, international developments have reached a line which cannot be overcome without taking critically important decisions aimed at curbing the arms race and halting the slide towards war. Such decisions cannot be put off lest one should lose control over dangerous processes that threaten mankind's very existence. To curb the forces of militarism and war and ensure a durable peace and reliable security is the cardinal problem of our time.

The search for new approaches to the solution of vitally important problems, given the tremendous diversity of social and political forces operating in the world arena, demands that a realistic account be taken of often non-coinciding and sometimes

even clashing interests so that a correct political course can be worked out. It is the opinion of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee that the updated edition of the Programme provides good pointers in this respect.

It is an integral expression of our concept of strengthening peace on Earth and promoting social progress and national liberation of the peoples; and in it are formulated the basic principles of policy, I would say, its principal mainstays, which remain immutable. At the same time, the Programme demonstrates our Party's broad approach to international affairs, its ability to take timely account of changes in the situation, to face reality squarely and without prejudice, objectively to assess what is taking place and react flexibly to the demands of the moment.

We openly speak about the objectives of our international policy, about the ways of attaining them. In this sense our policy is quite predictable, there are no riddles or ambiguities in it. It is a policy based on the Leninist idea of the peaceful coexistence of two opposite systems. We proceed from the belief that only a stable and reliable policy is worthy of states and parties that are aware of their responsibility for the future of the world in our age, full as it is of contradictions.

The progressive forces will see in the Programme an expression of our invariable solidarity with their struggle, of our respect for their views and stands, of our striving to help consolidate their unity—that dialectic unity of diversity which covers the entire living fabric of the socialist world, of the working-class, communist and national liberation movements, of all movements against reaction and aggression, for peace and progress.

And now the draft Guidelines. They are designed to carry into effect the provisions of the CPSU Programme, to translate them into the language of concrete plan targets, as applied to such a crucial stage in its implementation as the 12th five-year plan period and the period till the year 2000.

A great amount of work has been accomplished, but it did not proceed easily or smoothly. And this was not only because the elaboration of a scientifically substantiated perspective for the development of an economy of such an immense scale as ours is not at all a simple thing, and especially now, when it is faced with qualitatively new tasks. We had to take into account the

totality of objective factors which in different ways influence the growth rates, proportions and efficiency of the national economy.

We also encountered problems of a different kind, problems stemming from the fact that not all of our cadres have discarded inertia, given up old patterns and adherence to extensive methods of economic management. Not all, it turned out, are psychologically prepared for work under new conditions, for incorporating in the 12th five-year plan a radical turn towards intensiveness and quality. Such moods had to be overcome as we went along, while work on the Guidelines was already in full swing. A great role in this respect was played by the fact that work collectives were brought in to help in the search for untapped reserves and in the working out of challenging targets for the five-year plan period and by the fact that Party organisations—from republican, territorial, regional to primary—adopted an active position.

As a result, we succeeded in correcting many things, and the draft under discussion today meets in the main, so the Political Bureau of the Central Committee believes, the Party's policy aims for speeding up economic growth, and simultaneously carrying out such strategic tasks as improving the people's well-being, strengthening the country's economic potential and maintaining its defence capacity at a proper level.

It is noteworthy that in the new five-year plan the growth in national income and output of all branches of material production will be achieved entirely, for the first time, by raising productivity. A marked reduction in the materials input, envisaged for the five-year plan period, will help turn thrift into a vital source for meeting the requirements of the national economy in additional material resources.

Structural reorganisation of the economy and concentration of capital investment on top-priority areas of development of the national economy will be effected more energetically than before. Emphasis is laid, first of all, on technical re-equipment and modernisation of existing enterprises. The machine-building, chemical, electronic and electric engineering industries are to be developed at an accelerated pace. The output of new generations of machinery and equipment and the use of advanced materials and technologies will be expanded.

In short, a marked change towards greater efficiency is envisaged in the 12th five-year plan period. But in order to bring about a radical turn in this direction we must not relax our efforts. On the contrary, we must step them up. It is a matter of primary importance to perfect planning and management and methods of running the economy, improve organisation, strengthen discipline, enhance responsibility in all sectors and encourage in every way the creative initiative of the masses.

Attainment of the targets to be reached by the start of the third millennium will depend on how fast we bring about a turn towards efficiency and carry out a new technical reconstruction of the national economy. It is planned in the next fifteen years to create an economic potential approximately equal in scale to that accumulated throughout all the previous years of Soviet government and to almost double national income and industrial output. Productivity of labour is to go up by 130-150 per cent.

This will help double the volume of resources for meeting the requirements of the people. I think that the document being presented gives us every ground for saying that the implementation of its social programme will make it possible, in the next three five-year plan periods, to raise the Soviet people's standard of living to a qualitatively new level.

The magnitude, depth and complexity of the tasks for both our home and foreign policy make great new demands on the level of Party leadership and dictate the need for new approaches to all aspects of Party work. Naturally, all this must be reflected in the CPSU Rules—the fundamental law of the Party, its code of life.

What is the basic meaning of the changes proposed for the Party Rules?

Briefly, on the one hand, to further broaden democracy within the Party, develop the initiative and activity of Communists, of all Party organisations, especially primary ones, and, on the other hand, to enhance their sense of responsibility for carrying out common tasks. The more diverse and the richer Party life, and the deeper its democratism in decision-making on all key matters—from new admissions to the Party to cadre policy—the stronger and more effective the Party influence on all social processes.

The basic principles of Party guidance of state and public organisations are defined in the Rules along the same lines. Every one of them is to discharge its functions in full, while Party guidance of their activities should be clearly of a political character and should actively help to further develop socialist self-government by the people in all sectors and at all levels. The proposed changes will help enhance the prestige of the Party member, his importance and role as a political fighter and organiser of the masses, and his responsibility for implementing the Party's general line and directives.

On the whole, the proposed changes in the Party Rules will enrich them with new points in accordance with the demands of life, help strengthen the Party organisationally on the basis of the tried and tested principles of democratic centralism, and enhance the leading role of the CPSU in the face of new tasks confronting the country.

Comrades, a meeting was held yesterday by the Programme Commission which presents today the draft of an updated edition of the Party Programme. I believe that our discussion of the draft at the Plenary Meeting will be businesslike and fruitful. What has been just said applies, to no smaller extent, to the draft Guidelines and the proposed changes in the CPSU Rules.

Approval by the Central Committee Plenary Meeting of the documents submitted will usher in a very important stage in the preparations for the 27th Congress of the CPSU—a stage of the Party's large-scale and direct consultation with the people on major economic and political matters.

The Political Bureau proposes that these documents be published and widely discussed at Party meetings, district, city, regional and territorial conferences, congresses of the communist parties of the Union Republics and that the draft Guidelines should also be discussed at meetings in work collectives, educational establishments, army units and public organisations. The local government, the trade unions and the Komsomol should also have their say. The participation of millions and millions of Soviet people—Communists and non-Party people—in Party-wide and nation-wide debate will make it possible better to adjust the Party's policy for the future, and take fuller account of the will, interests and needs of all classes, of all sections of the people.

The main thing that we should ensure in the process of discussion is a businesslike approach and orientation on solving specific practical problems. Meetings and discussions must be meaningful and held without any pomp, fuss and over-organisation. The leading Party, state and economic cadres should take a most active and direct part in them.

The work collective and its primary sections—the division and team, farm unit and laboratory—should become the centre of all work relating to the study and explanation of the pre-Congress documents. Substantive discussions must be held there on the questions that concern us, on the need to bring into play our tremendous reserves, on the thrifty use of resources, the removal of existing shortcomings and the spread of advanced experience. It is very important that every person in the Soviet Union should have a clear understanding of the policy objectives and tasks of the Party, of the meaning of its home and foreign policy, and be able to associate his day-to-day work with them.

In other words, it is essential from the very beginning to make the discussion constructive and creative. The Central Committee's line aimed at encouraging an innovatory approach to the current problems of our development, at overcoming everything that is outdated and hampers our onward movement, has the total support of the working people. We will continue to pursue this line consistently, relying on the will and creative endeavour of the entire nation.

There is no doubt that the pre-Congress documents will call forth a wave of comments, proposals and letters. Apart from considerations of state importance, people will raise specific issues and make comments on the work of Party, government and economic bodies. Not a single useful idea, not a single proposal should be left unheeded. It is important that during the discussion of the documents the working people should know that their critical remarks have been heard and appropriate measures are being taken on the basis of their proposals. This is a matter of principle for us.

It seems advisable to use the experience of work on the Guidelines and to draft the five-year plan while the Guidelines are being discussed. This will make it possible to examine and approve it shortly after the Congress.

The concluding stage of the preparations for the Congress

makes great demands on the mass media. They should become a nation-wide forum for discussion, accumulate the ideas, opinions and experience of the masses and create that lofty labour and ideological-moral atmosphere without which implementation of any plan is impossible.

Comrades, however inspiring the drafted plans may be, their targets can be achieved only by strenuous and highly efficient work. What is especially needed now is concrete efforts by every Soviet citizen, every work collective, every Party organisation. The time has come for still more vigorous actions, and this is the main thing today. It is the duty of Party, government, economic, trade union and Komsomol organisations to mobilise all our potential, all our resources and possibilities, and, above all, the human factor for consistent fulfilment of the set tasks.

We have already started such work. Major decisions have been taken and important measures are being carried out in the economic, social and ideological spheres. We must continue to work in the spirit of the political line we have laid down and undeviatingly follow the course that has been charted. We must continue to speed up our onward movement while improving discipline and order in everything, actively using moral and material incentives and opening still greater prospects for the creative initiative of the masses.

All organising, political and economic efforts, the entire energy of work collectives should be concentrated on completing both the plan for the present year and the five-year plan as a whole with the best results and on bringing significant new achievements to the 27th Congress of our Leninist Party. This is now the most urgent task both practically and politically.

Historical experience convincingly shows that the loftiest dream of the happiness of the people, even if it is a dream of a genius, will remain just a noble idea if it does not capture the minds and hearts of millions. On being accepted by the popular masses, forward-looking ideas turn into a mighty motive force of progress.

The policy of the Leninist Party, its wisdom and conscience correctly express what is felt and understood by the people—their thoughts, aspirations and hopes. And we are convinced that the great cause of communism, to which the Party has devoted itself, is invincible.

Press Conference in the Soviet Press Centre in Geneva

Our talks with the President of the United States of America, the first in six and a half years, have just ended. This has been, beyond any doubt, a significant event in international life. The significance of this meeting becomes even more apparent if one considers not only Soviet-American, but international relations as a whole, which are experiencing an unusual, I would say, a difficult, period.

First, a few words about what had preceded the Geneva meeting. It had been anxiously awaited around the world. People linked with it great hopes for an improvement in the world situation and a relaxation of international tension which is reaching a dangerous level. True, there were some doubts: hasn't the confrontation between the two powers gone too far to count on any accords at all? All this took place, you know that no worse than we do.

As regards the Soviet side, the Soviet Union, we were well aware of the actual situation and did not harbour the slightest illusion about American policy. We saw how far the militarisation of the economy and even of political thought in that country has gone.

But we understood well that the situation in the world was too dangerous to neglect even the slightest chance of rectifying things and moving towards a more stable and lasting peace.

Well before the meeting, a few months prior to it, we began to pave the way towards it, as it were, and create a favourable climate for it. Back in the summer we unilaterally suspended all

nuclear explosions, expressing readiness to resume immediately the talks on complete cessation of nuclear tests. We also reaffirmed our unilateral moratorium on the testing of anti-satellite weapons and, as you know, put forward radical proposals for a reduction of nuclear arsenals. Our proposals to prevent the arms race from extending to outer space were accompanied by proposals to launch the broadest possible international cooperation in peaceful exploration and use of outer space for the good of all nations.

I repeat, we were doing everything to lay the ground for mutual understanding and create a healthier political atmosphere even before the meeting. Prior to the Geneva summit, the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states held a session in Sofia at which the socialist nations spoke out strongly in favour of peace, detente, and cooperation, against the arms race, against confrontation, and for an improvement of the international situation in the interests of all peoples of the Earth.

And although these moves of ours, prompted by a sense of responsibility for the future of the world, fetched no proper response from our partners in the talks to be held in Geneva, we stood firm by a constructive position. We considered it necessary to try to reverse the dangerous course of events by the force of argument, the force of example, the force of common sense. The very complexity of the international situation convinced us that a direct conversation with the US President was necessary. In the light of the tremendous role played by both the Soviet Union and the United States of America, these states and their political leaders naturally have just as tremendous a responsibility to bear. Our conclusion was this: the time has come to learn the great art of living together in the face of universal nuclear danger. Both our Soviet people and, I am deeply convinced, the American people, are equally interested in this. All of the world's peoples are interested in this.

We have always felt that people in all countries are in favour of peace and not only want peace to be preserved but the situation to be improved and real progress to be made in the struggle to halt the arms race. This striving is growing stronger and it is of tremendous importance. Two major conclusions may be drawn from it.

On the one hand, and this encouraged us, what we do corresponds to the hopes and aspirations of a great mass of people in the world, regardless of where they live and whatever their political views, religious convictions and traditions. On the other hand, this not only encouraged us but imposed many duties on us, particularly responsibility.

What characterises the present stage of development of the international situation? Briefly, it is the growing responsibility for the future of the world. The peoples have realised this tremendous responsibility and they are acting in every way they can.

This means that states and political leaders should be guided by this situation and these characteristics in their practical policies. The absence of a policy appropriate for the needs of the moment, which are felt by all the peoples of the world, cannot be replaced by all sorts of propaganda wrappings. The peoples have learned to see quickly what is what and put everything in its proper place.

This is my profound conviction. This is how we in the political leadership of the Soviet Union have understood the situation and we have therefore focused our attention on a constructive search for a better and more tranquil world.

I was greatly impressed by the letters I received from citizens in the Soviet Union, from the United States, Australia, Europe, Asia and Africa. They were from children, women, men, war veterans. It is important to emphasise that in those letters the voice of the world's youth, those to whom the future belongs, those who are making a start in life and assuming responsibility for the world's future, was heard loud and clear.

Now about the meeting itself.

It was largely a tête-à-tête meeting with President Reagan. When the US President and I were saying goodbye to one another just now, we wanted to count the number of private meetings we had had. We counted five or six. Most of our meetings lasted for an hour, some a little longer. These are not just figures. Our discussions were straightforward, lengthy, intense, at times extremely intense. Nevertheless, it seems to me they were also productive to a certain extent. Of course, they took a great deal more time than we had planned. I would say they occupied the greater part of these two days.

This enabled us to discuss a broad range of problems face to face. We spoke the language of politics, open and straightforward, and I think that was of not only great, but I would say, of decisive importance.

These discussions as well as the plenary sessions and broad contacts between all members of the delegations and experts at appropriate levels—on the Soviet and American side these were authoritative people, known not only in our countries but internationally—made it possible to carry out a tremendous amount of serious work in two days.

We acquainted the President with our views and our assessment of the situation in the world. The point of reference in our analysis was as follows: during the past few decades dramatic changes have taken place in the world which require a new approach and a fresh look at many aspects of foreign policy. The international situation today is distinguished by a very important feature which we and the United States of America must take into account in our foreign policy. What I mean is this. In the present situation we are talking not only about confrontation between the two social systems, but about a choice between survival and mutual annihilation.

In other words, the objective course of world developments itself has placed the problem of war and peace and the problem of survival at the centre of world politics. I would like to emphasise that I am using the word "survival" not in order to dramatise the situation or create fear, but in order that all of us should deeply feel and comprehend the realities of the world today.

The problem of war and peace is one of paramount importance, a burning problem of concern for all of us living on earth. I would like to emphasise that this problem is now at the centre of world politics. We cannot avoid looking for a solution to this crucial problem. This is our firm belief. This is the will of the Soviet people, the will of the American people and that of all the peoples of the world. This is all in the first place.

Second, we once again drew the attention of the American side to the following factors which I have already mentioned. These factors are so important, and we attach such serious significance to them that we deemed it necessary to bring this up again in Geneva. Namely, it is indeed a fact that we already find it very difficult now to commence a productive dialogue

and talks on the cessation of the arms race and on nuclear disarmament. It will be even more difficult to do so tomorrow.

That is why a meeting, a responsible dialogue was necessary. We have all reached a point at which we must stop, look round, think things over, and decide, on the basis of the realities, on the basis of a broad approach to defining national interests, what is further to be done in the world. In the course of the meetings and talks I wanted to understand the position of the present US Administration on this cardinal issue—the question of war and peace.

We have all read a great deal on this score. To be sure, you journalists have also said quite a lot about this. But for the decision-makers it is essential to understand the starting-point for the shaping of the partner's policy, the initial design of the foreign policy of the present US Administration. It took a lot of work and a lot of effort to appraise everything without bias, with great responsibility and with a broad outlook, and to find an answer to this very important question.

The analysis has shown that despite different approaches and appraisals of the two sides, which came into the open during this serious and necessary work—it was impossible to go to the summit without having done this work—we saw that, as it seems to me, we have elements in common which can serve as the starting-point for the improvement of Soviet-US relations. I mean the understanding of the fact that a nuclear war is inadmissible, that it cannot be waged and cannot be won. This idea was voiced more than once both by us and by the American side. A conclusion follows from this that the pivotal problem in relations between our countries at the present stage is the problem of security. We resolutely stand for the achievement of agreements which will ensure equal security for both countries.

We are aware that consistent strengthening of mutual confidence and general improvement of the political atmosphere, in which one could hope for development of a political dialogue, for fruitful discussion of economic and humanitarian problems and the problems of contacts and reciprocal information, will become possible precisely on this basis. Herein lies the key to the problem of preserving life on earth, to changing the political atmosphere towards goodwill.

We told the President that we have not sought and will not

seek to gain military superiority over the USA. Moreover, I have repeatedly tried, both privately and at the plenary meetings, to express our profound conviction that a lower level of security on the part of the United States of America as compared with that of the Soviet Union would not benefit us because this would lead to mistrust and generate instability. We count on the same approach by the USA in what concerns our country. At the same time, we told the President that we would by no means let the USA gain military superiority over us. I think, this is a logical approach to the question. Both sides had better get used to strategic parity as a natural state of Soviet-American relations. What should be discussed is how to lower the level of this parity through joint efforts, in other words, to carry out real measures for reducing nuclear armaments on a mutual basis. This is a field of activity worthy of the leaders of such great states as the Soviet Union and the United States of America, as well as of other leaders of states, for it is our common issue.

But this quite logically leads to the following conclusion of fundamental importance. Neither of us, neither the United States of America nor the Soviet Union, should do anything that might open the door for the arms race in new spheres, specifically, in outer space. If the door into outer space were to be opened for weapons, the scope of military confrontation would grow immeasurably and the arms race would acquire an irreversible character, which can definitely be predicted already now, and would get out of control. In that event each side would constantly feel as though it had fallen behind in something, and would be frantically looking for ever new counter-measures. All this would spur on the arms race, not only in outer space but on earth as well, for counter-measures should not necessarily be taken in the same sphere. They must just be effective.

I am following the same line of reasoning now as I did while talking to the President. If such a situation does arise, I repeat that the possibility of agreement on any restraint in military rivalry and the arms race will grow extremely problematic. I would like to return to what I have already said: the distinctive feature of the present situation is that we have reached a certain point. And unless we think things over with genuine responsibility, incorrect, erroneous conclusions by politicians may lead to

such steps which would have dire consequences for all nations.

Of course, the differences and rivalry between our countries will remain, but we must do everything to prevent this rivalry from overstepping permissible bounds and leading to military confrontation. Let each social system prove its advantages through example.

We have a good idea not only of the weak but also of the strong aspects of American society and of other advanced nations. We are aware of their accomplishments and their potentials. Naturally, we know our own capabilities better, including those which have yet to be realised. In other words, we are in favour of competition with the USA, active competition. It was history itself rather than mere theorising and speculations that has confirmed the viability of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

A great deal in the development of relations between the USSR and the USA depends on how each side perceives the surrounding world. We feel that it is particularly important here to have a clear understanding of historical realities and to take them into account in policy-making. I am referring now both to the Soviet and American leaders.

Today's world is a highly diversified assemblage of sovereign states, of nations with their own interests, aspirations, policies, traditions and dreams. Many of them have just embarked on the road of independent development. They make their first steps under incredibly difficult conditions left over from the days of colonialism and foreign dependence. Having acquired political sovereignty, they are seeking now to gain economic independence. They see that they have the resources and manpower, that is, what can ensure a better life for them, given the appropriate work process. Why, these are huge continents. So it is only natural that each nation should seek to exercise its sovereign right in the political, economic and social spheres.

One may like or dislike this policy, but it does reflect the inner processes in each particular country and the interests of each given nation which possesses that sovereign right. This is the right to choose the way, the system, the methods, the forms and the friends. This is the right of each nation. I don't know how international relations can possibly be built without the recognition of this right.

When I was in Britain last December, I recalled a phrase by

Palmerston. I memorised this phrase when I was studying international relations in the Law Department of Moscow State University. Palmerston said that Britain had no eternal enemies or eternal friends, only eternal interests. I told Margaret Thatcher then that I agreed with this. But if both Palmerston and you, the present political leader of Britain, admit that you do have such interests, you must admit that other nations and other countries also have their own interests.

When there are about two hundred states in the international arena, each of them strives to have its own interests realised. But to what extent are these interests realised? This depends on the extent to which the interests of others are taken into account in the course of cooperation. To look upon the world as somebody's private domain is an approach which we reject. We have always said so—ten years ago and today—and we will continue to say so tomorrow. We have no dual policy here. We pursue an honest and open policy. We have been doing so and we shall continue to do so.

Tension, conflicts in some regions, even wars between various states in some part of the world or another, have their roots both in the past and in the current socio-economic conditions of those countries and regions. To present the whole thing as if these contradiction knots have been born of the rivalry between East and West is not only erroneous but also extremely dangerous. I said this to the President and the American delegation.

If today, for example, Mexico, Brazil and several other states are unable to pay not only their debts but even the interest on those debts, one can imagine what processes are going on in those countries. The situation may become strained and lead to an explosion. Will they then again talk about the "hand of Moscow"? But you simply cannot come out with such judgements on such issues in so irresponsible a manner before the entire world. These banalities still occur in some places, but they are inadmissible, particularly at meetings such as the present one. That is why we said at the very start: let us not tell each other banalities, for many were uttered before, in the course of preparations for the meeting. It was quite a clash, and not without the help of you journalists.

Of course, the Soviet Union and the United States are two mighty powers with their own global interests and with their

own allies and friends. They have their priorities in their foreign policies. But the Soviet leadership sees this not as a source of confrontation but rather as a basis for a special, greater responsibility for the destinies of the world borne by the Soviet Union and the United States, and their leaders. This is how we see it. Of course, we can argue about the situation in some part of the world or another. Our conclusions may be different, often contradicting, especially when the matter concerns particular events and the causes of particular conflicts. In principle, we are not against discussing any particular regional problems to find ways of promoting their settlement. We discussed this and the President and I agreed to continue to exert joint efforts, which has been reflected in the final Joint Statement. Yet we always emphasise—and I want to repeat here—that this must not involve any kind of interference in the internal affairs of other states. Such is our conception of Soviet-American relations, which we brought to the meeting and presented to the President and the American delegation. It was put forth in a more detailed form, but here I have just tried to convey its essence to you.

We believe that improvement of Soviet-US relations is quite possible. Many problems have accumulated, I would say, whole pile-ups that must be cleared away. Soviet leaders have the political will to tackle this job. But it should be done jointly with the American side. As we know, when geologists or miners are faced with cave-ins and find themselves in a critical situation, rescue teams come converging to save people.

In order to keep our relations from being further strained, to prevent them from moving towards confrontation and turn them to a normal course towards improvement, this work should be done through joint efforts. We are ready for this. I told the US President that it would be a big mistake to fail to use this opportunity that has presented itself for redirecting the situation in Soviet-US relations towards normalisation, and this means towards improvement of the situation in the world as a whole.

I would like to return again to the main issue which was pivotal to the Geneva meeting. There was not a single full-scale meeting, not a single private face-to-face meeting, in which questions of war and peace and arms control did not hold a

central place. These were the pivot of the Geneva meeting. We explained to the American side that the Star Wars programme would not merely give an impulse to the arms race involving weapons of all types, but that it would also put an end to any restrictions on the arms race. In reply, we were told again and again that the large-scale space-based anti-missile system was allegedly defensive in character. We were told: what would you tell the Soviet people after Geneva if you refused to carry out a reduction in offensive arms? We gave an answer to that question, and I repeat it here: this isn't so. We are prepared to carry out a radical reduction in nuclear arms, provided the door is firmly closed to starting an arms race in space. On that condition we are ready to go through the first stage on the basis of the principle of a 50 per cent reduction in nuclear arms and then, drawing the other nuclear powers into this process, to move further on the road of radical reductions.

A certain part of the world, perhaps even some politicians and journalists react positively, so to speak, to the SDI. It is said that this is a defensive weapon, a kind of shield. This is absolutely not so. As a matter of fact, mountains of weapons have been stockpiled in the world, the arms race is going on and we are unable, in spite of all our efforts, to cope with this process, put it under control, curb and reverse it. And yet in this highly complicated situation the United States proposes that we start a race in space. Who could guarantee that we would then be able to organise any effective talks? I think no man in his senses could guarantee this. The American side is reluctant to admit that the SDI means putting weapons in space. And they are weapons. They would fly over people's heads in waves—American and Soviet weapons. We would all watch this sky and wonder what might fall from there. We said to the American side, let us imagine the consequences of even an accidental collision in space. Say, something has become separated from a missile, the warhead goes off on its own and the detached vehicle collides with some space weapon system. There would be signals which could be interpreted as an attempt of the other side, I don't even say which side, ours or the other, to destroy these weapons. All computers would be switched on, while politicians in such a case would not be able to do anything that is sensible. Shall we allow such things to prevail over us? We can

imagine many such situations. I said to the US President: we feel that he is captivated by this idea as a man and to some extent we can understand this. What we cannot understand in this respect is the position he has taken as a politician who is responsible for such a mighty state, for security matters. We think that after our talks the American side would consider in earnest everything we said on this score.

The meeting has shown once again that the Americans do not like our logic, while we cannot find logic in their arguments. They say: believe us, if the Americans were the first to develop the SDI, they would share their experience with the Soviet Union. I said then: Mr. President, I call on you to believe us. We have already said that we would not be the first to use nuclear weapons and we would not attack the United States. Why then do you, while preserving the entire offensive potential on earth and under water, intend to start the arms race also in space? You don't believe us? This shows you don't. Why should we believe you more than you believe us? We have all the more reasons not to believe you, since we have proposed that both sides should not put weapons into space and start disarmament on earth. All this is comprehensible to everybody.

In general, it is to be hoped that this is not all the American side has to say. The talk with the President was serious. We listened attentively to each other's arguments and recorded all that. If the United States should find the will and the resolve to consider the matter anew and evaluate all the pernicious aspects and implications of the Star Wars programme, the road would be clear for solving the problems of international security in a constructive spirit and for ending the arms race. In saying this, I have in mind the problems of verification as well. There is much speculation around this issue, with the Soviet stand being deliberately misrepresented. However, the truth is that the Soviet Union is open for verification. Provided an agreement is reached to ban the deployment of weapons in space, we are prepared, on the basis of reciprocity, to open our laboratories for the monitoring of such an agreement. However, what we are asked to do is something like this: let us open the laboratories and monitor the progress of the arms race in space. This is naive and, besides, the very premise is wrong and unacceptable.

If the American side also stops all tests of nuclear weapons and we sign a relevant agreement, there will be no problems of verification, including international verification, on our side too.

If both sides agree to cut their nuclear weapons by 50 per cent, then, of course, it will be necessary to verify this process, and we shall be no less interested in this than the Americans are.

Let me say briefly that at this stage differences have been disclosed in our positions with regard to the 50 per cent cut in nuclear weapons. We have our reservations concerning the draft submitted by the Americans, and the Americans have theirs with regard to our drafts. But we do not dramatise these differences and are ready to seek a mutually acceptable solution if, of course, an arms race in space is not started. The proposals of the two sides form a basis for seeking mutually acceptable solutions. There can be compromises here; this will require time and clarification of the situation. We are prepared to look for these solutions, proceeding from the basic principle that we are not striving to achieve military superiority and that we stand for equal security.

There was an exchange of views on humanitarian issues at the meeting. This has resulted in corresponding agreements which are reflected in the Joint Statement. Let me remind you that an understanding has been reached on some questions of bilateral Soviet-American relations and on extending contacts in the fields of science, culture, education and information. There will be a broader exchange of students, TV programmes and sports delegations. An understanding in principle has been reached on concluding an agreement on air links. I think that we already have information from Moscow that this problem too seems to have been settled yesterday.

I would like to draw your special attention to the fact that it has been decided jointly to appeal to a number of states concerning cooperation in the field of thermonuclear fusion. This is a very interesting idea. Its implementation can open a new page in a very important sphere—providing a practically inexhaustible source of energy to mankind. This is an area for joint activity. This calls for tremendous efforts on the part of scientists, for tremendous inputs of technology, for new technological

solutions. All this will promote technological progress and technology.

From the point of view of the political results and consequences of this meeting it is important, it seems to me, to take one more factor into account. We have seen what a great political effect this meeting has had. It has revealed and heightened the world public's interest in the problems of Soviet-American relations, in the danger of the arms race, and in the necessity of normalising the situation.

I cannot but mention several incidents in this connection. The day before yesterday a group of leaders of the US pacifist movements, led by prominent politician Jesse Jackson, visited our Mission. I would like to say that we regarded and regard them as worthy and respected American citizens representing millions of people in the United States who have signed the appeal to President Reagan and to me with wishes of success of the meeting and with concrete proposals aimed at strengthening peace, including a call for stopping the nuclear tests. American war veterans who participated in the Elbe linkup came to Geneva, and representatives of many public organisations of other countries, children's organisations included, were also here these days. The Soviet delegation received them at my request. It was a moving meeting. It is hardly necessary for me to say that we constantly felt the powerful support and solidarity of our socialist friends and of the non-aligned countries. Even before the summit the leaders of six states—India, Mexico, Argentina, Tanzania, Greece and Sweden—proposed a freezing of all types of nuclear weapons. We highly appreciate their initiative. A large group of Nobel Prize winners had put forward proposals all of which I was ready to back right away except one. That was a wish, or demand, that we should not leave Geneva till we had reached an accord. It would be risky to agree to this, for then it might be a long time before we could go home. Now I would think differently. I would have most likely backed this proposal, too.

Ladies and gentlemen, comrades.

At sharp, crucial turns of history moments of truth are as necessary as the breath of life. As a result of the intensified arms race, the international situation has become too dangerous, and too many fables on this score are invented to scare people.

It has really become necessary to dispel this fog and to test words by deeds. The best way to do this is to have a frank talk, the kind of talk one expects at a summit meeting, especially with account taken of our states' role and responsibility in the world. Issues are discussed here on a different plane, one where it is impossible to evade the truth. So, when we speak about the general results of the meeting, any one-dimensional appraisal would hardly be right. Of course, it would have been much better if in Geneva we had reached agreement on the crucial, key issue—the problem of stopping the arms race. Regrettably, this has not happened.

At the moment, the American side has proved to be unprepared for taking major decisions. But I think it was impossible to complete this process within two days anyway, even if it had moved in that direction. We have a negotiating mechanism. But at the same time the meeting is too important an event to be appraised by any simplified standards. It has enabled us to have a better idea of the nature of our differences, to remove—at least, I think and hope so—some of the biased notions about the USSR and the policy of its leaders, and to eliminate a part of the amassed prejudices. This may have a favourable effect on the further course of events. It is impossible to restore trust at once. This is a no easy process. We have taken note of the American President's assurances that the United States does not seek military superiority and does not want a nuclear war. It is our sincere wish that these statements will be confirmed by deeds.

We would like to regard the meeting as the beginning of a dialogue whose aim is to bring about changes for the better both in Soviet-American relations and in the world in general. In this sense I would appraise the meeting as one that has created opportunities for progress.

Generally speaking, such is our appraisal of the results and significance of the Geneva meeting. And this gives me reason to look to the future with optimism when I leave hospitable Geneva. Common sense must prevail.

Till we meet again.

* * *

Question (BBC, Britain). Mr. General Secretary, what, in your opinion, are the prospects of development of relations be-

tween the USSR and the USA and the international situation as a whole after the Geneva meeting?

Answer. Despite everything, I look to the future with optimism. If we all continue to act in a spirit of responsibility both in Soviet-American relations and in international relations as a whole, which was, after all, felt at the Geneva meeting, we shall find answers to the most burning issues and approaches to solving them. I am deeply convinced of this.

Question (Soviet television). You have mentioned the need for a new approach in international relations today, even a new way of thinking. What do you regard as the essence of such a new approach, a new way of thinking?

Answer. Yes, I am convinced that at this stage of international relations, which is characterised by a closer interrelationship of states, by their interdependence, a new policy is required.

We feel that the new approach requires that the present-day policy of any state should take fully into account the realities of today's world. This is the most important prerequisite for a foreign policy of states to be constructive. This is what will lead to an improvement of the situation in the world.

The problems of war and peace are in the focus of world politics. It is a special concern of all nations.

All countries—developed capitalist, socialist and developing countries—have economic problems, social problems and ecological problems. These problems can be more successfully solved on the basis of cooperation and mutual understanding. What is needed is a dialogue, greater cooperation, a pooling of efforts.

Take the problems of the developing world. We cannot fence ourselves off from them. And the new policy, based on the realities of today's world, obliges us all to seek answers to the problems of this large group of states which are striving for a better life.

The most important question—and I return to it—is that everything should be done to stop the arms race. An awareness of this is growing. Unless this question is resolved, all our other hopes, plans and actions can be undermined.

I am convinced that with the old approach, based on purely egoistical interests—although this is presented as the defence of national interests—there will be no movement forward. A new

policy is required that will correspond to the present stage, taking into account the realities pushed to the fore by the very course of world development.

Question (NBC television network, USA). During World War II the United States and the Soviet Union fought together against fascism and defeated it. Considering your talk with President Reagan, do you think that the Soviet Union and the United States of America can again become allies in the struggle against hunger in Africa, against international terrorism, against the pollution of the environment, against such diseases as cancer and others?

Answer. I thank you for recalling an important stage of our common history. We remember it, we do not forget it. I think that as a result of the Geneva meeting opportunities open up for broad cooperation between our countries and peoples. And when I say: between our countries and peoples, I do not oversimplify the situation.

I know the deep differences that now separate us; I'm aware of the real state of current Soviet-American relations. But I am convinced that interaction is possible, including cooperation on the problems you have mentioned. As for the nuances of these problems, I shall not dwell on them at present.

We will be able to release huge funds and use them to help the developing countries. Today in Latin America alone an enormous number of people, half of them children, starve or are undernourished. A reduction of military spending in the world by just 5 to 10 per cent would make it possible to solve this problem.

So, all this demands that we give thought to this problem.

I welcome your question and answer it affirmatively. Although this does not mean that there do not exist certain nuances in our approach to the problems mentioned by you.

Question (NBC television network, USA). You have said that you are disappointed with President Reagan's response regarding the SDI. There are as many weapons now, after the meeting as before it. Can it be said that the world has become safer after the Geneva meeting, and if so, why?

Answer. I would venture to say that although the amount of weapons has remained unchanged since before the meeting, the world has become safer. At any rate, it seems to me that the

meeting itself and its results are a definite contribution to strengthening security, since the meeting marks the beginning of the road towards dialogue and understanding, that is, towards the things that help strengthen security. In this sense, Geneva has certainly produced such a political effect.

Question (newspaper *Pravda*). What concrete, practical steps could be taken by the Soviet Union and the United States to bring about the earliest end to the arms race?

Answer. Although I have devoted all of my speech here to this subject, I will say again: we simply must stop.

If we can prevent an arms race in space, both our proposals and what is proposed by the American side will enable us to move ahead, to look for compromises and to seek parity at a lower level. There is a good mechanism for this: the Geneva talks.

I would also add that we hope that the US Administration has not said its final word concerning the prohibition of all nuclear weapon tests. The whole world is for such a ban. There is still time for the American side to consider the situation. A positive decision would be a tremendous step stimulating the process of curbing and ending the arms race.

I think that a further intensification of the political dialogue between the leaders of the USSR and the United States of America will also contribute to this process. We have agreed to expand it and I think that participation of the top leaders of our countries in this political dialogue will facilitate the process of curbing the arms race.

And here is another point. The things dealt with at the Geneva talks, that is, the aims and the subject of these talks, are a cause of all nations. Responsible politicians and, first of all, the leaders of states must take a firm and constructive stand on this issue. That would be of tremendous importance.

I think that the overwhelming majority of politicians are in favour of speeding up the search for solutions in Geneva and of finding ways to stop the arms race and to proceed to disarmament.

Question (GDR television). What, in your opinion, are the most important results of the meeting? And another question: what is the significance of top-level political dialogue?

Answer. To answer your question, I would first of all point out that the Geneva meeting marks an important stage in Soviet-

American relations. It lays the groundwork for searching ways to improve and normalise these relations in all areas. If this search continues in the form of further joint efforts of both sides, this will help improve the situation in the world. This is what I would call the political result.

At the Geneva meeting attention was focused on the issues which concern the world's nations. The Joint Statement by the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, which says that nuclear war is impossible, that it should never be started, that they are not seeking military superiority and that they will give a fresh impetus to the Geneva talks, is of great importance in itself if it is consistently implemented through practical moves.

Now the second question. I think that the meeting has shown that under any circumstances the thing to do is to try to maintain a political dialogue which makes it possible to compare one another's positions, understand one another better and on this basis look for mutually acceptable solutions to the most urgent problems of today's world.

Question (Italian newspaper *Il Mattino*). The Soviet Union suffered heavy material and human losses during the Second World War. But nevertheless, don't you think that forty years after the end of the war the Soviet Union could help bring about the unification of the two German states?

Answer. I believe that this question was thoroughly discussed and considered at the conference in Helsinki. The Helsinki process and the Final Act signed by all states of Europe, as well as by the United States and Canada, are our common achievement. The Helsinki process deserves to be supported and developed in every way. And so the results of the Helsinki conference provide an answer to your question.

Question (Swiss radio). You stressed the deep differences in the positions of the USSR and the USA on Star Wars. Will not this hamper progress at the Geneva talks?

Answer. I do not want to repeat what I have said earlier. Our position can be stated in a few words. We take a constructive line at the Geneva talks. We shall do our best to search for solutions that would stop the arms race and bring about a radical reduction of nuclear armaments so that at one of the subsequent stages we could really start eliminating nuclear weapons

with the participation of all nuclear powers. It is our strong conviction that this is possible if the door to an arms race in outer space is firmly shut.

Question (Associated Press). You spoke about the President's personal allegiance to the Star Wars programme and said that you had discussed the SDI in detail. What was his attitude to your arguments? How did he react to them? Do you see any possibility to get things moving in this field?

Answer. I think that after the meeting the American side has grounds for thinking over everything we have said. We hope that our arguments will be considered with understanding. In our opinion, their essence is in keeping with the spirit of the January accord. That is, as a result of the Geneva talks we must take the road of drastic reductions of nuclear armaments provided an arms race in space is prevented.

This objective was jointly defined by us earlier. The US President says that the SDI is a shield. I hope that we have convincingly shown that it is a space weapon which can be used against missiles, against satellites and against targets on earth. It is a new type of weapon. Thus a new sphere of the arms race is being opened. This is unacceptable. This would complicate the whole situation and create problems at the Geneva talks.

That is why I appreciate the fact that it was stressed at the level of the US President and the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee that the work at the negotiations in Geneva would be speeded up on the basis of the January accord.

This is now a point of view that has been confirmed not only by the signatures of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs but also by the leaders of the two states. We regard this as a certain signal, a hopeful sign.

Question (BBC, Britain). If you cannot reach agreement on stopping the arms race in space, would the Soviet Union be able to compete with US technology in this field or will it fall behind?

Answer. You have touched on a very interesting subject. I tried to explain to the President in a frank and straightforward conversation that US policy towards the Soviet Union, it seems to me, is largely built on misconceptions. On the one hand, some people hope that the continued arms race will wear out the Soviet Union economically, weaken its influence in the world and

so give the United States of America a free hand. History had put such prophets to shame. And that was at a time when the potential of our society was different from what it is today and when our society had less possibilities. Now we have immense possibilities. And misconceptions regarding us only prevent the implementation of a realistic policy.

On the other hand, there have been misconceptions in terms of military calculations. There have been attempts to outstrip us. Intercontinental ballistic missiles were developed. Our response followed. It came a little later, but it came. Next independently targetable nuclear warheads appeared. The response followed. We have always been able to find a proper response.

Now, it seems to me, the illusions existing among US military circles have to some extent affected the political quarters, in particular, perhaps, the President himself. I do not affirm this is so; however, it is an impression that we have formed.

Some people in the United States apparently believe that the Americans now have a certain edge on us in some aspects of technology, computer technology, radioelectronics. Again there is a desire to use that "edge" and secure military superiority. Once again some people are quoting President Johnson who once said that the nation that would dominate space would also dominate the Earth. Some people are obviously itching to achieve world supremacy and look down on the rest of the world. Those are old ambitions of bygone years. The world has changed very much and in many ways.

So, speaking of the so-called technological superiority which the SDI supposedly will embody and thus put the Soviet Union into a predicament, I want to say that this is yet another misconception. We would find a proper response.

And that is what I said to the President: "Do remember that you are not dealing with simpletons."

If the President is so much committed to the SDI, then it is understandable that we should consider it our duty to make out what the Star Wars programme is all about.

And so we did, especially since there has been a kind of invitation from the American side: let us see, let us make it out, let us talk not about how to prevent space from being militarised, but about what kind of weapon to take into space. We are against that. We are against an arms race in space.

We have looked into another aspect of the matter too: let us suppose that the Americans do not accept our arguments and do not appreciate our goodwill and our appeal for seeking a way out through ending the arms race and reducing the existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons, that is, suppose they continue along the same path. We would, of course, find a proper response. The Soviet leadership has at one time given appropriate instructions to competent organisations and scientists, and we can say that our response would be effective, less expensive and could come within a shorter period of time.

But that is not our political choice. Our choice is to urge the United States to think over the entire situation after all, and pursue a responsible policy based on common sense and the aspirations and hopes of people, rather than further complicate the most acute problem of international relations.

Question (Czechoslovak television and the newspaper *Rudé Právo*). In what specific, practical fields do you see possibilities for the development of Soviet-American relations after the meeting with President Reagan?

Answer. I think the political dialogue will be furthered. And it will be conducted at various levels. We have agreed to exchange visits, and this is something that must be welcomed. We will have more opportunities to promote bilateral cooperation in those spheres which we have agreed on. Apparently, we will continue and broaden our consultations on regional problems and the situation in various regions of the world.

Finally, we proceed from the belief that both in our country and in the business community in the United States there is still a good deal of mutual interest—I know this for certain—in improving relations. If things go that way, the scope of economic cooperation may be expanded. We are prepared to invite US business quarters to take part in carrying out some big projects. Our plans are vast. We are doing a good deal to widen the scope of our cooperation with the West Europeans. And we welcome it.

I said to the President that one should not underestimate economic relations. And not just because they cannot do without us, or we cannot do without the United States. We can do very well without the United States, and I hope, America can do without us. But this is the material base for political relations,

for improving these relations, for creating an atmosphere of confidence.

Frankly speaking, economic ties lead to interdependence. This interdependence is then reflected in the way political problems are solved.

I think it would be to the advantage of both the Soviet Union and the United States of America to continue to promote economic ties. But please don't think we are begging for this.

Question (Lebanese newspaper *Al-Nahar Arab Report*). Did you consider the situation in the Middle East, particularly in Lebanon, when you discussed regional problems? What is your forecast regarding the situation there after the summit?

Answer. During the meeting we discussed the situation in such regions as Central America, the Middle East and Africa. However, we spent most of the time discussing the principles involved in these issues. We have agreed to continue political consultations and broaden the scope of cooperation in dealing with regional problems.

Question (Yulian Semyonov, a writer). Mikhail Sergeyeovich, you have spoken of the need to learn the art of living together. I know from my experience as a writer that since the sad times of McCarthy the cinema and television of the United States have, unfortunately, been presenting to the American people an image of the Soviet people as something of a monster. Don't you think that now, after the Geneva meeting it is very important that in the United States that kind of biased thinking should be reconsidered and the Soviet people should be regarded more objectively, as partners of the American people?

Answer. Here is what I am going to tell you, Comrade Semyonov. Don't you try and make political leaders shoulder all the burdens. We have agreed to further cultural contacts, which include the cinema, and so meet with each other and talk with each other. One must act in the spirit of Geneva, that is, one must work for an improvement of Soviet-American relations.

Pravda, November 22, 1985

Report at the Fourth Session of the Eleventh USSR Supreme Soviet

November 27, 1985

Comrade deputies.

Major questions of the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet state have been submitted for discussion at the current session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The laws on the state economic and social development plan of the USSR and on the state budget for 1986, approved by this session, are vastly important to our country, to its present and future, to every work collective, and to every Soviet family. The new year 1986 ushers in not merely the first year of the 12th five-year plan period but a qualitatively new stage in the development of Soviet society.

The 1986 plan reflects the Party's strategic line towards accelerating the country's socio-economic development. It provides for higher rates of the growth of the national income, industrial and agricultural production, and labour productivity. The efficiency in the use of material resources will grow. Priority is given to developing the branches which are called upon to ensure scientific and technological progress and enhance the quality of output.

Measures have been set forth for speeding up the reconstruction, refurbishing and modernisation of production, perfecting management and the economic mechanism. A further rise in the people's well-being is envisaged.

It is important, comrades, that we all constantly take into account the specific features of the plan for 1986.

An even pace should be set right in the first year of the five-year plan for the whole period. Proceeding from that, the

planned rates of developing the national economy for 1986 are such that their implementation, with intensity gradually growing in the subsequent years, will facilitate the fulfilment of assignments of the five-year plan on the whole. This will help avoid the situation that occurred in the previous five-year period when reduced targets were fixed for the first years, while the major increment was planned in the concluding years. It is known what negative results this practice brought about.

The second specific feature of the plan is that it was shaped with maximum account for the need to speed up scientific and technological progress. Proceeding from the directive of the June conference at the CPSU Central Committee, the plan includes, on a top-priority basis, assignments for accelerating scientific and technological progress envisaged by resolutions on developing major scientific and technological branches in the national economy. Simultaneously, established practices in planning were largely revised. The plan provides for the first time for generalised key indicators of scientific and technological progress of the branches, and its effectiveness. These indicators are fixed with a view to invigorating the practical work of ministries, amalgamations and enterprises to ensure advancement towards the pinnacle of scientific and technological development.

The next specific feature of the 1986 plan is its orientation on a practical transfer to intensive methods of running the economy. This is dictated by life itself, by the situation with labour and material resources, which is not simple, and by the near exhaustion of extensive factors of economic growth. Next year, we are to achieve production growth through maximum saving of resources. In other words, saving is actually becoming the main source providing resources for the entire increment in production volumes. Here are some figures to illustrate the point. Next year, 97 per cent of national income growth will be gained through higher labour productivity, metal consumption in the national income will drop by 2.7 per cent, energy consumption by 3 per cent.

And, finally, this is a wide-scale transition to the new methods of management which proved to be effective. Starting from January 1986, the industry will turn out more than half of products at the enterprises working under the new conditions.

In general, comrades, the line is correct. Now we are to ma-

terialise it—both in the process of the further detailed elaboration of plans in the industries, republics, territories and regions, at amalgamations and enterprises, and, naturally, in concrete practical work. This aspect should be emphasised also because many people in the centre and in the localities, including those at planning and economic bodies, have not fully appreciated the importance of assessing and resolving in a new way the country's economic, social and financial problems.

The current session is held at a crucial period preceding the Party Congress. The April Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee charted a course towards accelerating the social and economic development of society, marked the beginning of substantive changes in approaching the fulfilment of economic and political tasks, and set a new rhythm for the entire work of Party, state and government bodies, all our cadres and work collectives.

The Party's political course, both as regards domestic matters and international problems, has found its fullest reflection in the theoretical and political documents of paramount importance that will be submitted for consideration to the 27th Congress of the CPSU—the draft of the new edition of the CPSU Programme, the proposed changes in the Party Rules, and the draft Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and for the Period Ending in 2000.

The first results of the broad public discussion launched by the Party show that the documents submitted for consideration evoke profound satisfaction of the Soviet people. Our optimism, our confidence that the chosen road is correct and that what has been planned will certainly be fulfilled stems from the vigorous support for the Party's strategic course, support by word and deed.

As you know, comrade deputies, the Central Committee of the Party and the Soviet government have of late undertaken a number of important measures aimed at speeding up the switch of the economy to the lines of intensive development, and enhancing the efficiency of economic management. Further practical measures are taken for setting things to rights, strengthening labour and state discipline and the regime of strict economy, for combating drunkenness and alcoholism. In other words, vast

and intensive work has been started in all spheres of public life, and it is beginning to bear fruit.

The new things that are introduced into our life now have stirred up Soviet people, boosted their creativity, showed once again the vastness of resources and possibilities inherent in the socialist system.

We can now say with certainty that things have begun to look up. The growth rate of production is rising and other economic indicators are improving. Despite setbacks in a number of sectors of the national economy at the start of the year, the Soviet people managed to put the situation right and to ensure the fulfilment of economic plan targets. Change for the better is taking place in the agrarian sector of the country as well.

Immense credit for what has been achieved goes to our heroic working class who, sparing neither effort nor energy and overcoming difficulties, has done everything possible to meet the plan targets. The positive results are achieved by the strenuous work of the collective farmers and all the other workers in the agro-industrial complex. Our achievements embody the creative thought of scientists and engineers, the people's intelligentsia. Soviet young people who boldly and energetically come to grips with difficult and complex tasks and vigorously support the ongoing change in our society, linking to it their own future, have pioneered and initiated many important undertakings.

We also associate these changes with the activation of the work of the Party, government and trade union bodies, of all our cadres.

In short, comrade deputies, a good deal is being done. However, it would be an error to overestimate all this—and it is not our custom anyway. We are at the start of the way we have charted, the way which is arduous and difficult and which calls for a combination of a creative approach to the tasks posed by life with purposefulness, a high sense of discipline and dedication. We have immense reserves and potentialities and we are to work hard to tap them and use them to maximum benefit. This is to be done in all areas of economic, social and cultural development, primarily in those in which the situation remains complex and which are slow to catch up and gain momentum.

Now that the current five-year period is drawing to a close, it is vital to work hard so that we should start from the next

year a confident and dynamic advance, should ensure that the targets planned will be reached, should create the prerequisites for a further qualitative transformation of the country's productive forces.

Comrades, the plan for 1986 shows patently the peaceful, constructive nature of our concerns. Our foreign policy aspirations, the international policy of the Soviet state are closely linked with this peaceful orientation of the domestic policy.

The foreign policy guidelines of the April Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee have become a concrete manifestation of the Leninist foreign policy at the present stage. The Plenary Meeting has emphasised the need for intensifying to the utmost the Soviet Union's peaceful policy on the broadest front of international relations. It has called for doing everything so that the forces of militarism and aggression should not prevail; emphasised the urgency of ending the arms race, of stepping up the process of disarmament; came out for the development of balanced, proper, civilised relations between states, and for the widening and deepening of mutually advantageous economic ties.

The Plenary Meeting's directives were dictated by the time, the specific features of the situation and demands of the socialist policy of peace and progress. In its assessment, the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee proceeded from the premise that the degree of the unpredictability of events grows as a result of the continuing arms race. The possibility of the militarisation of outer space signifies a qualitatively new leap in the arms race which would inevitably result in the disappearance of the very notion of strategic stability—the basis for the preservation of peace in the nuclear age. A situation would develop when crucial decisions, irreversible in their possible consequences, would in fact be taken by computers, without participation of human mind and political will, without taking into account the criteria of ethics and morality. Such a development of events could result in a universal catastrophe—even if it were set off by an error, miscalculation, or technical malfunctioning of sophisticated computer systems.

In other words, the development of world events has approached a line when especially responsible decisions are required, when the lack of action or tarrying are criminal, for the point at issue today is the preservation of civilisation and life itself.

That is why we have believed and continue to believe that all necessary measures should be taken to break the vicious circle of the arms race, so as not to miss a single chance of changing the course of events for the better. The question today is acute and definite in the extreme: it is necessary to rise above narrow interests, to realise the collective responsibility of all states in face of the danger that looms over humanity on the threshold of the third millennium.

The April Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee instructed us to pursue such a line in our foreign policy. And this line is fully in keeping with the interests of the Soviet people, the peoples of all socialist states, and, as we see, is met with understanding in other countries. During a short period of time that was marked by important international events, the Soviet Union tried to interact in the interests of peace with a great number of states. We have been proceeding from the view that the period of dangerous tension can be ended only by the efforts of all countries, big and small.

Political and economic ties between countries of the socialist community have intensified and deepened considerably in the past months. We have drawn up long-term programmes of cooperation in the economy, science and technology and created a mechanism of effective concrete ties. Coordination of the foreign policy activity has become more intensive. The meetings of the leaders of fraternal countries in Moscow, Warsaw, Sofia and Prague became important milestones in the process of further consolidation of the socialist community. Ties with all the socialist countries are developing and growing stronger.

Cooperation with states that got rid of colonial oppression, that participate in the non-aligned movement, is becoming broader. Important steps have been taken in the development of relations with many of those countries. This is a factor of great importance in the rough sea of the present-day international relations, a factor that operates in favour of peace, equality, freedom and independence of peoples.

The Soviet Union is trying to improve ties with capitalist states as well. I will single out the recent Soviet-French summit in Paris, in the course of which substantial steps were taken towards further developing bilateral cooperation, consolidating European and international security and returning to detente.

We will continue to build our foreign policy on a multiple foundation, on the basis of firm and stable bilateral relations with all countries. But the reality of today's world is such that there are states which—due to their military, economic, scientific and technical potential, and international weight—bear special responsibility for the nature of world development, its course and consequences. It is primarily the Soviet Union and the United States which have this responsibility, I stress, responsibility—not privilege.

Looking at things from this position, the Soviet-American summit held last week is, as assessed by the Politbureau of the Central Committee, an important event not only in our bilateral relations, but in world politics as a whole. I already shared my first impressions of the talks with the US President at a press conference in Geneva. The meeting's final document—the Joint Statement—is known, too.

Today, speaking at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, I would like to appraise the results and significance of the Geneva meeting in the context of the present-day situation, with due account for past experience and prospects for the future, and the tasks that we are to tackle.

First of all, I must say that the road to the Geneva dialogue was long and arduous due to many reasons. The US Administration which came to office in the early 1980s openly embarked on a course of confrontation while rejecting the very possibility of a positive development of Soviet-American relations. I think everyone still remembers the pitch of anti-Soviet rhetoric of those years and the actions “from strength” practised by the US ruling circles.

The many years of mutual efforts to achieve the essential minimum of trust in those relations were committed to oblivion and almost every thread of bilateral cooperation was snapped. De-tente itself was branded as running counter to the interests of the United States of America.

Having settled on a course for military superiority over the USSR, the US Administration went ahead with programmes of nuclear and other rearmament. US first strike missiles began to be deployed in Western Europe. In this way a situation was taking shape that was fraught with great military and political uncertainties and concomitant risks.

Lastly, there appeared a Star Wars programme, the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative. Obsessed with that idea, Washington was not giving much thought to those grave consequences which were bound to ensue if this idea was realised. The plan to introduce weapons in space is extremely dangerous to all the peoples of the world, all without exception.

But we also knew another thing: such US policies would inevitably clash with reality. So it happened. The Soviet Union together with its allies unequivocally declared that they would not allow military superiority over themselves.

Confusion emerged even among US allies in face of Washington's obvious disregard for the interests of their security, and its readiness to stake all in pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp of military superiority. In the United States itself, the course generated serious doubts. The proclamation of the Star Wars preparation plans sounded the alarm bell throughout the world.

Those who thought that their line towards confrontation would determine world development have clearly miscalculated. I would add in this connection that the dreams of world domination are basically wrong—in what concerns the objective, and in what concerns the means. Similar to designs of perpetual motion machines being born out of the lack of knowledge of elementary laws of nature, imperial claims grow out of notions about the world which are far removed from present-day reality.

While giving a firm rebuff to the US line towards upsetting military-strategic equilibrium, the Soviet Union advanced large-scale peace initiatives, displayed restraint and took a constructive approach to the key issues of peace and security.

Our initiatives, and there are quite a number of them, have clearly shown what we are seeking to achieve in the world arena, what we are urging the United States and its allies to do. These actions by the USSR were met with enthusiastic approval of the world public, and they were highly assessed by the governments of many countries.

Under the influence of these factors, Washington was compelled to manoeuvre. Signs of demonstrative peacefulness appeared in the American Administration's statements. They were not backed by deeds, but their very appearance was symptomatic.

Early this year, an agreement was reached at our initiative on new talks between the USSR and the United States, talks

to encompass the entire complex of space and nuclear armaments in their interrelationship, and aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on Earth.

The atmosphere of Soviet-American relations, and to some extent the international behaviour of the United States started to undergo changes, which fact, naturally, could not but be taken into account when considering the possibility of holding a summit meeting.

By adopting this decision, we firmly proceeded from the premise that central to the talks should be questions that determine our relations and the world situation in general—security issues. We also took into account political and strategic realities in Europe and the world, the opinion of our friends and allies, the views of the governments and the public in many countries, their persistent calls on the Soviet Union to do everything possible so that the summit meeting be held. We understood how many hopes were pinned on the meeting by people all over the world, and undertook concrete steps to improve the international climate, to make it more favourable for the meeting.

We put forward concrete and radical proposals in the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space arms. What is their substance?

We have first of all proposed a complete ban on space strike arms. We did so because the beginning of an arms race in outer space, or even the deployment in the near-Earth space of anti-missile systems only, would not contribute to the security of any state. Hidden behind a space "shield", offensive nuclear systems would become even more dangerous.

The appearance of space strike arms could turn the present strategic balance into a strategic chaos, cause the arms race to proceed feverishly in all directions, and undercut one of the fundamental pillars of its limitation—the ABM Treaty. As a result, mistrust in relations between states would grow and security would diminish considerably.

Further. We proposed, given complete prohibition of space strike weapons, to halve all nuclear systems of the USSR and the US capable of reaching the territory of each other, and to limit the total number of nuclear warheads on such systems belonging to either side by a ceiling of 6,000. These are radical reductions amounting to thousands of nuclear warheads.

Such an approach is fully justified. It embraces all those systems which form the strategic correlation of forces, makes it possible to take due account of the nuclear threat which really exists with respect to either side, regardless of the fact how and from where nuclear warheads can be delivered to their territory, whether by missile or plane, from one's own territory or the territory of one's allies.

We regard the reduction of nuclear systems of the USSR and the US by 50 per cent as a beginning. We are prepared to go further, right down to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons—the process in which other nuclear powers should, naturally enough, be involved too.

It does not take much to realise that the nuclear arms race is a source of special concern to European nations. We understand well why it is so. Europe is overflowing with nuclear systems. The Soviet Union stands for completely removing nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical ones, from Europe. However, the US and its NATO partners do not agree to that. Then we proposed starting at least with intermediate decisions and then working towards further reductions. We are convinced that our proposals accord with the hopes of European nations for lessening the nuclear threat and enhancing European security.

I would like to emphasise the aspect of principle: in the three areas of the negotiations—space, strategic offensive arms and medium-range nuclear systems—we do not propose to the US anything that would damage its security. Moreover, our proposals make it possible to resolve such issues which the American side elevates to the rank of its "special concerns".

For example, much is said about the Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles. Our proposals provide for a reduction of the number of such missiles and the limitation of the share of their warheads in the overall number of nuclear munitions. Or, say, another example. There has been quite an outcry in the West over the Soviet SS-20 missiles. We propose reducing them substantially in the context of the solution of the problem of nuclear medium-range weapons in Europe.

Britain's and France's nuclear weapon systems are presented as a stumbling block. They say that these cannot be discussed at the Soviet-American talks. Well, we are prepared to seek a

solution to this, too. We propose starting direct exchange of opinions with those countries about their nuclear arms.

The Soviet proposals met with broad and positive response in the world. They are backed by the prestige of the Warsaw Treaty member states that unanimously supported our constructive stand. Joint statements made by the leaders of six countries—Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, India, Sweden and Greece—are largely consonant with our approach. The Soviet initiative was received with approval and hope by communist and workers' parties, large public organisations of different countries and continents, scientists of world renown, prominent politicians and military leaders. It evoked positive response of most of the parties of the Socialist International.

What is more, there were thousands of letters from Soviet and foreign citizens that were addressed to me on the eve and during the Geneva meeting. I would like to take the opportunity to express gratitude to their authors for good wishes, advice and support, and for profound and sincere concern over safeguarding peace.

The Americans advanced their counter-proposals on the eve of the meeting. This fact is positive in itself. One of our numerous initiatives evoked a favourable response.

A lot was written in the press about the essence of these counter-proposals. I shall not repeat their contents. I shall only say that these are half-hearted and largely unfair proposals. They are based on a one-sided approach and are clearly prompted by the striving for military superiority for the United States and NATO as a whole.

But the main thing is that the US stand does not envisage a ban on the development of space strike arms. Quite the contrary, it is sought to legalise their creation. The stand assumed by the US side concerning Star Wars is the main obstacle to agreement on arms control. And this is not only our opinion. The governments of France, Denmark, Norway, Greece, the Netherlands, Canada and Australia refused to take part in the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative. On the eve of the Geneva meeting the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution urging the leaders of the USSR and the USA to work out effective agreements aimed at the prevention of an arms race in space and its termination on Earth. It is only the United States and some of

its allies that deemed it possible not to support this clear call of the world community. A fact, as it is said, that needs no comment.

It should also be recalled that there were powerful political forces at work in the United States, doing whatever they could to thwart the meeting or at least make it meaningless and nullify its importance. I think such steps as the test of an anti-satellite system, the appearance of the *Iowa* battleship carrying long-range cruise missiles in the Baltic, the speedy deployment of Pershings in West Germany, the decision to develop binary chemical weapons and, finally, the adoption of a new all-time record military budget are fresh in the memory of many people.

Moreover, the President was already on his way to Geneva when a letter from the US Defence Secretary, pleading with him not to make any agreements with the USSR which would reaffirm the treaties on the limitation of strategic weapons and on anti-missile systems, was made public. In other words, the Defence Secretary wanted the USA to have a completely free hand to act in every venue of the arms race on Earth and in space.

And indeed, was the Pentagon alone in the path? We did not overlook also the "mandate" given to the US President by the American extreme right-wing forces represented by their ideological headquarters, the Heritage Foundation. The President was instructed to carry on the arms race, not to give the Soviet Union any opportunity to convert its resources to socio-economic development programmes and to seek eventually to crowd the USSR out of international politics. Those gentlemen went so far as to formulate for the US Administration the task of forcing us to alter our system, to revise our Constitution! These are familiar tunes, comrades. We have heard all this on more than one occasion. In short, there were quite a few attacks.

Yet we decided in favour of meeting the US President. We took that decision because we had no right to disregard even the slightest chance to reverse the dangerous world developments. We took that decision in the awareness that if we failed to start a direct and frank discussion now, tomorrow it would be a hundred times more difficult, if at all possible.

It is beyond question that differences between us are immense. But the interrelationship and interdependence between us in the present-day world are similarly immense. The crucial

times we are living through leave the leaders of the USSR and the USA, the peoples of the USSR and the USA no alternative to learning the great art of living together.

During our first eye-to-eye discussion with the President—and such discussions featured prominently at the Geneva meeting—it was stated directly that the Soviet delegation had come to seek solutions to the most urgent problem in the focus of international affairs, the problem of averting nuclear war and curbing the arms race. That, as I told the President, was the main meaning of our meeting and that was what would determine its results.

I must stress that our discussions in Geneva were sometimes very acute and, I would say, frank to the utmost. It was impossible there either to outwit each other or to get away with political or propaganda stereotypes—too much depended on these pivotal questions of war and peace.

The American side stubbornly insisted at the meeting on going ahead with the SDI programme. We were told that the point was the development of purely defensive systems, which were not even weapons as such. We were also told that those systems would help to stabilise the situation and to get rid of nuclear weapons altogether. There even was the proposal that in some foreseeable future these systems would be “shared” with us and that the sides should open to each other the doors of their laboratories.

We frankly told the President that we did not agree to these evaluations. We had thoroughly analysed all those questions and our conclusion was univocal. Space weapons are not defensive at all. They can breed the dangerous illusion that it is possible to deliver the first nuclear strike from behind a space “shield” and to avert, or at least weaken, retaliation. And what are the guarantees that space weapons in themselves would not be used against targets on Earth? There is every indication that the US space-based ABM system is being conceived precisely as a component of an integrated offensive complex rather than as a “shield”.

Naturally, we cannot agree to the allegation that the programmed space systems are not weapons altogether. Neither can we rely on the assurances that the United States will share with us what they will develop in that field.

So if the doors of the laboratories are to be opened, it is only to verify compliance with a ban on the development of space strike weapons but not to legalise these weapons.

We are told about a desire to remove the fear of missiles and to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons. This desire can only be welcomed and it is fully in accord with the goals of our policy. But it is far easier to eliminate these weapons without developing space strike systems. Why spend tens and hundreds of billions of dollars and pile up mountains of space weapons in addition to nuclear armaments? What is the point?

I asked the President if the American leadership believed in all seriousness that at a time when American space weapons were being developed we would reduce our strategic potential and help the United States with our own hands to weaken it. No hopes should be pinned on this. Quite the contrary will happen: to regain the balance, the Soviet Union will have to improve the efficiency and accuracy and to raise the yield of its weapons so as to neutralise, if necessary, the electronic space machinery of Star Wars that is being developed by the Americans.

And will the Americans feel more secure if our weapons in space will be added to the echelons of space weapons planned by Washington? Indeed, the USA cannot really hope to achieve monopoly in outer space. At least, all this is not serious.

However, the American Administration is still tempted to try out the possibility of achieving military superiority. At present, too, by intending to start an arms race in outer space, they hope to overtake us in the field of electronics and computers. But we will find a response, just as it happened several times in the past. The response will be effective, sufficiently prompt and, perhaps, less costly than the American programme. We put this idea across to the President.

I think that in order to achieve a real turn in our relations, which would meet the interests of the USSR and the United States, the interests of the peoples of the world, what is required are new approaches, a fresh look at many things and, what is most important, political will of the leadership of the two countries. The USSR—and I emphasised that in Geneva—does not feel enmity towards the United States, and respects the American people. We are not building our policy on the desire to in-

fringe on the national interests of the United States. I will say more: we would not like, for instance, a change of the strategic balance in our favour. We would not like that because such a situation would heighten suspicion of the other side and enhance the instability of the overall situation.

Life is developing in such a way that both our countries will have to grow accustomed to strategic parity as a natural state. We will have to come to the joint understanding of which level of arms of either side can be considered relatively sufficient from the point of view of its dependable defence. We are convinced that the level of such sufficiency is well below what the USSR and the United States actually have at the present time. And this means that tangible practical steps in arms limitation and reduction are quite possible. These measures will not diminish the security of the USSR and the US, or the overall strategic stability in the world; on the contrary, they will enhance them.

What can be said about other questions discussed at the meeting?

I will begin with the problem of regional conflicts. Both sides expressed concern over the continuing existence of such "trouble spots". It is easy to understand why. Such conflicts are a dangerous thing, especially in the light of the threat of their escalation in the nuclear age.

However, it can be said that our approaches to the causes and ways of settling such conflicts are not simply different—they are diametrically opposite. The United States, which is used to thinking in terms of "spheres of interests", reduces these problems to East-West rivalry. But these days it is an anachronism, a relapse of imperial thinking which denies the right of a majority of nations to think and take decisions independently.

The deep-lying causes of such conflicts are multifaceted—to an extent they are rooted in history, but mainly, in those social and economic conditions into which the newly free countries have been put. It is definitely not by chance that in discussing the problem of regional conflicts, the US does not mention the atrocities of apartheid in South Africa, the aggression staged by that country against its African neighbours, the wars fought by American puppets in Central America and Southeast Asia, Israel's banditry in the Middle East and many other things. Washington is trying to equate the legitimate governments of the states that

follow the path of national liberation and social progress with counter-revolution.

It goes without saying that we could not accept such an interpretation of the situation. The President was told that we are for the recognition of the inalienable right of every people to freedom and independence, to an independent choice of the road. We wish this right not to be flouted by anyone, that there should be no attempts at outside interference, that freedom, not tyranny, should prevail. We have been and remain on the side of peoples upholding their independence. This is our principled line.

The President touched upon the question of Afghanistan. We confirmed again in this connection that the Soviet Union consistently favours a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. We stand for friendly neighbouring Afghanistan to be an independent non-aligned state, for creating conditions of guaranteed non-interference in Afghanistan's affairs. The question of withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country will thus also be resolved. The Soviet Union and the government of Afghanistan are wholly for this. And if anybody hinders an early resolution of that question, it is above all the United States, which is financing, backing and arming gangs of counter-revolutionaries, and frustrating efforts aimed at the normalisation of the situation in **Afghanistan**.

Matters of bilateral relations assumed an important place at the talks. A certain invigoration that has of late started in this area has now been borne out with concrete agreements on exchanges and contacts in the sphere of science, education and culture, on the resumption of air services between the two countries.

The potential inherent in this will, naturally, be much easier to bring out in full measure in conditions when security matters decisive for our mutual relations start being tackled. If we are to cooperate, this must be cooperation on an equal footing, without any discrimination and preconditions, without attempts at interference in the internal affairs of the other side. Our stand on this is firm and consistent.

How can the main results of the Geneva meeting be assessed?

The meeting was, undoubtedly, a significant event. The direct, clear and concrete talk, the possibility to compare the stands

were useful. Too many explosive, acute problems have heaped up, problems that needed to be considered in earnest to try to overcome the deadlock on them.

We appreciate the personal contact established with the President of the United States. A dialogue of top leaders is always a moment of truth in relations between states. It is important that such a dialogue has been held. It is a stabilising factor in itself in the present troubled times.

But we are realists and we must say outright that solution of the most important questions related to the cessation of the arms race was not achieved at the meeting. The unwillingness of the US leadership to give up the Star Wars programme has made it impossible to achieve in Geneva concrete arrangements on real disarmament, above all, on the cardinal problem of nuclear and space arms. The amount of weapons stockpiled by both sides has not lessened as a result of the meeting. The arms race continues. This cannot but cause disappointment.

Major differences remain between the Soviet Union and the United States on a number of other major issues of the world situation and of the development in individual regions. But we are also far from belittling the significance of the Geneva accords.

I will recall the most important of them. These are, above all, the common understanding, sealed in the Joint Statement, that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, the pledge by the USSR and the USA to build their relations proceeding from this indisputable truth, and not to seek military superiority.

We believe that this understanding, jointly endorsed at the highest level, should underlie in practice the foreign policy of the two states. Since it is acknowledged that a nuclear war, by its very nature, cannot help attain any rational goals, the stronger the stimulus should be in favour of its prevention, termination of the development and testing of weapons of mass annihilation, and complete elimination of the stockpiles of nuclear armaments. More still, it is inadmissible to open new areas of the arms race. Of course, a joint statement is not a treaty, but it is a principled position that commits the leaders of the two countries to much.

Further, the USSR and the USA clearly reaffirmed their pledge to facilitate in all ways the enhancement of the effectiveness of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and agreed on joint prac-

tical steps in this direction. This is of no little importance for maintaining world stability and diminishing the risk of nuclear wars in the present-day disquieting international situation.

The joint declaration of the leaders of the two countries in favour of the universal and complete prohibition and elimination of such barbarous weapons of mass destruction as chemical arms is of major importance. We express hope that the United States will translate that important understanding into practical politics as well.

The agreement of the leadership of the USSR and the USA to contribute jointly with the other states participating in the Stockholm Conference to its early completion with the adoption of a document which would include both concrete obligations on the non-use of force and mutually acceptable confidence-building measures, goes far beyond the boundaries of Soviet-American relations.

It is only to be welcomed that the meeting produced a number of useful agreements in many areas of the development of bilateral cooperation between the USSR and the USA. I think that they will provide a good base for increasing trust between our countries and peoples—naturally, if a careful attitude is taken to all the achievements and everything positive inbuilt in those achievements is developed, and if artificial pretexts are not created to throw them overboard.

The importance of the agreement reached in Geneva to continue political contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States, including new meetings at the summit level, should be mentioned specifically.

To sum it all up, we have every right to say that the overall balance sheet of the Geneva meeting is positive.

Undoubtedly, the constructive and consistent policy of our country contributed in the decisive degree to the achievement of such an encouraging outcome. Simultaneously, it would be wrong not to say here that the position of the American side at the meeting included certain elements of realism, which helped to resolve a number of questions.

Of course, the real importance of all useful things agreed upon in Geneva can only manifest itself in practical deeds. I want to state in this context that the Soviet Union for its part intends not to slow down the pace and will seek most resolutely and in

the spirit of honest cooperation with the United States the curtailment of the arms race and the overall improvement of the international situation. We hope that the USA will display a similar approach. Then, I am certain, the work done in Geneva will bear real fruit.

This is our evaluation of that event and its role in international relations. I can say with satisfaction that this evaluation is shared by our allies, the fraternal socialist countries, which is borne out with utmost clarity by a meeting of the leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member countries in Prague immediately upon the completion of the Soviet-American summit talks.

The participants in the Prague meeting stressed that the situation, of course, remained difficult. Struggle for improving it is being carried on but conditions for that struggle have become better, as can be stated even today. The Geneva meeting is an important element of our long-term, joint and closely coordinated efforts to ensure peace.

A natural question to ask is: what is to be done now in the light of the results of the Soviet-American dialogue in Geneva?

As I have already said, we attach much importance to the agreement reached in Geneva on holding new Soviet-American summit meetings. I want to stress that our approach to this question is not formal. What is important is not the mere fact of another meeting between the leaders of the two countries but its results. The peoples will expect practical advance on the road mapped out in Geneva. It is precisely this that we will be seeking. We should begin making preparations for the next Soviet-American summit meeting right now, first and foremost in the area of practical politics.

To facilitate new agreements, both sides, we are convinced, should first and foremost refrain from actions subverting what was achieved in Geneva, refrain from actions which could block talks and detract from the existing constraints on the arms race. This calls, inter alia, for strict and honest compliance with the ABM Treaty and also for the continued respect by both sides for the relevant provisions of the SALT-II Treaty.

But the main thing, of course, is to create a possibility for actually ending the arms race and initiating practical reductions in the existing nuclear arms arsenals.

Is there such a possibility? It is our firm conviction that there is. True, at present there are differences on many points between our and American proposals on nuclear arms reductions. But we do not dramatise this circumstance. Compromises are possible here and we are prepared to look for them.

We are sure that, given such a course of developments, questions of dependable verification, in which the Soviet Union has a direct interest, could be resolved too. One cannot rely on promises here, especially since the case in point is disarmament and the country's defences.

But to resolve all these questions it is absolutely essential to shut the door through which weapons could get into space. Without this, radical reductions in nuclear armaments are impossible. I want to state this with utmost responsibility on behalf of the people and their supreme body of power.

Accord is possible if it takes account of the interests of both sides. The stubborn desire of the American side to go ahead with the development of space weapons can have only one result, the blocking of the possibility to end the nuclear arms race. This outcome, naturally, would bitterly disappoint the peoples of the whole world, including, I am certain, the American people.

There is a real chance today to dramatically lessen the threat of nuclear war and subsequently to remove altogether any possibility of such a war. It would be a fatal mistake to miss that chance. We hope that what was said on the SDI in Geneva was not the last word of the American side.

We have come to terms with President Reagan on instructing our delegations at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms to speed up negotiations and carry them on on the basis of the January agreement between the two countries. Thus, it was confirmed by both sides at the highest level: it is necessary to prevent an arms race in space, resolving this question jointly with the reduction of nuclear arms. This is what the Soviet Union will press for. This is what we call upon the United States to do. By realising the pledge we have made jointly, we will live up to the hopes of the peoples of the world.

As time goes on the termination of nuclear tests is becoming a more and more acute question. Primarily because with it an end would be put to the development of new and modernisation of the existing types of nuclear weapons. Further, because with-

out testing, without renovation, the gradual process of withering away of nuclear arsenals and demise of nuclear weapons would begin. Lastly, because it is inadmissible to permit nuclear blasts—and their number stands in the hundreds—to continue to deface our beautiful planet, intensifying concern over how the succeeding generations will live on it.

This is why the Soviet Union has announced a moratorium on all types of nuclear tests till January 1, 1986, and is ready to extend this moratorium given reciprocity on the part of the United States. We expect the US leadership to make a concrete and positive decision that would have a very favourable effect on the entire situation, that would largely change it and build up trust between our countries.

We have put this question to the American President in Geneva.

Silence was the answer we got. Really, in essence there are no reasonable arguments against the prohibition of nuclear tests. Difficulties of verification are sometimes mentioned. But the Soviet Union clearly demonstrated the excellent possibility of exercising such verification with the help of national means. This year we registered an underground nuclear blast of a very low yield staged in the United States and unannounced by it. We are also ready to examine the possibility of establishing international control. In this context, worthy of attention are the ideas formulated in the message of the leaders of six states who proposed setting up special stations on the territories of their countries to monitor the observance of a test ban agreement.

The entire world raises its voice in favour of terminating nuclear tests. Not so long ago the UN General Assembly passed a resolution calling for such a move. And only three countries—the US, Britain and France—voted against it. This is deplorable.

But there is still time. I think that the leaders of the United States and other nuclear powers will use the existing opportunity and, proceeding from the interests of peace, will show the necessary responsibility. I would like to remind them—our moratorium remains in effect, and we hope that the discussion of that issue at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR will be regarded as an urgent call for a realistic and immediate prohibition of all nuclear tests.

On the whole the Soviet Union comes out with an all-embracing complex of measures which would block all ways for the arms race, be it in space or on Earth, be it nuclear, chemical or conventional weapons. Concrete proposals on that score are well known—in Vienna, in Geneva and in Stockholm. They remain in effect and fully retain their relevance.

Europe should be mentioned separately. The task of preventing the level of military confrontation in Europe from growing any further is more urgent than ever before. The European home is a common home where geography and history have strongly bonded together the destinies of tens of countries and peoples. It is only by a collective effort, by following the reasonable norms of international contacts and cooperation that the Europeans can preserve their home, make it better and safer.

We proceed from the view that Europe, which gave the world so much in the sphere of culture, science, technology, and advanced social thought, is capable of setting an example also in the solution of the most complex problems of the present-day international life. The basis for this was laid down in Helsinki ten years ago. It is our profound conviction that the whole world, including the United States, stands ultimately to gain from the positive developments in Europe. We have been and shall be working for the sake of the principles and policy of detente being consolidated more vigorously on the long-suffering European continent, for the roadblocks of the past and the consequences of confrontation of the recent years being overcome.

I should like to make a special mention here of trade and economic relations. The business circles of many Western countries would like to establish wider economic contacts with us. I heard this mentioned by very influential representatives of those circles: they were talking about readiness to conclude large-scale contracts, to start vast joint projects. Those politicians who try to impose restrictions on this natural striving for businesslike cooperation in the hope of "punishing" someone, of inflicting damage on a partner are simply acting unwisely, to my mind. The fallacy of this policy of pressure has long become obvious. It would be much more useful to exert efforts for a different purpose, for ensuring that trade and scientific and technical exchanges consolidate the material basis of confidence and accord.

We will continue closely to cooperate with our Warsaw Treaty

allies and with all the other countries of the socialist community in the struggle for lasting peace and cooperation among nations in Europe and in other continents. The states participating in the Warsaw Treaty Organisation will under no circumstances forsake the security of their peoples. They will pool their efforts to an ever growing extent within the CMEA framework also to accelerate scientific and technological progress and socio-economic development.

Interaction with the non-aligned movement, including comprehensive cooperation with the Republic of India, for the people and leaders of which we have profound respect, has a great role to play in the improvement of international relations.

The Soviet leadership attaches serious importance to the Asian and Pacific region. The Soviet Union's longest borders are in Asia: we have there loyal friends and reliable allies, from neighbouring Mongolia to socialist Vietnam. It is extremely important to ensure that this region is not a source of tension or an area of armed confrontation. We stand for the broadening of political dialogue among all the states in the region in the interests of peace, good-neighbourliness, mutual trust and cooperation.

We welcome the stand of the People's Republic of China, which is opposed to the militarisation of space, and its statement renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons.

We stand for better relations with Japan and it is our conviction that this is possible. It stems from the very fact that our countries are next-door neighbours. Also, the interests of the USSR and Japan cannot but coincide in the vital matter of removing the nuclear threat.

We have established relations of equal cooperation with many states in Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. The Soviet Union will continue to work purposefully to develop these relations. We value especially our close contacts with socialist-oriented countries in different continents.

The peoples of the whole world are today facing a host of questions which can only be resolved jointly and only under conditions of peace. A few dozen years ago serious ecological problems were virtually non-existent. But our generation is already witnessing mass extermination of forests, extinction of animals, contamination of rivers and other water bodies, and growing desertification. What will the world be like that the future

generations will see? Will they be able to live in it if the rapacious destruction of nature is not stopped and if the economic, technical and scientific achievements of our time are directed not at ensuring conditions for the existence and progress of man and his environment, but at perfecting weapons of destruction?

Or take energy. We are now living for the most part at the expense of the Earth's bowels. But what was lying virtually on the surface is being exhausted and the further development of these resources is growing more and more expensive and becoming more and more arduous. Moreover, this source is not eternal.

Dangerous upheavals can be caused by the growing gap between a handful of highly industrialised capitalist nations and those developing countries—and there is the overwhelming majority of them—whose lot is poverty, hunger and lack of hope. The abyss dividing these two poles in the world is becoming ever wider, and relations between them—ever more antagonistic. It cannot be otherwise unless the industrialised capitalist nations alter their self-serving policies.

Mankind is capable of resolving all these problems today if it pools its forces and intellect. Then it will be possible to scale new heights in the development of our civilisation.

Militarism is an enemy of the nations. The arms race whipped up by the thirst of gain of the military-industrial complex is sheer madness. It affects the vital interests of all countries and peoples. This is why when instead of the elimination of nuclear weapons it is proposed to us to project the arms race to space, we respond with a firm "no". We say "no" because such a step means a new round of the mad squandering of funds. We say "no" because this means the heightening of the threat already looming large over the world. We say "no" because life itself calls not for a competition in armaments, but for joint action for the good of peace.

The Soviet Union is a strong advocate of the development of international life in this direction.

On the initiative of the USSR work involving scientists from different countries has begun on the Tokamak thermonuclear reactor project which opens up an opportunity to radically resolve the energy problem. According to scientists, it is possible to create as early as this century a "terrestrial sun"—an inex-

haustible source of thermonuclear energy. We note with satisfaction that it was agreed in Geneva to carry on with that important project.

Our country submitted to the United Nations an extensive and detailed programme of peaceful cooperation in space, of the establishment of a universal space organisation to coordinate the efforts of countries in the exploration and utilisation of space. There are truly boundless possibilities for such cooperation. They include fundamental research projects and the application of their findings in geology, medicine, and studies of the materials, the climate and the environment. They include the development of global communication satellite systems and remote-control probing of the Earth. They also include the development of new space technology, such as large orbital scientific stations and various manned spacecraft, and their use in the interests of all peoples, and the eventual industrialisation of near-Earth space. All this constitutes a realistic alternative to the Star Wars plans; it is oriented to a peaceful future for all mankind.

The Soviet Union was one of the active participants in the conclusion of an international convention to regulate the economic utilisation of the resources of the World Ocean. The accomplishment of this task is also vastly important for ensuring the progress of human civilisation and for broadening and multiplying the possibilities open to present-day society.

We offer the whole world, including the world of capitalist states, a broad, long-term and comprehensive programme of mutually beneficial cooperation, a programme incorporating new opportunities which are being opened before mankind by the age of the scientific and technological revolution. And cooperation between two such states as the Soviet Union and the United States of America could play a far from the least role in carrying out this programme.

Our policy is clear: it is a policy of peace and cooperation.

Comrades, the successes of our foreign policy are inherent in the nature of the socialist system. The Communist Party is well aware of and highly appreciates the nation-wide support for its home and foreign policy. This support is manifested in the daily practical work of millions upon millions of people. The achievements in the national economy mean not only an economic,

but also an important moral and political result attesting to the rightness of our course.

We face important and not easy undertakings. "However, difficulty does not imply impossibility," the great Lenin taught us. "The important thing is to be confident that the path chosen is the right one, this confidence multiplying a hundred-fold revolutionary energy and revolutionary enthusiasm."¹ And the Party and the Soviet people have this confidence, which multiplies our strength.

We are confident that every Communist, every worker, every peasant, every engineer and scientist, every work collective, being aware of their high responsibility to the Motherland, will perform their duty.

We are confident that everything will be done at every work place to ensure that the plans of 1986 are successfully fulfilled and overfulfilled, so that our country becomes still richer and mightier and the cause of peace on Earth strengthens and wins.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, 1977, p. 103.

Statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

The new year 1986 has begun. It will be an important year, one could say a turning point in the history of the Soviet state, the year of the 27th Congress of the CPSU. The Congress will chart the guidelines for the political, social, economic and cultural development of Soviet society up to the next millennium. It will adopt a programme for accelerating our peaceful construction.

All efforts of the CPSU are directed towards ensuring a further improvement in the life of the Soviet people.

A turn for the better is also needed in the international arena. It is awaited and demanded by the peoples of the Soviet Union and peoples throughout the world.

Aware of this fact, at the start of the new year, the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government have adopted a decision on a number of major foreign-policy actions of a fundamental nature. They are designed to maximally further improve the international situation. They are prompted by the need to overcome the negative confrontational tendencies that have been growing in recent years, and to clear the way for cutting back the nuclear arms race on Earth and preventing it in outer space, for an overall reduction of the war danger and for building confidence as an integral part of relations among states.

I

The most important of these actions is a concrete programme aimed at the complete destruction of nuclear weapons throughout the world within a precisely defined time.

The Soviet Union is proposing a phased and consistent process of ridding Earth of nuclear weapons, to be implemented and completed within the next 15 years, before the end of this century.

The 20th century has given mankind the energy of the atom. But this brilliant achievement of the human mind can become an instrument of man's self-destruction.

Is it possible to solve this contradiction? We are convinced that it is. Finding effective ways of eliminating nuclear weapons is a feasible task if it is tackled without delay.

The Soviet Union is proposing a programme for ridding mankind of the fear of nuclear catastrophe to be carried out beginning in 1986. And the fact that the United Nations has proclaimed this year International Year of Peace provides an additional political and moral incentive. Here we must rise above national selfishness, tactical considerations, differences and disputes, which are insignificant compared to safeguarding the most precious thing—peace and a safe future. The energy of the atom should be placed exclusively in the service of peace, a goal that our socialist state has invariably advocated and continues to pursue.

As far back as 1946, our country was the first to raise the question of prohibiting the production and use of atomic weapons and to utilise atomic energy for peaceful purposes to the benefit of mankind.

How does the Soviet Union now visualise in practical terms the process of reducing nuclear weapons, both delivery vehicles and warheads, until they are all destroyed? Our proposals amount to the following:

Stage One. Within the next five to eight years the USSR and the USA will reduce by half the nuclear arms that can reach each other's territory. On the remaining delivery vehicles of this kind each side will retain no more than 6,000 warheads.

It stands to reason that such a reduction is possible only if the USSR and the USA mutually renounce the development, testing and deployment of space strike weapons. As the Soviet Union has repeatedly warned, the development of space strike weapons will dash all hopes of reducing nuclear weapons on Earth.

The first stage will include the adoption and implementation

of the decision on the complete elimination of medium-range ballistic and cruise missiles of the USSR and the USA in the European zone as a first step in clearing Europe of nuclear weapons.

At the same time, the United States should pledge not to supply its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries, while Britain and France should pledge not to build up their respective nuclear armaments.

The USSR and the USA should from the very beginning agree to stop all nuclear explosions and call on other states to join in such a moratorium as soon as possible.

The reason why the first stage of nuclear disarmament is confined to the Soviet Union and the United States is that they must set an example to the other nuclear powers. We said this frankly to US President Ronald Reagan when we met in Geneva.

Stage Two. At this stage, which should start not later than 1990 and extend over five to seven years, the other nuclear powers will begin to join the nuclear disarmament process. To begin with, they will pledge to freeze all their nuclear arms and not to have any in the territory of other countries.

At this time, the USSR and the USA will go on with the reductions agreed upon in the first stage and also take further measures to scrap their medium-range nuclear weapons and freeze their tactical nuclear weapons.

Following the completion by the USSR and the USA of the 50-per cent reduction of their relevant arms in the second stage, another radical step is taken: all nuclear powers destroy their tactical nuclear arms, namely, weapons with a range (or action radius) of up to 1,000 km.

At the same stage, the Soviet-American accord on the prohibition of space strike weapons will have to become multilateral, with the obligatory participation in it of the major industrial powers.

All nuclear powers will stop nuclear weapons testing.

There will be a ban on the development of non-nuclear weapons based on new physical principles, whose destructive capacity approaches that of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction.

Stage Three begins not later than 1995. At this stage, all re-

maining nuclear weapons are to be scrapped. By the end of 1999 there will be no more nuclear weapons on Earth. A universal accord is to be drawn up to ensure that such weapons shall never again reappear.

It is envisaged that special procedures will be worked out for the destruction of nuclear weapons as well as for the dismantling, conversion or destruction of delivery vehicles. In the process, agreement will be reached on the number of weapons subject to scrapping at each stage, on the sites where they are to be destroyed, and so on.

Control over the armaments subject to destruction or limitation will be carried out both by national technical means and through on-site inspections. The USSR is ready to come to terms on any other additional verification measures.

Adoption of the nuclear disarmament programme that we propose would undoubtedly have a favourable impact on the negotiations underway at bilateral and multilateral forums. The programme would identify specific routes and reference points, establish a specific time-table for reaching agreements and implementing them, and would make the negotiations purposeful and goal-oriented. This would end the dangerous tendency when the rate of the arms race is higher than that of progress at negotiations.

In short, we propose that the world should enter the third millennium without nuclear weapons on the basis of mutually acceptable and strictly controlled agreements. If the US Administration is really committed to the complete scrapping of nuclear weapons everywhere, as it has repeatedly stated, it is being offered a splendid opportunity to tackle the matter in practice. Instead of wasting the next 10 to 15 years on developing new, extremely dangerous space weapons allegedly designed to make nuclear arms useless, would it not be more sensible to start destroying those arms and finally reduce them to zero? The Soviet Union, I repeat, proposes this very approach.

The Soviet Union calls on all peoples and states and, naturally, above all on nuclear states, to support the programme for scrapping nuclear weapons before the year 2000. It is absolutely clear to any unbiassed person that if such a programme were implemented, nobody would lose and everybody would gain. This is a problem that concerns all mankind and it can and must

be solved only in common. And the sooner the programme is translated into deeds, the safer will human life be on our planet.

II

Guided by the same approach and the wish to take another practical step within the context of the nuclear disarmament programme, the Soviet Union has taken an important decision.

We are extending for another three months our unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions which expired on December 31, 1985. The moratorium will remain in effect longer if the United States, too, stops nuclear tests. We again offer the United States to join this initiative whose significance is apparent to literally everyone in the world.

Obviously, adopting our decision was by no means simple. The Soviet Union cannot display unilateral restraint with regard to nuclear tests indefinitely. But the stakes are too high and the responsibility too great for us not to use every opportunity for influencing the position of others by force of example.

All experts, scientists, politicians and military men agree that a cessation of tests would indeed reliably seal off the channels for upgrading nuclear weapons. And that is a top priority task. The mere reduction of nuclear stockpiles, unaccompanied by a prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, offers no way out of the nuclear threat dilemma, because the remaining weapons would be modernised and there would still be the opportunity for developing increasingly refined and deadly nuclear weapons and testing their new types at testing grounds.

Therefore, the cessation of tests is a practical step towards the destruction of nuclear weapons.

I want to say from the outset that possible references to verification as an obstacle to a moratorium on nuclear explosions would be totally groundless. We declare most definitely that for us verification is no problem. Should the United States agree to stop all nuclear explosions on a reciprocal basis, the due verification of compliance with the moratorium will be fully ensured

by national technical means as well as international procedures, including on-site inspections whenever necessary. We are inviting the USA to come to terms with us on this score.

The USSR is strongly in favour of the moratorium becoming a bilateral, and later a multilateral, action. We are also in favour of resuming the trilateral negotiations (between the USSR, the USA and Great Britain) on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. This could be done immediately, even this month. We are also prepared to begin without delay multilateral test ban negotiations in the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, with all nuclear powers taking part.

Non-aligned countries are proposing consultations with a view to extending the 1963 Moscow Treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water to underground tests, which are not covered by the Treaty. The Soviet Union agrees to this as well.

Since last summer we have been calling on the United States to follow our example and stop nuclear explosions. Washington has not done this so far, despite the public protests and demands, and the will of most states in the world. By setting off more and more of its nuclear devices, the American side continues the chase of its futile dream of military superiority. That is a barren and dangerous policy not worthy of the level of civilisation that modern society has reached.

In the absence of a positive response from the United States, the Soviet side had every right to resume nuclear tests as from January 1, 1986. And had we followed the usual "logic" of the arms race, that should evidently have been the thing to do.

But that is precisely the sort of logic, if one may call it that, which must be firmly renounced. We are making yet another attempt in this direction. Otherwise the process of military rivalry will avalanche, making control over the course of events impossible. To submit to the momentum of the nuclear arms race is impermissible. It would mean acting contrary to the voice of reason and the human instinct of self-preservation. New and bold approaches, a new political thinking and a keen sense of responsibility for the future of the people are required.

The US Administration again has additional time to weigh our proposals on stopping nuclear explosions and to reply to them

in the affirmative. That is the kind of response people everywhere in the world will expect from Washington.

The Soviet Union calls on the President and US Congress, and on the American people. The opportunity for halting the process of upgrading nuclear arms and developing new weapons of that kind is at hand. It must not be missed. The Soviet proposals place the USSR and the USA in an equal position. They contain no attempt to outwit or outplay the other side. We are proposing a road of sensible and responsible decisions.

III

To implement the programme of reducing and scrapping nuclear arsenals, it is necessary to set in motion the entire existing system of negotiations and to ensure the highest possible efficiency of the disarmament machinery.

In a few days, the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms will be resumed in Geneva. When we met with President Reagan last November at Geneva, we had a frank discussion on the whole range of problems that were the topic of those negotiations, namely space, strategic offensive arms, and medium-range nuclear weapons. It was agreed to speed up the negotiations, and that agreement cannot remain a mere declaration.

The Soviet delegation in Geneva will be instructed to abide strictly by that agreement. We expect the same constructive approach from the US side, above all on the question of outer space. Outer space must remain peaceful; strike weapons must not be deployed there. Neither should any be developed. And let there be most rigorous control, including inspection of relevant laboratories.

Mankind is at a crucial point in the new space age. And it is time to renounce the Stone Age mentality, when the chief concern was to have a bigger stick or a heavier stone. We are against weapons in outer space. The Soviet Union's material and intellectual resources make it possible to develop any weapon if we are compelled to do so. But we are fully aware of our responsibility to the present and future generations, and are deeply convinced that we should go to the third millennium not with a Star Wars programme but with large-scale projects for

the peaceful exploration of space by all mankind. We propose that all concerned begin drawing up and implementing such projects. This is one of the best ways of ensuring progress on our entire planet and establishing a reliable security system for all.

To prevent the arms race from spreading to outer space means removing the obstacle to far-reaching reductions of nuclear arms. On the negotiating table in Geneva is a Soviet proposal for reducing by half the corresponding nuclear arms of the Soviet Union and the United States, which is an important step towards the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons. To padlock the door to a solution of the outer space problem means not wanting to stop the arms race on Earth. This has got to be said clearly for all to hear. It is no accident that the devotees of the nuclear arms race are also ardent supporters of the Star Wars programme. Those are two sides of one and the same policy hostile to the interests of humanity.

Now the European aspect of the nuclear problem. It is a matter of extreme concern that, contrary to common sense and to the national interests of the European peoples, American first-strike missiles are still being installed in certain West European countries. This problem has been under discussion for many years. But meanwhile security in Europe is going from bad to worse.

It is time to put an end to this course of events and cut that Gordian knot. The Soviet Union has long since proposed that Europe should be freed of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. This proposal still stands. As a first and radical step in that direction we are now proposing, as I have said, that already in the first stage of our programme all medium-range ballistic and cruise missiles of the USSR and the USA in the European zone should be destroyed.

If tangible practical results were achieved at the Geneva talks, this would give meaningful material substance to the programme we are proposing for the total elimination of nuclear arms by the year 2000.

IV

The Soviet Union holds that it is entirely feasible to completely eliminate such barbaric instruments of mass destruction as chemical weapons before the end of this century.

At the talks on chemical weapons held within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament certain signs of progress have appeared of late. However, the talks have been dragged out intolerably. We are in favour of intensifying the talks in order to conclude an effective and verifiable international convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons and on destroying their existing stockpiles, as agreed upon with US President Reagan in Geneva.

In the matter of banning chemical weapons, as in other disarmament matters, all participants in the talks must take a fresh view of things. I would like to make it perfectly clear that the Soviet Union is in favour of the earliest total destruction of those weapons and the industrial plant for their production. We are prepared to ensure timely notification of the location of plants producing chemical weapons and the cessation of such production, and are ready to start working out procedures for destroying the relevant industrial facilities, and also to proceed, soon after the convention enters into force, to destroy the stockpiles of chemical weapons. All these measures would be carried out under strict control, including international on-site inspections.

A radical solution to this problem would also be facilitated by interim measures. For example, agreement could be reached on a multilateral basis not to transfer chemical weapons to anyone and not to deploy them on the territories of other states. The Soviet Union has always strictly abided by these principles in its practical policies, and we call on other states to follow this example and show the same restraint.

V

Besides eliminating weapons of mass destruction from the arsenals of states, the Soviet Union proposes that conventional armaments and armed forces should also become objects of agreed reductions.

An agreement at the Vienna negotiations could well give the start to progress in this direction. It seems, indeed, that the contours have appeared of a possible decision to reduce Soviet and US troops and subsequently freeze the level of the armed forces of the opposite sides in Central Europe. The Soviet Union and our Warsaw Treaty allies are determined that the Vienna talks should succeed. If the other side really wants the same thing, 1986 could become a milestone for the Vienna talks as well. We are aware that the possible agreement on troop reductions will naturally require sensible verification. And we are prepared for it. As for compliance with the commitment to freeze the number of troops, permanent control posts could be established in addition to the national technical means to monitor any military contingents entering the reduction zone.

Now about the important forum known as the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. It is called upon to put up barriers against the use of force and covert preparations for war, whether on land, at sea or in the air. The possibilities of this have come into evidence.

As we see it, especially in the current situation, it is essential to reduce the numbers of troops participating in major military exercises notifiable under the Helsinki Final Act.

The time has come to effectively tackle the still outstanding problems at the Conference. The tightest bottleneck there, as we know, is the issue of notifying major ground, naval and air exercises. Those are serious problems, of course, and they must be handled thoroughly in the interests of building confidence in Europe. But if a package solution of the problems is not achieved now, why not look for their partial solution, and, for instance, come to terms on notification of major ground and air exercises, and leave the question of naval activities until the next stage of the Conference.

It is no coincidence that a considerable part of the new Soviet initiatives is directly addressed to Europe. A special mission could fall to its lot in securing a radical turn in favour of the peace policy. That mission is to rebuild detente.

Europe has the requisite historical experience, much of it unique. Suffice it to recall that the joint efforts of the Europeans, along with the United States and Canada, yielded the Helsinki

Final Act. If a specific and tangible example of new thinking and political psychology is needed in approaching the problems of peace, cooperation and international confidence, that historic document could in many ways be such an example.

VI

Security in Asia is of vital importance to the Soviet Union as a major Asian power. The Soviet programme for liquidating nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of the current century is in harmony with the sentiments of the peoples of the Asian continent, for whom the problems of peace and security are no less acute than for the peoples of Europe. How can one fail to recall that Japan and its cities Hiroshima and Nagasaki were victims of nuclear bombings and Vietnam, a target of chemical weapons.

We put great store by the constructive initiatives advanced by the socialist countries of Asia and by India and other members of the non-aligned movement. We consider it highly important that the two nuclear powers in Asia, the USSR and the People's Republic of China, have both pledged no-first-use of nuclear weapons.

Implementation of our programme would fundamentally change the situation in Asia, deliver the nations in that part of the globe, too, from fear of the nuclear and chemical danger, and heighten security in the region to a qualitatively new level.

We regard our programme as a contribution to the joint search of all the Asian countries for a common comprehensive approach to shaping a system of secure and durable peace on that continent.

VII

Our new proposals are addressed to the whole world. Initiating active steps to halt the arms race and reduce armaments is a necessary step towards coping with the increasingly acute global problems—the destruction of human habitat and the need for finding new sources of energy, combating economic backwardness, hunger and diseases. The principle imposed by the militarists—arms instead of development—must be reversed: disarmament

for development. The noose of the trillion-dollar foreign debt, now choking dozens of countries and whole continents, is a direct consequence of the arms race. The over 250 billion dollars annually siphoned out of the developing countries is an amount that almost equals the mammoth US military budget. And in substance, this coincidence is anything but a coincidence.

The Soviet Union wants each measure limiting and reducing arms and each step related to the destruction of nuclear weapons to bring the nations greater security and, indeed, enable them to allocate more funds for improving people's life. It is only natural that peoples seeking to do away with backwardness and achieve the level of industrially developed countries associate the prospects of shaking off the dependence on imperialism caused by their foreign debt draining their economies with the limitation and scrapping of armaments, reducing military expenditures and use of the freed resources for social and economic development. This subject will doubtless figure prominently at the coming international conference on disarmament and development to be held this summer in Paris.

The Soviet Union is opposed to making the implementation of disarmament measures conditional on so-called regional conflicts. Behind that we see both a reluctance to disarm and a desire to impose an alien will on sovereign nations and arrangements which would maintain the profoundly unfair conditions that enable some countries to live at the expense of others, and to exploit their natural, human and intellectual resources for the selfish imperial purposes of certain states or aggressive alliances. The Soviet Union will always oppose this. It has always been a consistent advocate of freedom for the peoples, and of peace, security, and stronger international law and order. The Soviet Union's goal is not whipping up regional conflicts but settling them by collective effort on a basis of justice, and the sooner the better.

Today, there is no shortage of professions of peace. What is really in short supply is concrete action to strengthen its foundations. All too often words of peace conceal war preparations and power politics. What is more, statements are being made from high rostrums with the intention of wiping out the "spirit of Geneva", the new element that is having a salutary effect on international relations today. The matter is not confined to just

statements. There are also actions clearly designed to incite animosity and mistrust, and to revive confrontation, the antipode of detente.

We reject this mode of acting and thinking. We want 1986 to be more than simply a peaceful year and to enable us to come to the end of the 20th century under the sign of peace and nuclear disarmament. Our package of new foreign-policy initiatives is intended to make it possible for mankind to celebrate the advent of the year 2000 under a peaceful sky and peaceful space, without fear of nuclear, chemical or any other threat of annihilation, and fully confident of survival and the continuation of the human race.

The new resolute measures now being taken by the Soviet Union to safeguard peace and improve the overall international situation give expression to the substance and spirit of our home and foreign policies and their organic unity. They reflect the fundamental law of history emphasised by Lenin. The whole world sees that our country is holding still higher the banner of peace, freedom and humanism that was raised over our planet by the Great October Socialist Revolution.

No one must be indifferent or stand aloof in the matter of preserving peace and saving mankind from the threat of nuclear war. This concerns each and everyone. Each state, large or small, socialist or capitalist, has an important contribution to make. Every responsible political party, every mass organisation and every individual also have an important role to play.

No task is more urgent, more noble and humane than to unite all efforts to achieve this lofty goal. This task is to be accomplished by people of our generation without shifting it onto the shoulders of those who succeed us. That is the bidding of our time or, if you like, the burden of historic responsibility for our decisions and actions in the time that remains until the beginning of the third millennium.

Peace and disarmament will continue to be central to the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. In pursuance of this policy, the Soviet Union is prepared to engage in wide-ranging cooperation with all those who stand on positions of reason and goodwill, and are conscious of their responsibility to mankind for securing a future without wars and weapons.

Pravda, January 16, 1986

Answers to *l'Humanité*

Question. Mikhail Sergeyevich, I thank you for agreeing to answer the questions of *l'Humanité*. You are the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This lends special weight to your answers to questions about life in the Soviet Union asked by French people, who are permanently influenced by the hostile attacks against your country. So, the first question. There is much talk about the USSR entering a stage of development that is as important as the one ushered in by the Great October Revolution. Does this mean that a new revolution has occurred?

Answer. Certainly not. It is wrong, I think, to put the question this way. It would be more correct, in my view, to say that today, in the 1980s, we are setting ourselves the task of powerfully accelerating the job started by the Bolshevik Party almost 70 years ago.

The October Revolution was a crucial event in the thousand-year history of our state. Nothing in the past can compare with

l'Humanité, the leading newspaper of the French Communist Party, asked Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to answer a number of questions.

On February 4, 1986, Mikhail Gorbachev received Roland Leroy, Member of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party and political director of *l'Humanité*, Gérard Streiff, Member of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party and *l'Humanité's* permanent Moscow correspondent, and José Fort, head of the newspaper's international desk.

Here are given the answers of Mikhail Gorbachev and the transcript of his conversation with Roland Leroy.

it in terms of its significance and consequences for the development of all mankind. Yet it is not enough to accomplish a revolution—it is necessary to uphold it, to translate into life the working man's ideas of equality and justice, his social and moral ideals; in other words, to build a new society that will provide a life worthy of human beings.

All this has required enormous work, truly heroic deeds and many a sacrifice from our people, from the Party. The Civil War and the war against Nazi Germany, the deep-going transformations in the countryside, the creation of a powerful industry, the eradication of illiteracy which afflicted the majority of the population, the fundamental social and cultural reconstruction of society, the moulding of fundamentally new relations between nations—these are only some of the pages from our history, which, in general, is still quite short.

We are proud of it, and this pride underlies Soviet patriotism. Had we not been able to hold out, had we suffered defeat in even one of the above-mentioned endeavours, everything for the sake of which the October Revolution was accomplished would have been called in question. And each of these endeavours can be rightly called a truly revolutionary accomplishment.

The same is true of the tasks that have been tackled today. They are complex and, at the same time, very important. If we fail to cope with them, we will depreciate everything we achieved at the cost of enormous efforts in the past and will complicate our future. And possibly the most difficult but also the most indispensable thing for each Soviet Communist, for the whole Party, is to understand and appreciate in its entirety the challenge of the epoch, and meet it in a worthy manner.

The challenge is double-pronged.

On the one hand, Soviet society has entered a new stage of its history. The essence of this stage is that the requirements of the development of the productive forces, the requirements of the nation, the requirements of people have put on the agenda the question of a very serious restructuring and improvement of many aspects of production relations, methods of economic management and of the techniques, forms, and style of Party and state leadership, i.e., politics. The point is also to draw ever broader sections of the people into resolving social issues, mobilising their creative abilities and experience to carry out the

increasingly complicated tasks, i.e., to further develop and enrich our socialist democracy.

For quite a long time now we have felt the need for all this. The substance of what is under way currently in the country and, above all, in the Party, is to accelerate resolutely the socio-economic and cultural development of Soviet society, using all available opportunities to this end. This is certainly a revolutionary task.

On the other hand, the challenge of our epoch stems from the fact that human civilisation has unfortunately created highly effective means of self-destruction. Not even unheard-of foolishness or a crime is needed for the worst to happen. It is enough to act in a way people have acted for millennia—to rely on weapons and military force in resolving international issues, and to use them when an occasion presents itself. All these thousand-year traditions must now be broken ruthlessly; they must be given up once and for all. Otherwise, the problem of mankind's survival may prove to be insoluble. In this nuclear age it is impossible to live, at any rate to live long, with the psychology, habits, and rules of conduct that belong to the Stone Age. Isn't such a sharp turn in international relations, in the mentality and practices of foreign policy, a profoundly revolutionary task? To my mind, it is. And we, as the country that was the first to accomplish a socialist revolution, see our enormous responsibility, our duty, in helping to carry out this task in every way possible.

In general, we regard our programme of practical action, which is to be discussed and adopted by the 27th Congress of the CPSU, from every position as a programme of a truly revolutionary character and scale.

Question. What are the most important prospects for the development of the Soviet economy in the next ten-fifteen years? How will this affect the wellbeing of the people?

Answer. The prospects will depend on how well we cope with the existing problems, in other words, on how well and how skilfully we shall work. Frankly speaking, these problems are not simple. We are faced with objective difficulties (the unfavourable demographic situation and the arms race that is being forced on us are the biggest of them). And there are also difficulties that have arisen through our own fault. And

because their resolution was being dragged out, they became more complicated.

Now we must do a lot of work within the shortest period—to improve radically our planning, management, and material incentives, and to accelerate progress in science and technology. And, on this basis, to raise the efficiency of the economy and the quality of economic performance, and to improve the quality of products. In the next fifteen years we are planning to double the country's production potential, to change considerably the very character of our economy, the character of labour, and to restructure the people's way of life.

You ask how this will affect the wellbeing of the people. My answer is that we are, indeed, doing it for the benefit of the people. I mean both the quantitative and qualitative aspects, i.e., consumption and services, housing, medical care and education, social security, access to cultural benefits, environmental protection, improvement of urban and rural planning, leisure and recreation, and many other things. I am not going to conceal the fact that in many of these areas things are not at all what we would like them to be. Because for a long time our difficult history did not permit us to devote due attention to these areas of life, on the one hand, and on the other because of our own fault—because of inertness, inability, and, at times, simply the irresponsibility of some officials, entire departments and organisations. If you read our newspapers, you must know how many officials, including high-ranking officials, are being sharply criticised for that. Now we have begun resolutely to remedy the situation. This will, of course, take much time and effort. But I am sure that we will achieve serious progress in all these things. Certainly, all of us would like to get this done as quickly as possible.

Among the most urgent matters is the need to fill the market with a wide range of good-quality products. The products must be various: new and traditional, expensive and cheap, for young people and for people of advanced age—in a word, to satisfy all tastes and requirements, naturally, within reasonable limits. We regard this as exceptionally important.

Question. Are there still queues?

Answer. Yes, especially for high-quality goods, the demand for which is not yet being met.

I would like to note that not all ways of resolving this problem are open to us. In the West, if the demand for some kind of product exceeds supply, the price is increased. We never or almost never do this, at any rate in the case of consumer goods. As a result, there are shortages, and shortages mean queues.

I am saying all this to explain the problem, and not to justify the shortcomings. We firmly insist that shortcomings should be eliminated, not justified. That is why we have now started a serious restructuring of the economy, of all the economic mechanisms.

Question. Do Soviet citizens have the right and opportunity to "resist" actions of the "heads" of their enterprise? And not just to "resist", but also to change their decisions?

Answer. If by "heads" you mean directors or the administration, we have neither private owners nor relations of private ownership. Already during the first years of Soviet government a whole mechanism was created to protect the rights of the working people: strict labour legislation, broad trade union rights, Party and government control. In recent years, the rights of the working people and work collectives have been broadened substantially. Practically all major decisions are prepared and adopted with the participation of the personnel and after due discussion. This applies among other things to the draft plans for the economic and social development of enterprises.

Now specifically about the trade unions. They sign collective agreements with the administration and exercise control over compliance with labour legislation. And if they believe that something, including the dismissal of workers, the question of pay, the provision of housing, and so on, is being done wrongly, they can, to use your expression, very effectively "resist", up to and including the demand that this or that administrator be fired. This happens from time to time.

But there is also another side to the matter. Not only the administration and the trade union, but also the work collective as a whole, should also make certain demands on the workers, their discipline, conscientiousness, and on-the-job behaviour. And, as a rule, this is done with the complete support of the workers. The collective itself is interested in the good work of each of its members. This is also in the interests of all workers,

since their wages, working conditions, and social benefits depend on it.

Question. Isn't unemployment an inevitable price for modernising production?

Answer. In a plan-based economy geared to meeting the needs of society as fully as possible, such a connection does not exist. Even if some fundamental technological improvements make entire trades no longer necessary, we can and should not only foresee this in advance, but also take measures to retrain workers and, if need be, set up new production units. And that is exactly what we do in practice. Indeed, since the reconstruction of enterprises is, as a rule, accompanied by their expansion, the question of new jobs is solved at the same enterprises. But this question is as yet more or less academic for us, primarily because for us the problem is not one of a surplus, but of a shortage of manpower. At the same time, to tell you frankly, there is also another reason. So far, we are modernising slowly, and this also in industries where it is overdue. Be that as it may, the Party takes account of the social aspect of modernisation and considers it exceptionally important to do this in drafting plans for the country's economic development.

Question. Is the Communist Party in the USSR "the driving belt" in relation to the state? What meaning is put in your country today in the expression "to make policy"?

Answer. In our society the Communist Party is the leading and guiding force. This status of the Party is enshrined in the Constitution. This means that the Party is not a symbol, but a real, continuously functioning political organisation which numbers nearly twenty million of the most active workers, farmers, and intellectuals. It is a democratic organisation that elects its leading bodies and its leaders, and holds them strictly accountable. At present we are seeking to enhance these democratic principles of Party life and work, and to make all Party collectives more active. As we see it, this is one of the efficient tools for extending democracy and drawing millions of people into deciding production, social and political issues. I think that the question of the Party's work in present-day conditions will occupy a central place at the coming congress.

The Party is responsible for working out the strategy and tactics of building our new society, implementing personnel pol-

icy, and conducting the ideological education of the people. Party committees at all levels, including the Central Committee, are bodies that provide political guidance. The Party has a vital interest in our political system working actively at all levels. It supports and gives assistance to the Soviets of People's Deputies, trade unions, the Young Communist League, and other mass organisations, and sees to it that each of these organisations should perform its functions in full.

You ask about the meaning of the expression "to make policy". We do not use this expression. We say "to work out policy, to formulate policy, to pursue policy". This, in my opinion, conveys the substance of the matter more accurately, at least in our understanding.

Working out policy, which is, as I said, a responsibility primarily of the Party, begins with the study of the objective situation, of the relevant needs of society, and of the sentiments of the masses (our Party, in fact, carefully studies public opinion and takes full account of it). It is on this basis, after a proper discussion, that political decisions are made. This process is, of course, not a simple one and proceeds in different ways, depending on the nature of the problems being tackled. Not infrequently, decision-making is preceded by an extensive, sometimes nation-wide, discussion and hence by a comparison and collision of points of view on some issues. This is the case with the draft five-year plans. This was the case with the Constitution, the labour and housing legislation, the educational reform and, more recently, the law on combating hard drinking and alcoholism.

The main thing in the entire political process is translating the decisions into reality. There can be no policy without this. And if you have followed the discussion we had in our country since the April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, you could not have failed to notice that we attach special significance to the unity of words and deeds.

We wage a determined struggle for words to be matched by deeds. To achieve this we use the weapons of criticism, publicity, and discipline.

Question. Not infrequently one hears that young Soviet people are not interested in politics and are socially inert. Is that true?

Answer. This is said in the West by our ill-wishers. But I'll be blunt: they engage in wishful thinking. We have no reason to complain about our young people. On the whole, they have a strong sense of civic duty and a deep interest in the affairs of society and in domestic and foreign policy. Young people are doing quite well at factories, on collective farms, in colleges and the army. And they go readily, of their own free will and, I would even say, with enthusiasm, to work where it is most difficult: at the big construction projects in Siberia, in the country's North, and in the Far East. There are now half a million young volunteers working on these projects. In short, I can by no means agree that young Soviet people are inert and passive. We have complete political confidence in our young generation.

This does not mean, of course, that there are no problems and questions in the matter. There are. We were seriously worried, for instance, that some young people were affected by alcoholism. There are also instances of parasitic and consumerist sentiments, bad taste, narrow cultural and intellectual interests, and inadequate cultural standards. We are well aware of these things and, naturally, do not leave them unattended. There is a big field here for the activity of the Komsomol. Generally speaking, it is long known that force of example is far more effective than the most eloquent sermon. I think that what is being done in the country and the Party at present will prove very fruitful as regards educating young people.

Question. There is talk about persecution of Jews, about political prisoners, and censorship in the USSR. Some names, such as Sakharov's, are mentioned. What can you say on this score?

Answer. Let's begin with the Soviet Jews. This issue has become part of a clamorous anti-Soviet campaign, of all-out psychological warfare against the USSR. Anti-semitic propaganda, as well as other forms of racial discrimination, is prohibited by law in the Soviet Union and constitutes a criminal offence. What is commonplace in the USA, and for that matter in France and other Western countries—desecration of Jewish graves and the activities of neo-Nazi organisations preaching hatred for Jews in newspapers and radio programmes—is impossible in the USSR. Jews in our country are as free and have the same rights as people of all the other nationalities. They are active in public life and

state affairs. We publish books, magazines, and newspapers in Yiddish. There are synagogues. I think the importunate "attention" paid to the fate of Jews in the USSR by anti-communist and Zionist propaganda is nothing but hypocrisy in the pursuit of far-reaching political goals. These goals have nothing to do with the true interests of Soviet Jews.

I believe there should be no room in a civilised society for anti-Semitism, Zionism, and any other types of nationalism, chauvinism, or racism. And the question of eradicating these evils on a global scale is very urgent. In South Africa the racists have gone over to bloody repressions against the Black majority. Pogroms and acts of violence against Africans, and Indians, Turks, and immigrants from other Asian countries have become more frequent in Western Europe. Racism has also clearly launched a counter-offensive in the United States in the past few years. And the Arab people of Palestine have been locked out of their land for many years—for reasons commonly known.

Now about political prisoners. We have none, just as we have no persecution of people for their convictions. We do not put people on trial for their convictions.

But any state must protect itself against those who try to subvert it, who call for undermining or destroying it, or who spy for foreign intelligence services. These actions are defined by our laws as crimes against the state. In the recent period, as I have been informed, slightly more than 200 people have been serving sentences for all crimes of this sort in the USSR.

Now about Sakharov. I have already had occasion to answer this question, and will therefore be brief. It is common knowledge that he committed actions punishable by law. The press reported them more than once. Measures were taken with regard to him in accordance with our legislation.

The actual state of affairs now is as follows. Sakharov resides in Gorky in normal conditions, is doing scientific work, and remains a Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He is in normal health, as far as I know.

His wife has recently left the country for medical treatment abroad. As for Sakharov himself, he is still a bearer of secrets of special importance to the state and for this reason may not go abroad.

And, finally, about censorship. We do have censorship. Its task is to prevent state and military secrets from being made public by the press and also to prevent any propaganda of war, violence, cruelty, humiliation of the individual, and pornography. The mass media and the book publishers, their editorial boards and councils, select works for publication, edit and abridge them etc., on their own. I can only add that such censorship, in one form or another, exists in every country. In your country, for instance, owners of newspapers and publishing businesses or editors employed by them decide what should be published and what should be withheld. And slander or publication of state secrets are punishable by law. To say nothing of the widespread practice in, say, the USA, of books being removed from school libraries under the pressure of reactionary groups, including, as was reported at the latest congress of the PEN Club, the books of Dostoyevsky, Hemingway, even Dickens, let alone *The Diary of Anne Frank*. These are the facts, and facts, they say, speak for themselves.

It is a pity that the Soviet press, television and radio are known so little in France and in the West in general. Freedom of speech and of criticism are extensive in our country. Open discussions, sometimes very heated, are conducted. Now, on the eve of the congress, this is especially evident. To tell the truth, the vociferous campaigns to "prove" that the USSR (meaning socialism in general) is a society of uniformity, officially-imposed like-mindedness, and so on, are, in my opinion, nothing short of sanctimonious and hypocritical.

In our society an active stand in life and struggle against injustice and violations of law or social morality are standard behaviour provided for in the Constitution, which defines criticism as the right of every citizen. More than that. Those who interfere with it—often referred to, and to my mind, too mildly, as "suppressors of criticism"—act *in opposition to the law*. Officials of any rank can even be taken to court for this. Our press, radio and television are probably not perfect yet, but on the whole they are a free and broad vehicle of public opinion, the opinion of the people.

Question. It is often asked in various circles in the West if the left-overs of Stalinism have been overcome in the Soviet Union.

Answer. "Stalinism" is a notion made up by opponents of communism and used on a large scale to smear the Soviet Union and socialism as a whole.

Thirty years have passed since the question of overcoming Stalin's personality cult was raised at the 20th Party Congress and since the CPSU Central Committee passed a resolution on that question. To tell the truth, those decisions did not come easily to our Party. It was a test of the Party's fidelity to principle and of its loyalty to Leninism.

I think that we have stood the test with honour and have drawn proper conclusions from the past. This applies to the life of the Party and of Soviet society as a whole. Our major task is to develop further inner-Party democracy, and socialist democracy in general, to strengthen the principles of collective leadership in work, to broaden publicity. The Party and its Central Committee demand modesty from people elected to high posts and are cultivating intolerance of adulation and toadying among Communists. We attach and will continue to attach immense importance to protecting and consolidating socialist legality, to constantly keeping strict control over law-enforcement agencies. These are all important areas in the political work currently being carried out by our Party. And this work, the whole of our life today are a convincing reply to the question you have raised.

Question. In what way will the processes currently taking place in your country affect the state of cultural life in the USSR which, by the way, is poorly known in the West?

Answer. It is quite true that little is known in the West about our cultural life. And speaking quite frankly, some people in the West take advantage of this in order to virtually cram fabrications and distortions of the true state of affairs down people's throats.

The Soviet Union is at present experiencing a period of noticeable cultural upsurge. Among our contemporaries are many outstanding writers, poets, composers, artists, and actors and directors of the opera, ballet, drama and cinema. They are outstanding not only by our standards, but by world standards as well. Literature and the arts in our country have become the property of the broad popular masses, and not of a handful of

connoisseurs and patrons. The Soviet Union publishes classical and contemporary poetry and prose—both Soviet and foreign, including, of course, French—in printings of a size unparalleled anywhere in the world. But probably the most remarkable thing in our cultural life is the broad development of amateur artistic activities among the people.

In this respect, I think, the changes taking place in the life of our society will undoubtedly benefit Soviet culture, will influence it favourably.

We have everything necessary for the further rapid development of Soviet culture, for its all-round advancement: a well-educated population; the remarkable traditions of profound interest in, and respect and desire for, cultural values; access to the entire wealth and diversity of our country's multinational culture; and finally, the policy of the Party which regards the development of society's spiritual life as a top priority. We are also now thinking about considerably expanding the material base of culture, of the entire spiritual sphere.

Question. Now, let us turn to international issues. Can the American Star Wars plans lead to a war? Do you see any new signs of a revival of detente in international relations following the Geneva summit?

Answer. You are asking two questions at once.

The first one concerns the American Star Wars programme. We are deeply convinced that this programme increases the threat of war, and may, at a certain stage, make it probable. The grounds for this conclusion were mentioned more than once, and in sufficient detail. I would like to draw attention to just one aspect of the problem. Although the Star Wars plan is slated for completion some decades later, and only a handful of "enthusiasts" believe it is feasible, the United States' stubborn pursuit of this programme will entail very grave consequences already in the near future. The point is that, by implementing the Star Wars programme, Washington is in fact aiming to thwart the current talks and scrap all the existing arms control agreements. In that case, the USSR and the United States, their allies and the entire world, would in the upcoming years face a totally uncontrolled arms race, strategic chaos, the most dangerous disruption of stability, general uncertainty and fear, and a heightened risk of catastrophe. This

danger, I repeat, is a threat not only for our grandchildren, but for ourselves, all of us, the whole of mankind.

Why take such a risk? I am prepared to assume that President Reagan personally believes in the "life-saving" mission of Star Wars. But if the whole thing is meant to eliminate the nuclear threat, why won't the United States agree in principle to the Soviet Union's latest proposals? They provide for a far shorter, cheaper, more direct and, most importantly, a safer way of averting the nuclear threat—the total elimination of nuclear weapons. I stress: a safer way. For the way towards this objective now proposed by the United States is hopeless. Despite the claims of Star Wars advocates to the contrary, there will simply not be enough time for nuclear weapons to become "obsolete". On the contrary, they will be perfected. As a result, they might become so sophisticated that the whole process of decision-making will have to be turned over to computers, to automatic control systems. Human civilisation will thus become a hostage to machines, and will thus be exposed to technical breakdowns and errors. The extent of this danger was again demonstrated by the recent tragedy of the American spacecraft *Challenger*, which was reliable and repeatedly tried and tested within the limits of what is at all possible today.

I'm convinced that Washington is also well aware of this, and that for every "believer" in this surrealistic plan of eliminating the nuclear threat there are at least a dozen cynics who have in mind something quite different from what President Reagan seems to talk and dream about. Some, for instance, who understand that it is impossible to create an "impenetrable shield", would settle for less—a limited anti-missile defence which, combined with the means for a preemptive strike at the retaliatory forces of the other side, would create an opportunity for launching nuclear aggression with impunity. Others simply want to make money. Still others want to undermine the Soviet economy by drawing it into a space race. A fourth group seeks to broaden the technological gap between the United States and Western Europe and thus secure the latter's dependence on the former . . . and so on, and so forth.

So the Star Wars issue is a very broad one. The clash is not only between two opinions on the concrete programme, but between two approaches, two concepts of security.

The American concept is to ensure security first of all by military-technical means—in this case by means of a new “super-weapon”, a technical trick that would help break the nuclear deadlock. What’s more, despite the rather vague, ridiculously improbable talk about a readiness to share “at some future date” the “miraculous technology” with other countries (including the USSR), the United States wants to be the only one to break the deadlock. To win absolute security for itself it wants to place everyone else in a position of absolute danger.

The Soviet concept is that of ensuring equal security for all through arms reductions and disarmament, up to and including the total elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction. Nowadays, there can be no security for the USSR without security for the United States, and no security for the Warsaw Treaty countries without security for the NATO states. And without their mutual security there can be no universal security.

Answering your question, I want to emphasise the problem of ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, above all of medium-range missiles, which are seriously undermining European security. Here, too, we have reasons to count on the realistic approach and prudence of British and, naturally, French politics.

Advocates of nuclear arms argue that the elimination of these arms will leave the West “defenceless” in the face of Soviet “superiority” in so-called conventional armaments. At the moment, I won’t go into the question of whether such “superiority” exists or not. The important thing is that our proposals provide for the reduction of the latter type of armaments too, as well as for an extension of confidence-building measures. When we advanced the proposal to eliminate nuclear weapons it was not our purpose simply to transfer the arms race to other spheres which will in due course become no less dangerous.

We are well aware that the realisation of our concept of security requires enormous effort, work, consistent struggle, and breaking down traditions that are thousands of years old. I have already spoken about all this. But the world simply cannot continue living and behaving in the old way when the threat of nuclear war is so real.

Is a world without weapons, a world without wars at all possible? I would like to answer this question with another ques-

tion: Is it possible to safeguard human civilisation while continuing the constantly accelerating arms race, whipping up tensions, and balancing on the, so to say, ever more narrow brink of war?

Are there any indications of a revival of detente in international relations after the Geneva summit? Here, as I see it, one must be cautious in one's opinions. Yes, certain signs are beginning to appear. And the reason lies not only, and not so much, in isolated minor shifts towards an improvement in Soviet-American relations: these shifts are too limited, peripheral, and have no bearing on the vital issues. But a certain change in the political atmosphere is already evident. And this has revived among the peoples of many countries the hope and belief in the possibility of returning to detente, terminating the insane arms race and developing normal peaceful international cooperation. Now that is something real and politically substantial.

The changing political atmosphere is helping us, the Soviet Union, to be bolder and more resolute in working out new proposals and initiatives. Sometimes I am asked: Does the Soviet Union believe that the present US Administration and the governments of some of its allies will accept the new Soviet proposals, such, for example, as the proposal for the complete prohibition of nuclear explosions, the stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe and throughout the world, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, etc.?

That's a legitimate question. But then, especially in the nuclear age, policy cannot be based on the principle of whether or not you believe your partner at all. Policy should be built on realistic foundations, with due account of the correlation of forces in the international arena, the requirements of the times, the interests of one's own people, of other peoples, of universal peace. That being the case, the Soviet Union as a socialist state must offer the world a radical and at the same time realistic alternative to nuclear war, an alternative which would take into consideration the interests of all peoples, a programme for resolving the problems facing mankind. Such proposals are in a way a moment of truth. They force our partners in the talks to show their true face, to disclose the real aims of their policy. When we proposed a moratorium on nuclear explosions we were accused of having made more tests that year (this, by the way,

was not true even then) and then suggesting the USA stop. We have not made any tests for seven months now. So the USA can no longer use that pretext. It began talking about control and verification. We said we were ready to agree to any verification measures. So this pretext fell away as well. So what remains? Can it be just the determination of the USA to continue the arms race at any cost?

The Decree on Peace written by Vladimir Lenin (the newly-established Soviet government's first decree, by the way) expressed the world's first socialist state's firm determination to pursue its policy and to act "openly in full view of the whole people", to address its proposals "to the governments and peoples", "help the peoples to intervene in questions of war and peace". Introducing the draft Decree to the Congress of Soviets, Lenin said: "We are combating the deception practised by governments which pay lip-service to peace and justice, but in fact wage annexationist and predatory wars." And at the same time he said, referring to the Soviet state's relations with capitalist powers: "We should not and must not give the governments an opportunity of taking refuge behind our uncompromising attitude and of concealing from the peoples the reason why they are being sent to the shambles. . . An ultimatum would make the position of our opponents easier. But we shall make all the terms known to the people. We shall confront all the governments with our terms, and let them give an answer to their people."¹

Such is the principled communist approach to the question. It is not without reason that I recalled these words, these principles of Lenin. There is a strong similarity between the situation of that time and the present one. In 1917, when the First World War was at its height, the principal question was how to stop as soon as possible the bloodshed imposed on the peoples by imperialist governments. Lenin and the Party decided that the most effective way to do this was to address not only the governments, but the peoples as well. At present, the peoples of the world are being drawn into the arms race, into a nuclear competition which threatens mankind with even more terrible

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. October 25-26 (November 7-8), 1917", *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, 1972, pp. 252, 251, 255.

devastation. And it is only natural that, working consistently and painstakingly with the governments of the West in a bid to resolve these problems, we constantly turn to the peoples as well, address our policy to them.

Question. Are there any grounds to hope for an end to the war in Afghanistan in the near future, and consequently, for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country?

Answer. We would like very much for this to happen, and will do everything in our power to achieve it. The government of Afghanistan, as we know, adheres to the same position. It is prepared to go far towards a solution of the complex problems of the country's internal development, and is actively involving various political forces, both in the centre and in the provinces, including representatives of tribes, the clergy, intelligentsia and business circles, in the efforts of returning life to normal.

But not everything here depends on the government of Afghanistan. There are external forces in that conflict, which broke out as a result of outside interference in the first place, and these forces are interested in continuing and expanding it. I am referring to Pakistan and the USA. Western Europe, too, could influence the course of events. I think that if the situation in and around Afghanistan were soberly evaluated there, and, of course, if individual interests and the interests of universal peace were weighed, it would be possible to find ways of facilitating the solution of the problem.

Question. Can Soviet-French relations be improved and what should be done towards this end?

Answer. Of course they can. I would even say they must be improved. The Soviet Union stands for broad cooperation with France, for friendship between the Soviet and French peoples. The differences between the USSR and France are no obstacle at all to concord and cooperation between them. This is our firm, permanent and principled position. We consider improvement of mutual understanding and promotion of cooperation between the USSR and France important to our countries' fundamental interest, that of consolidating peace in Europe and throughout the world and making the international situation sounder.

The summit meeting in Paris last autumn was aimed at giv-

ing fresh impetus to Soviet-French relations. Lately we have been able to achieve certain things. But, from our point of view, there remain many untapped potentialities. We hope that our countries will be active partners in solving such historic problems as curbing the arms race, completely eliminating nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, and preventing the development of space strike weapons.

The Soviet Union and France, with their great scientific, technological and intellectual potentials and their history of good relations, could set a fine example of cooperation in science and engineering. Incidentally, together with the further development of trade and economic relations, this could in some measure help solve the employment problem in France.

Soviet-French relations have traditionally rested on the two peoples' mutual sympathy and respect. This makes it all the more difficult for us to understand the stubborn efforts of certain quarters in your country to arouse enmity and distrust of the Soviet Union among French people and create a false image of our country and its policy. We are grateful to the French Communists and *l'Humanité* for coming out against anti-Sovietism and for spreading the truth about the Soviet Union and socialism. We consider this to be an important form of the French Communist Party's solidarity with our Party.

The communist movement is strong precisely because of such solidarity, solidarity in practice, between all the parties that comprise it—equal and independent parties working in different conditions and accomplishing different tasks but united by common struggle for the interests of the working masses, for peace and socialism.

In conclusion, I would like to convey heartfelt greetings and good wishes to the readers of *l'Humanité*, the French Communists, and all the working people of France.

* * *

Roland Leroy. I want to thank you for answering our questions with directness and frankness. The matters you touch upon are of much interest to the French, who lack unbiased information. I must say that, regrettably, most of the French mass media are now pursuing a strongly anti-Soviet line.

Mikhail Gorbachev. In their contacts with us, representatives of various circles in France, including the President, pointed out the traditionally friendly relations between our two countries, noting that they are rooted in history. In so doing, they stressed the desire to maintain these relations and to give them new meaning. This is our attitude as well. We are for maintaining traditionally friendly contacts with France and are doing all we can to develop good Soviet-French relations. In this context, we find it hard to understand why the unfriendly campaign against the USSR has assumed such large proportions in France.

Or take the recent expulsion from France of several Soviet Embassy officials on the pretext that they had engaged in illicit activities. The spectre of "Soviet spies" is again haunting France. Of course, this is a totally groundless action taken on a far-fetched pretext. Suffice it to say that one of those charged with "illicit contacts" is a technician who had worked exclusively on Embassy premises, had no contacts with foreigners and does not even speak any foreign language. All this is very puzzling. What political aim is there behind it? What are the reasons—domestic politics or something else?

As I told President Mitterrand, we are sincerely striving to impart greater dynamism to Soviet-French relations, to cooperate with France, with the French people and with its political forces in matters of mutual interest for our countries. But this does not mean that we will not react to unfriendly actions towards our country. In this case, too, we had to take adequate measures in response.

It would be wrong to think that the Soviet Union is more interested in good relations with France than France is in good relations with the Soviet Union. To my mind, both countries have a mutual interest in maintaining and developing good bilateral relations.

Roland Leroy. Obviously, the French people have a special interest in rapprochement and cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Mikhail Gorbachev. In pursuing our foreign policy, we always take into account the interests of France and its people. This may be illustrated, among other things, by our latest proposals, formulated in my Statement of January 15 of this year.

Incidentally, in formulating our proposals, we think it natural to take into account the legitimate interests not only of France but, say, of such a partner of ours as the United States. Otherwise such proposals would not be realistic.

I told President Mitterrand, and I want to repeat now, that we do not have the slightest intention of damaging the security of France. In our latest proposals we proceed from the assumption that France, like Britain, will join in the process of nuclear disarmament only after the United States and the Soviet Union have substantially reduced their nuclear armaments. At present, we would like to hope that France and Britain will not continue to build up their nuclear potentials while the American and Soviet arsenals are being reduced.

Roland Leroy. We follow with interest the preparations for the 27th Congress of your Party.

Mikhail Gorbachev. At our Congress we will demonstrate in detail how socialism's potentialities are going to be used ever more fully in our country, how its potential is going to be realised. I think it will be our contribution to the common struggle of the Communists for a better and more just society. In foreign policy, we will continue to work energetically for a stronger peace and for the elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. This, of course, is also very important in that it characterises socialism's firm commitment to peace.

**Political Report
of the CPSU Central Committee
to the 27th Congress
of the Communist Party
of the Soviet Union**

February 25, 1986

Comrade Delegates,
Esteemed guests,

The 27th Congress of the CPSU has gathered at a crucial turning point in the life of the country and the contemporary world as a whole. We are beginning our work with a deep understanding of our responsibility to the Party and the Soviet people. It is our task to elaborate a broad conception, in the Leninist way, of the times we are living in, and to work out a realistic, well-thought-out programme of action that would organically blend the grandeur of our aims with our real capabilities, and the Party's plans with the hopes and aspirations of every person. The resolutions of the 27th Congress will determine both the character and the rate of our movement towards a qualitatively new state of the Soviet socialist society for years and decades ahead.

The Congress is to discuss and adopt a new edition of the Programme of the CPSU, amendments to the Party Rules, and Guidelines for Economic Development for the next five years and a longer term. I need hardly mention what enormous importance these documents have for our Party, our state, and our people. Not only do they contain an assessment of the past and a formulation of the urgent tasks, but also a glimpse into the future. They speak of what the Soviet Union will be like as it enters the 21st century, of the image of socialism and its positions in the international arena, of the future of humanity.

Soviet society has gone a long way in its development since the currently operative Party Programme was adopted. In fact, we have built the whole country anew, have made tremendous headway in the economic, cultural, and social fields, and have raised generations of builders of the new society. We have blazed the trail into outer space for humanity. We have secured military strategic parity and have thereby substantially restricted imperialism's aggressive plans and capabilities to start a nuclear war. The positions of our Motherland and of world socialism in the international arena have grown considerably stronger.

The path travelled by the country, its economic, social and cultural achievements convincingly confirm the vitality of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and socialism's tremendous potential as embodied in the progress of Soviet society. We can be justly proud of everything that has been achieved in these years of intensive work and struggle.

While duly appraising our achievements, the leadership of the CPSU considers it its duty to tell the Party and the people honestly and frankly about the shortcomings in our political and practical activities, the unfavourable tendencies in the economy and the social and moral sphere, and about the reasons for them. For a number of years the deeds and actions of Party and Government bodies lagged behind the needs of the times and of life—not only because of objective factors, but also for reasons above all of a subjective nature. The problems in the country's development grew more rapidly than they were being solved. The inertness and rigidity of the forms and methods of management, the decline of dynamism in our work, and increased bureaucracy—all this was doing no small damage. Signs of stagnation had begun to surface in the life of society.

The situation called for change, but a peculiar psychology—how to improve things without changing anything—took the upper hand in the central bodies and, for that matter, at local level as well. But that cannot be done, comrades. Stop for an instant, as they say, and you fall behind a mile. We must not evade the problems that have arisen. That sort of attitude is much too costly for the country, the state and the Party. So let us say it loud and clear!

The top-priority task is to overcome the negative factors in society's socio-economic development as rapidly as possible, to accelerate it and impart to it an essential dynamism, to learn from the lessons of the past to a maximum extent, so that the decisions we adopt for the future should be absolutely clear and responsible, and the concrete actions purposeful and effective.

The situation has reached a turning point not only in internal but also in external affairs. The changes in current world developments are so deep-going and significant that they require a reassessment and a comprehensive analysis of all factors. The situation created by the nuclear confrontation calls for new approaches, methods, and forms of relations between the different social systems, states and regions.

Owing to the arms race started by imperialism, the 20th century, in the field of world politics, is coming to an end burdened with the question: will humanity be able to avert the nuclear danger, or will the policy of confrontation take the upper hand, thus increasing the probability of nuclear conflict. The capitalist world has not abandoned the ideology and policy of hegemonism, its rulers have not yet lost the hope of taking social revenge, and continue to indulge themselves with illusions of superior strength. A sober view of what is going on is hewing its way forward with great difficulty through a dense thicket of prejudices and preconceptions in the thinking of the ruling class. But the complexity and acuteness of this moment in history makes it increasingly vital to outlaw nuclear weapons, destroy them and other weapons of mass annihilation completely, and improve international relations.

The fact that the Party has deeply understood the fundamentally new situation inside the country and in the world arena, and that it appreciates its responsibility for the country's future, and has the will and resolve to carry out the requisite change, is borne out by the adoption at the April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the *decision to accelerate the socio-economic development of our society*.

Formulating the long-term and fundamental tasks, the Central Committee has been consistently guided by Marxism-Leninism, the truly scientific theory of social development. It expresses the vital interests of the working people, and the

ideals of social justice. It derives its vitality from its everlasting youthfulness, its constant capacity for development and creative generalisation of the new facts and phenomena, and of its experience of revolutionary struggle and social reconstruction.

Any attempt to turn the theory by which we are guided into an assortment of rigid schemes and formulas which would be valid everywhere and in all contingencies is most definitely contrary to the essence and spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin wrote back in 1917 that Marx and Engels rightly ridiculed the "mere memorising and repetition of 'formulas', that at best are capable only of marking out *general* tasks, which are necessarily modifiable by the *concrete* economic and political conditions of each particular *period* of the historical process".¹ Those are the words, comrades, that everyone of us must ponder and act upon.

The *concrete* economic and political situation we are in, and the particular *period* of the historical process that Soviet society and the whole world are going through, require that the Party and its every member display their creativity, their capacity for innovation and ability to transcend the limits of accustomed but already outdated notions.

A large-scale, frank and constructive examination of all the crucial problems of our life and of Party policy has taken place during the discussion of the pre-Congress documents. We have come to the Congress enriched by the wisdom and experience of the whole Party, the whole people. We can now see more clearly what has to be done and in what order, and what levers we must set in motion so that our progress will be accelerated at a desired pace.

These days, many things, in fact everything, will depend on how effectively we will succeed in using the advantages and possibilities of the socialist system, its economic power and social potential, in updating the obsolescent social patterns and style and methods of work, in bringing them abreast of the changed conditions. That is the only way for us to increase the might of our country, to raise the material and spiritual life of the Soviet people to a qualitatively new level, and to enhance the

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Letters on Tactics", *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, 1980, p. 43.

positive influence of the example of socialism as a social system on world development.

We look to the future confidently, because we are clearly aware of our tasks and of the ways in which they should be carried out. We look to the future confidently, because we rely on the powerful support of the people. We look to the future confidently, because we are acting in the interests of the socialist Homeland, in the name of the great ideals to which the Communist Party has dedicated itself wholeheartedly.

I. THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD: ITS MAIN TENDENCIES AND CONTRADICTIONS

Comrades, the draft new edition of the Programme of the Party contains a thorough analysis of the main trends and features of the development of the world today. It is not the purpose of the Programme to anticipate the future with all its multiformity of concrete developments. That would be a futile exercise. But here is another, no less important point: if we want to follow a correct, science-based policy, we must clearly understand the key tendencies of the current reality. To penetrate deep into the dialectics of the events, into their objective logic, to draw the right conclusions that reflect the motion of the times, is no simple matter, but it is imperatively necessary.

In the days before the October Revolution, referring to the capitalist economy alone, Lenin noted that the sum total of the changes in all their ramifications could not have been grasped even by seventy Marxes. But, Lenin continued, Marxism has discovered “the *laws* . . . and the *objective* logic of these changes and of their historical development . . . in its chief and basic features”.¹

The modern world is complicated, diverse and dynamic, and shot through with contending tendencies and contradictions. It is a world of the most difficult alternatives, anxieties and hopes. Never before has our home on earth been exposed to such great political and physical stresses. Never before has man exacted

¹ V. I. Lenin, “Materialism and Empirio-Criticism”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, 1977, p. 325.

so much tribute from nature, and never has he been so vulnerable to the forces he himself has created.

World developments confirm the fundamental Marxist-Leninist conclusion that the history of society is not a sum of fortuitous elements, that it is not a disorderly "Brownian motion", but a law-governed onward process. Not only are its contradictions a verdict on the old world, on everything that impedes the advance; they are also a source and motive force for social progress. This is progress which takes place in conditions of a struggle that is inevitable so long as exploitation and exploiting classes exist.

The liberation revolutions triggered by the Great October Revolution are determining the image of the 20th century. However considerable the achievements of science and technology, and however great the influence which rapid scientific and technological progress has on the life of society, nothing but the social and spiritual emancipation of man can make him truly free. And no matter what difficulties, objective and artificial, the old world may create, the course of history is irreversible.

The social changes of the century are altering the conditions for the further development of society. New economic, political, scientific, technical, internal and international factors are beginning to operate. The interconnection between states and between peoples is increasing. And all this is setting new, especially exacting demands upon every state, whether it is a matter of foreign policy, economic and social activity, or the spiritual image of society.

The progress of our time is rightly identified with socialism. *World socialism* is a powerful international entity with a highly developed economy, substantial scientific resources, and a reliable military and political potential. It accounts for more than one-third of the world's population; it includes dozens of countries and peoples advancing along a path that reveals in every way the intellectual and moral wealth of man and society. A new way of life has taken shape, based on the principles of socialist justice, in which there are neither oppressors nor the oppressed, neither exploiters nor the exploited, in which power belongs to the people. Its distinctive features are collectivism and comradely mutual assistance, triumph of the ideas of freedom, unbreakable unity between the rights and duties of every

member of society, the dignity of the individual, and true humanism. Socialism is a realistic option open to all humanity, an example projected into the future.

Socialism sprang up and was built in countries which were far from being economically and socially advanced at that time and which differed greatly from one another in mode of life and their historical and national traditions. Each one of them advanced to the new social system along its own way, confirming Marx's prediction about the infinite variations and gradations of the same economic basis in its concrete manifestations.

The way was neither smooth nor simple. It was exceedingly difficult to rehabilitate a backward or ruined economy, to teach millions of people to read and write, to provide them with a roof over their heads, with food and free medical aid. The very novelty of the social tasks, the ceaseless military, economic, political, and psychological pressure of imperialism, the need for tremendous efforts to ensure defence—all this could not but influence the course of events, their character, and the rate at which the socio-economic programmes and transformations were carried into effect. Nor were mistakes in politics and various subjectivist deviations avoided.

But such is life; it always manifests itself in diverse contradictions, sometimes quite unexpected ones. The other point is much more important: socialism has demonstrated its ability to resolve social problems on a fundamentally different basis than previously, namely a collectivist one; it has brought the countries to higher levels of development, and has given the working people a dignified and secure life.

Socialism is continuously improving social relations, multiplying its achievements purposefully, setting an example which is becoming more and more influential and attractive, and demonstrating the real humanism of the socialist way of life. By so doing, it is erecting an increasingly reliable barrier to the ideology and policy of war and militarism, reaction and force, to all forms of inhumanity, and is actively furthering social progress. It has grown into a powerful moral and material force, and has shown what opportunities are opening for modern civilisation.

The course of social progress is closely linked with *anti-colonial* revolutions, national liberation movements, the renaissance of many countries, and the emergence of dozens of new ones.

Having won political independence, they are working hard to overcome backwardness, poverty, and sometimes extreme privation—the entire painful legacy of their past enslavement. Formerly the victims of imperialist policy, deprived of all rights, they are now making history themselves.

Social progress is expressed in the development of the *international communist and working-class movement* and in the growth of the new massive democratic movement of our time, including the anti-war and anti-nuclear movement. It is apparent, too, in the polarisation of the political forces of the capitalist world, notably in the USA, the centre of imperialism. Here, progressive tendencies are forcing their way forward through a system of monopolistic totalitarianism, and are exposed to the continuous pressure of organised reactionary forces, including their enormous propaganda machine which floods the world with stupefying misinformation.

Marx compared progress in exploitative society to “that hideous pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain.”¹ He said: “In our days everything seems pregnant with its contrary. Machinery, gifted with the wonderful power of shortening and fructifying human labour, we behold starving and overworking it. The new-fangled sources of wealth, by some strange weird spell, are turned into sources of want. The victories of art seem bought by the loss of character. At the same pace that mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own infamy. Even the pure light of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance. All our invention and progress seem to result in endowing material forces with intellectual life, and in stultifying human life into a material force.”²

Marx’s analysis is striking in its historical sweep, accuracy, and depth. It has, indeed, become still more relevant with regard to bourgeois reality of the 20th century than it was in the 19th century. On the one hand, the swift advance of sci-

¹ K. Marx, “The Future Results of British Rule in India”, in: K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. One, 1976, p. 499.

² K. Marx, “Speech at the Anniversary of the *People’s Paper*”, in: K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. One, p. 500.

ence and technology has opened up unprecedented possibilities for mastering the forces of nature and improving the conditions of the life of man. On the other, the "enlightened" 20th century is going down in history as a time marked by such outgrowths of imperialism as the most devastating wars, an orgy of militarism and fascism, genocide, and the destitution of millions of people. Ignorance and obscurantism go hand in hand in the capitalist world with outstanding achievements of science and culture. That is the society we are compelled to be neighbours of, and we must look for ways of cooperation and mutual understanding. Such is the command of history.

The progress of humanity is also directly connected with the *scientific and technological revolution*. It matured slowly and gradually, and then, in the final quarter of the century, gave the start to a gigantic increase of man's material and spiritual possibilities. These are of a twofold nature. There is a qualitative leap in humanity's productive forces. But there is also a qualitative leap in means of destruction, in the military sphere, "endowing" man for the first time in history with the physical capacity for destroying all life on earth.

The facets and consequences of the scientific and technological revolution differ in different socio-political systems. Capitalism of the 1980s, the capitalism of the age of electronics and information science, computers and robots, is throwing more millions of people, including young and educated people, out of jobs. Wealth and power are being increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few. Militarism is thriving on the arms race greatly, and also strives gradually to gain control over the political levers of power. It is becoming the ugliest and the most dangerous monster of the 20th century. Because of its efforts, the most advanced scientific and technical ideas are being converted into weapons of mass destruction.

Before the developing countries the scientific and technological revolution is setting this most acute question: are they to enjoy the achievements of science and technology in full measure in order to gain strength for combating neocolonialism and imperialist exploitation, or will they remain on the periphery of world development? The scientific and technological revolution shows in bold relief that many socio-economic problems impeding progress in that part of the world are unresolved.

Socialism has everything it needs to place modern science and technology at the service of the people. But it would be wrong to think that the scientific and technological revolution is creating no problems for socialist society. Experience shows that its advance involves improvement of social relations, a change of mentality, the forging of a new psychology, and the acceptance of dynamism as a way and a rule of life. It calls insistently for a continuous reassessment and streamlining of the prevailing patterns of management. In other words, the scientific and technological revolution not only opens up prospects, but also sets higher demands on the entire organisation of the internal life of countries and international relations. Certainly, scientific and technological progress cannot abolish the laws of social development or the social purpose and content of such development. But it exercises a tremendous influence on all the processes that are going on in the world, on its contradictions.

It is quite obvious that the two socio-economic systems differ substantially in their readiness and in their capacity to comprehend and resolve the problems that arise.

Such is the world we are living in on the threshold of the third millennium. It is a world full of hope, because people have never before been so amply equipped for the further development of civilisation. But it is also a world overburdened with dangers and contradictions, which prompts the thought that this is perhaps the most alarming period in history.

The first and most important group of contradictions in terms of humanity's future is connected with the *relations between countries of the two systems, the two formations*. These contradictions have a long history. Since the Great October Revolution in Russia and the split of the world on the social-class principle, fundamental differences have emerged both in the assessment of current affairs and in the views concerning the world's social perspective.

Capitalism regarded the birth of socialism as an "error" of history which must be "rectified". It was to be rectified at any cost, by any means, irrespective of law and morality: by armed intervention, economic blockade, subversive activity, sanctions and "punishments", or rejection of all cooperation. But nothing could interfere with the consolidation of the new system and its historical right to live.

The difficulty that the ruling classes of the capitalist world have in understanding the realities, the recurrence of attempts at resolving by force the whole group of contradictions dividing the two worlds are, of course, anything but accidental. The intrinsic mainsprings and socio-economic essence of imperialism prompt it to translate the competition of the two systems into the language of military confrontation. Owing to its social nature, imperialism ceaselessly gives rise to aggressive, adventurist policy.

Here we can speak of a whole complex of motives involved: the predatory appetites of the arms manufacturers and the influential military-bureaucratic groups, the selfish interest of the monopolies in sources of raw materials and markets for their goods, the bourgeoisie's fear of the ongoing changes, and, lastly, the attempts to resolve its own increasingly acute problems at socialism's expense.

Such attempts are especially typical of US imperialism. It was nothing but imperial ideology and policy, the wish to create the most unfavourable external conditions for socialism and for the USSR that prompted the launching of the race of nuclear and other arms after 1945, just when the crushing defeat of fascism and militarism was, it would seem, offering a realistic opportunity for building a world without wars, and a mechanism of international cooperation—the United Nations—had been created for this purpose. But imperialism's nature asserted itself that time again.

Today, too, the right wing of the US monopoly bourgeoisie regards the stoking up of international tensions as something that justifies military spending, claims to global supremacy, interference in the affairs of other states, and an offensive against the interests and the rights of the American working people. No small role seems to be played by the idea of using tensions to put pressure on the allies, to make them absolutely obedient, to subordinate them to Washington's dictation.

The policy of total contention, of military confrontation has no future. Flight into the past is no answer to the challenges of the future. It is rather an act of despair which, however, does not make this posture any less dangerous. By its deeds Washington will show when and to what extent it will understand this. We, for our part, are ready to do everything we can in order

radically to improve the international situation. To achieve this, socialism need not renounce any of its principles or ideals. It has always stood for and continues to stand for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

As distinct from imperialism, which is trying to halt the course of history by force, to regain what it had in the past, socialism has never, of its own free will, related its future to any military solution of international problems. This was borne out at the very first big discussion that took place in our Party after the victory of the Great October Revolution. During that discussion, as we may recall, the views of the "Left Communists" and the Trotskyites, who championed the theory of "revolutionary war" which, they claimed, would carry socialism to other countries, were firmly rejected. This position, as Lenin emphasised in 1918, "would be completely at variance with Marxism, for Marxism has always been opposed to 'pushing' revolutions, which develop with the growing acuteness of the class antagonisms that engender revolutions".¹ Today, too, we are firmly convinced that pushing revolutions from outside, and even more so by military means, is futile and inadmissible.

The problems and crises experienced by the capitalist world arise within its own system and are a natural result of the internal antagonistic contradictions of the old society. In this sense, capitalism negates itself as it develops. Unable to cope with the acute problems of the declining phase of capitalism's development, the ruling circles of the imperialist countries resort to means and methods that are obviously incapable of saving the society which history has doomed.

The myth of a Soviet or communist "threat" that is being circulated today, is meant to justify the arms race and the imperialist countries' own aggressiveness. But it is becoming increasingly clear that the path of war can yield no sensible solutions, either international or domestic. The clash and struggle of the opposite approaches to the perspectives of world development have become especially complex in nature. Now that the world has huge nuclear stockpiles and the only thing experts argue about is how many times or dozens of times human-

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Strange and Monstrous", *Collected Works*, Vol 27, 1977, pp. 71-72.

ity can be destroyed, it is high time to begin an effective withdrawal from the brink of war, from the equilibrium of fear, to normal, civilised forms of relations between the states of the two systems.

In the years to come, the struggle will evidently centre on the actual content of the policy that can safeguard peace. It will be a hard and many-sided struggle, because we are dealing with a society whose ruling circles refuse to assess the realities of the world and its perspectives in sober terms, or to draw serious conclusions from their own experience and that of others. All this is an indication of the wear and tear suffered by its internal "systems of immunity", of its social senility, which reduces the probability of far-reaching changes in the policy of the dominant forces and augments its degree of recklessness.

That is why it is not easy at all, in the current circumstances, to predict the future of the relations between the socialist and the capitalist countries, the USSR and the USA. The decisive factors here will be the correlation of forces on the world scene, the growth and activity of the peace potential, and its capability of effectively repulsing the threat of nuclear war. Much will depend, too, on the degree of realism that Western ruling circles will show in assessing the situation. But it is unfortunate when not only the eyesight but also the soul of politicians is blind. With nuclear war being totally unacceptable, peaceful coexistence rather than confrontation of the systems should be the rule in inter-state relations.

The second group of contradictions consists of the *intrinsic contradictions of the capitalist world itself*. The past period has amply confirmed that the *general crisis of capitalism* is growing keener. The capitalism of today, whose exploitative nature has not changed, is in many ways different from what it was in the early and even the middle 20th century. Under the influence and against the background of the scientific and technological revolution, the conflict between the productive forces, which have grown to gigantic proportions, and the private-owner social relations, has become still more acute. Here there is growth of unemployment and deterioration of the entire set of social problems. Militarism, which has spread to all areas, is applied as the most promising means of enlivening the economy. The crisis of political institutions, of the entire spiritual sphere, is growing.

Reaction is exerting fierce pressure all along the line—in domestic and foreign policy, economy and culture, and the use of the achievements of human genius. The traditional forms of conservatism are giving place to authoritarian tendencies.

Special mention should be made of such dangerous manifestation of the crisis of capitalism as anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. This concerns not only foreign policy. In the present-day system of imperialism it is also a very important aspect of domestic policy, a means of exerting pressure on all the advanced and progressive elements that live and fight in the capitalist countries, in the non-socialist part of the world.

True, the present stage of the general crisis does not lead to any absolute stagnation of capitalism and does not rule out the possibilities for economic growth, and the mastering of new scientific and technical fields. This stage “allows for” sustaining concrete economic, military, political and other positions, and in some areas even the possibility for social revenge, for regaining what had been lost before. Because capitalism lacks positive aims and orientations, capable of expressing the interests of the working masses, it now has to cope with the unprecedented interlacement and mutual exacerbation of all of its contradictions. It faces more social and other impasses than it has ever known before in all the centuries of its development.

The contradictions *between labour and capital* are among the first to grow more acute. In the 1960s and 1970s, with the onset of a favourable economic situation, the working class and working people managed to secure a certain improvement of their condition. But from the mid-1970s on, the proliferating economic crises and another technological modernisation of production changed the situation, and enabled capital to go on the counter-offensive, depriving the working people of a considerable part of their social gains. For a number of standard of living indicators, the working people were flung many years back. Unemployment has reached a postwar high. The condition of peasants and farmers is deteriorating visibly: some farms are going bankrupt, with their former owners joining the ranks of hired workers, while others become abjectly dependent on large agricultural monopolies and banks. The social stratification is growing deeper and increasingly striking. In the United States, for example, one per cent of the wealthiest families own riches that

exceed by nearly 50 per cent the aggregate wealth of 80 per cent of all American families, which make up the lower part of the property pyramid.

Imperialism's ruling circles are doubtlessly aware that such a situation is fraught with social explosions and political destabilisation. But this is not making their policies more considered. On the contrary, the most irreconcilable reactionary groups of the ruling class have, by and large, taken the upper hand in recent years. This period is marked by an especially massive and brutal offensive by the monopolies on the rights of the working people.

The whole arsenal of means at capitalism's disposal is being put to use. The trade unions are persecuted and economically blackmailed. Anti-labour laws are being enacted. The left and all other progressives are being persecuted. Continuous control or, to be more precise, surveillance of people's state of mind and behaviour has become standard. The deliberate cultivation of individualism, of the principle that might makes right in the fight for survival, of immorality and hatred of all that is democratic—this is practised on an unprecedented scale.

The future, the working people's fight for their rights, for social progress, will show how that basic contradiction between labour and capital will develop and what conclusions will be drawn from the prevailing situation. But mention must be made of the serious danger to international relations of any further substantial shift of policy, of the entire internal situation in some capitalist countries, to the right. The consequences of such a development are hard to predict, and we must not underrate their danger.

The last decades of the century are marked by new outbreaks of *inter-imperialist contradictions* and the appearance of their new forms and tendencies. This group of capitalist contradictions has not been eliminated either by class affinity, the interest in uniting forces, by military, economic and political integration, or by the scientific and technological revolution. The latter has incontestably accelerated the internationalisation of capitalist production, has given added impetus to the evening up of levels as well as to the leap-like development of capitalist countries. The competition that has grown more acute under the impact of scientific and technological progress, is affecting those

who have dropped behind ever more mercilessly. The considerable complication of the conditions of capitalist reproduction, the diversity of crisis processes, and the intensification of international competition have made imperialist rivalry especially acute and bitter. The commercial and economic struggle on the world market is witnessing ever greater reliance on the power of national state-monopoly capitalisms, with the role of the bourgeois state becoming increasingly aggressive and egoistic.

The *transnational monopoly capital* has gained strength rapidly. It is seizing control of, and monopolising, whole branches or spheres of production both on the scale of individual countries and in the world economy as a whole. By the early 1980s, the transnational corporations accounted for more than one-third of industrial production, more than one half of foreign trade, and nearly 80 per cent of the patents for new machinery and technology in the capitalist world.

The core of the transnational corporations consists of American firms. Their enterprises abroad use an additional army of wage and salary workers, whose number is half of those employed in manufacturing in the USA. At present, they produce something like 1.5 trillion dollars worth of goods and services a year, or nearly 40 per cent of gross US output.

The size of the "second economy" of the United States is double or triple that of the economies of such leading West European powers as the FRG, France, and Britain, and second only to that of Japan. Today, the biggest US transnational monopolies are empires whose scale of economic activity is comparable to the gross national product of an entire country.

A new knot of contradictions has appeared and is being swiftly tightened *between the transnational corporations and the nation-state form of society's political organisation*. The transnational corporations are undermining the sovereignty both of developing and of developed capitalist countries. They make active use of state-monopoly regulation when it suits their interests, and come into sharp conflict with it when they see the slightest threat to their profits from the actions of bourgeois governments. But for all that, the US transnational supermonopolies are, as a rule, active conductors of state hegemonism and the imperial ambitions of the country's ruling circles.

The relations between the three main centres of present-day imperialism—the USA, Western Europe and Japan—abound in visible and concealed contradictions. The economic, financial, and technological superiority which the USA enjoyed over its closest competitors until the end of the 1960s has been put to a serious trial. Western Europe and Japan managed to outdo their American patron in some things, and are also challenging the United States in such a traditional sphere of US hegemony as that of the latest technology.

Washington is continuously calling on its allies not to waste their gunpowder on internecine strife. But how are the three centres of present-day imperialism to share one roof if the Americans themselves, manipulating the dollar and the interest rates, are not loath to fatten their economy at the expense of Western Europe and Japan? Wherever the three imperialist centres manage to coordinate their positions, this is more often than not the effect of American pressure or outright dictation, and works in the interests and aims above all of the United States. This, in turn, sharpens, rather than blunts, the contradictions.

It appears that people are beginning to wonder about this cause-and-effect relationship. For the first time, governments of some West European countries, the social democratic and liberal parties, and the public at large have begun to discuss openly whether present US policy coincides with Western Europe's notions about its own security and whether the United States is going too far in its claims to "leadership"? The partners of the United States have had more than one occasion to see that someone else's spectacles cannot substitute for one's own eyes.

The clash of centrifugal and centripetal tendencies will, no doubt, continue as a result of changes in the correlation of forces within the imperialist system. Still, the existing complex of economic, politico-military and other common interests of the three "centres of power" can hardly be expected to break up in the prevailing conditions of the present-day world. But within the framework of this complex, Washington should not expect unquestioning obedience to US dictation on the part of its allies and competitors, and especially when this is to the detriment of their own interests.

The specificity of the inter-imperialist contradictions in the

current period also includes the possibility for changes in their configuration in the coming decades, with new capitalist "centres of power" coming on the scene. This will doubtless lead to a further growth of the bulk of contradictions, to their closer interlacement and aggravation.

A new, complex and changing set of contradictions has taken shape between imperialism, on the one hand, and the developing countries and peoples, on the other. The liberation of former colonies and semi-colonies was a strong political and ideological blow to the capitalist system. It has ceased to exist in the shape that it assumed in the 19th century and which extended into the first half of the 20th. A slow, arduous, but irreversible process of socio-economic transformations is under way in the life of nations comprising the majority of mankind. This process, which has brought about not a few fundamental changes, has also encountered considerable difficulties.

By political manoeuvring, blandishments and blackmail, military threats and intimidation, and all too often by direct interference in the internal affairs of the newly free countries, capitalism has in many ways managed to sustain the earlier relationships of economic dependence. On this basis, imperialism managed to create and run the most refined system of neocolonialist exploitation, and to tighten its hold on a considerable number of newly free states.

The consequences of this are tragic. The developing countries with a population of more than two billion, have, in effect, become a region of wholesale poverty. In the early 1980s, the per capita income in the newly free countries was, on the whole, less than 10 per cent that of the developed capitalist states. And in the past thirty years, far from shrinking, the gap has grown wider. Nor is it a question of just comparative poverty. There is illiteracy and ignorance, chronic undernourishment and hunger, appalling child mortality, and epidemics that afflict hundreds of millions of people.

This is a disgrace for civilised humanity! And its culprit is imperialism. Not only from the point of view of history, that is, of colonial plunder on entire continents which left behind a heritage of unbelievable backwardness, but equally in terms of present-day practices. In just the past ten years, the profits squeezed out of the developing countries by US corporations

exceeded their inputs fourfold. And in Latin America and the Caribbean, in the same period, the profits of US monopolies were over eight times greater than their inputs.

It is no exaggeration to say that, to a large extent, the imperialist system still lives by plundering the developing countries, by mercilessly exploiting them. The forms and methods are changing, but the essence remains the same. In the United States, for example, a tangible portion of the national income comes from these very sources. The developing countries are being exploited by all the imperialist states, but, unquestionably, US imperialism is doing it with the greatest impudence. Non-equivalent exchange, unequal trade, manipulations and arbitrary actions regarding interest rates and the pump of the transnational corporations are being used to one and the same end. They are adding still more to the poverty and misery of some, and to the wealth of others, and increasing the polarisation in the capitalist world economy.

The distressing condition of the developing countries is a major worldwide problem. This and nothing else is the true source of many of the conflicts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Such is the truth, however hard the ruling circles of the imperialist powers may invoke the "hand of Moscow" in order to vindicate their neocolonialist policy and global ambitions.

Take the problem of debts. Together with the profits shipped out yearly from the developing countries, the accumulated debt means just one thing: the prospects for their development have shrunk, and a further aggravation of the already grave social, economic, and other problems is inevitable.

In the existing circumstances, these countries will not, of course, be able to repay their debts. And if no fair solution is devised, the situation will be fraught with grave socio-economic and political consequences on the international scene. It would be wrong to say that the imperialist ruling circles are blind to the underlying danger here. But all their concerns boil down to one thing—how to save the present system of enriching themselves through the exploitation and super-exploitation of the peoples of the developing countries.

This other thing is certain as well: there is an irrefutable causal connection between the trillion-sized debt of these countries and the more than trillion-sized growth of US military ex-

penditures in the past ten years. The 200-odd billion dollars that are being annually pumped out of the developing countries and the practically equal size of the US military budget in recent years, are no coincidence. That is why militarism has a direct stake in maintaining and tightening the system of neocolonial super-exploitation.

It is also obvious that with capitalism's contradictions growing sharper and its sphere of predominance shrinking, neocolonialism is becoming an increasingly important source of means that provide monopoly capital with the possibility for social manoeuvring, reducing social tensions in the leading bourgeois states, and for bribing some sections of the working people. It is a truly extraordinary source, for a worker's hourly rate in the advanced capitalist states is higher, sometimes several times higher, than a day's earnings in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

All this cannot go on forever. But, of course, no miracle can be expected: the situation is not going to straighten itself out on its own. The military force that the USA is counting on to maintain the status quo, to safeguard the interests of the monopolies and the military-industrial complex, and to prevent any further progressive change in the newly free countries, can only complicate the situation and precipitate new conflicts. The bags of money are liable to become kegs of gunpowder. Sooner or later, in this area too, capitalism will have to choose between the policy of force and shameless plunder, on the one hand, and the opportunity for cooperation on an equitable basis, on the other. The solutions must be radical—in the interests of the peoples of the developing states.

Analysis of yet another group of contradictions—those on a global scale, affecting the very foundations of the existence of civilisation—leads to serious conclusions. This refers first of all to pollution of the environment, the air and oceans, and to the depletion of natural resources. The problems are aggravated not just by the excessive loads on the natural systems' as a consequence of the scientific and technological revolution and the increasing extent of man's activity. Engels, in his time, foresaw the ill effects of subordinating the use of natural resources to the blind play of market forces. The need for effective international procedures and mechanisms, which would make for

the rational use of the world's resources as an asset belonging to all humanity, is becoming increasingly apparent.

The global problems, affecting all humanity, cannot be resolved by one state or a group of states. This calls for cooperation on a worldwide scale, for close and constructive joint action by the majority of countries. This cooperation must be based on completely equal rights and a respect for the sovereignty of each state. It must be based on conscientious compliance with accepted commitments and with the standards of international law. Such is the main demand of the times in which we live.

Capitalism also causes an impoverishment of *culture*, an erosion of the spiritual values created over the centuries. Nothing elevates man more than knowledge. But in probably no other period of history has mankind experienced any stronger pressure of falsehood and deceit than it does now. Bourgeois propaganda foists cleverly doctored information on people all over the world, imposing thoughts and feelings, and inculcating a civic and social attitude advantageous to the ruling forces. What knowledge, what values and moral standards are implicit in the information dispensed to the people and in the system of education is, first and foremost, a political problem.

Life itself brings up the question of safeguarding culture, of protecting it from bourgeois corruption and vandalisation. That is one of the most important worldwide tasks. We cannot afford to neglect the long-term psychological and moral consequences of imperialism's current practices in the sphere of culture. Its impoverishment under the onslaught of unbridled commercialism and the cult of force, the propaganda of racism, of lowly instincts, the ways of the criminal world and the "lower depths" of society, must be, and certainly will be, rejected by mankind.

The problems, as you see, comrades, are many, and they are large-scale and intricate. But it is clear that their comprehension is, on the whole, lagging behind the scope and depth of the current tasks. The imperative condition for success in resolving the pressing issues of international life is to reduce the time of search for political accords and to secure the swiftest possible constructive action.

We are perfectly well aware that not everything by far is within our power and that much will depend on the West, on its leaders' ability to see things in sober perspective at impor-

tant crossroads of history. The US President said once that if our planet were threatened by a landing from another planet, the USSR and the USA would quickly find a common language. But isn't a nuclear disaster a more tangible danger than a landing by extra-terrestrials? Isn't the ecological threat big enough? Don't all countries have a common stake in finding a sensible and fair approach to the problems of the developing states and peoples?

Lastly, isn't all the experience accumulated by mankind enough to draw well-substantiated practical conclusions today rather than wait until some other crisis breaks out? What does the United States hope to win in the long term by producing doctrines that can no longer ensure US security within the modest dimensions of our planet?

To keep in the saddle of history, imperialism is resorting to all possible means. But such a policy is costing the world dearly. The nations are compelled to pay an ever higher price for it. To pay both directly and indirectly. To pay with millions of human lives, with a depletion of national resources, with the waste of gigantic sums on the arms race. With the failure to solve numerous, increasingly difficult problems. And in the long run, perhaps, with the highest possible price that can be imagined.

The US ruling circles are clearly losing their realistic bearings in this far from simple period of history. Aggressive international behaviour, increasing militarisation of politics and thinking, contempt for the interests of others—all this is leading to the inevitable moral and political isolation of US imperialism, widening the abyss between it and the rest of humanity. It is as though the opponents of peace in that country are unaware that when nuclear weapons are at the ready, for civilisation time and space lose their habitual contours, and mankind becomes the captive of an accident.

Will the ruling centres of the capitalist world manage to embark on the path of sober, constructive assessments of what is going on? The easiest thing is to say: maybe yes and maybe no. But history denies us the right to make such predictions. We cannot take "no" for an answer to the question: will mankind survive or not? We say: the progress of society, the life of civilisation, must and will continue.

We say this not only by dint of the optimism that is usual

for Communists, by dint of our faith in people's intelligence and common sense. We are realists and are perfectly well aware that the two worlds are divided by very many things, and deeply divided, too. But we also see clearly that the need to resolve the most vital problems affecting all humanity must prompt them towards interaction, awaken humanity's heretofore unseen powers of self-preservation. And here is the stimulus for solutions commensurate with the realities of our time.

The course of history, of social progress, requires ever more insistently that there should be *constructive and creative interaction between states and peoples on the scale of the entire world*. Not only does it so require, but it also creates the requisite political, social and material premises for it.

Such interaction is essential in order to prevent nuclear catastrophe, in order that civilisation could survive. It is essential in order that other worldwide problems that are growing more acute should also be resolved jointly in the interests of all concerned. The prevailing dialectics of present-day development consists in a combination of competition and confrontation between the two systems and in a growing tendency towards interdependence of the countries of the world community. This is precisely the way, through the struggle of opposites, through arduous effort, groping in the dark to some extent, as it were, that the controversial but *interdependent and in many ways integral world* is taking shape.

The Communists have always been aware of the intrinsic complexity and contradictoriness of the paths of social progress. But at the centre of these processes—and this is the chief distinction of the communist world outlook—there unfailingly stands man, his interests and cares. Human life, the possibilities for its comprehensive development, as Lenin stressed, is of the greatest value; the interests of social development rank above all else. This is what guides the CPSU in its practical activity.

As we see it, the main trend of struggle in contemporary conditions consists in creating worthy, truly human material and spiritual conditions of life for all nations, ensuring that our planet should be habitable, and in cultivating a caring attitude towards its riches, especially to man himself—the greatest treasure, and all his potentials. And here we invite the capitalist system to compete with us under the conditions of a durable peace.

II. THE STRATEGIC COURSE: ACCELERATION OF THE COUNTRY'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Comrades, by advancing the strategy of accelerating the country's socio-economic development at the April Plenary Meeting, the Central Committee of the CPSU adopted a decision of historic significance. It won the wholehearted support of the Party, of the entire people, and is being submitted for discussion at the Congress.

What do we mean by acceleration? First of all, raising the rate of economic growth. But that is not all. In substance it means a new quality of growth: an all-out intensification of production on the basis of scientific and technological progress, a structural reconstruction of the economy, effective forms of management and of organising and stimulating labour.

The policy of acceleration is not confined to changes in the economic field. It envisages an active social policy, a consistent emphasis on the principle of socialist justice. The strategy of acceleration presupposes an improvement of social relations, a renovation of the forms and methods of work of political and ideological institutions, a deepening of socialist democracy, and resolute overcoming of inertness, stagnation and conservatism—of everything that is holding back social progress.

The main thing that will ensure us success is the living creativity of the masses, the maximum use of the tremendous potentials and advantages of the socialist system.

In short, comrades, acceleration of the country's socio-economic development is the key to all our problems: immediate and long-term, economic and social, political and ideological, domestic

and foreign. That is the only way a new qualitative condition of Soviet society can and must be achieved.

A. THE RESULTS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND THE NEED FOR ITS ACCELERATION

Comrades, the programme tasks of the Party raised and discussed at our Congress necessitate a broad approach to the assessment of the results of the country's development. In the quarter of a century since the adoption of the third CPSU Programme, the Soviet Union has achieved impressive successes. The fixed production assets of our economy have increased seven times. Thousands of enterprises have been built, and new industries created. The national income has gone up by nearly 300 per cent, industrial production 400 per cent and agricultural production 70 per cent.

Before the war and in the early postwar years the level of the US economy appeared to us hard to attain, whereas already in the 1970s we had come substantially closer to it in terms of our scientific, technical and economic potential, and had even surpassed it in the output of certain key items.

These achievements are the result of tremendous effort by the people. They have enabled us to considerably enhance the well-being of Soviet citizens. In a quarter of a century real per capita incomes have gone up 160 per cent, and the social consumption funds more than 400 per cent. Fifty-four million flats have been built, which enabled us to improve the living conditions of the majority of families. The transition to universal secondary education has been completed. The number of people who finished higher educational establishments has increased fourfold. The successes of science, medicine, and culture are universally recognised. The panorama of achievements will not be complete if I say nothing about the deep-going changes in social relations, the relations between nations, and the further development of democracy.

At the same time, difficulties began to build up in the economy in the 1970s, with the rates of economic growth declining visibly. As a result, the targets for economic development set in the CPSU Programme, and even the lower targets of the 9th and 10th five-year plans, were not attained. Neither did we ma-

nage to carry out fully the social programme charted for this period. A lag ensued in the material base of science and education, health protection, culture, and everyday services.

Certainly, the state of affairs was affected, among other things, by certain factors beyond our control. But they were not decisive. The main thing was that we had failed to produce a timely political assessment of the changed economic situation, that we failed to apprehend the acute and urgent need for converting the economy to intensive methods of development, and for the active use of the achievements of scientific and technological progress in the national economy. There were many appeals and a lot of talk on this score, but practically no headway was made.

By inertia, the economy continued to develop largely on an extensive basis, being oriented towards drawing additional labour and material resources into production. As a result, the rate of growth of labour productivity and certain other efficiency indicators dropped substantially. The attempts to rectify matters by undertaking new projects affected the problem of balance. The economy, despite the enormous resources at its disposal, ran into shortage of them. A gap appeared between the needs of society and the attained level of production, between the effective demand and the supply of goods.

And though efforts have been made of late, we have not succeeded in wholly remedying the situation. The output of most types of industrial and agricultural goods fell short of the targets set by the 26th Congress of the CPSU for the 11th five-year plan period. There are serious lags in engineering, the oil and coal industries, electrical engineering, in ferrous metals and chemical industries, and in capital construction. Neither have the targets been met for the main indicators of efficiency and the improvement of the people's standard of living.

And we, comrades, must draw the most serious lessons from all this.

The *first* of them may be described as the lesson of truth. A responsible analysis of the past clears the way to the future, whereas a half-truth which shamefully evades the sharp corners holds down the elaboration of realistic policy, and impedes our advance. "Our strength," Lenin said, "lies in stating the truth!"¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, "No Falsehood! Our Strength Lies in Stating the Truth!", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, 1977, p. 295.

That is precisely why the Central Committee deemed it essential to refer once more in the new edition of the Party Programme to the negative processes that had surfaced in the 1970s and the early 1980s. That is why, too, we speak of them at the Congress today.

The *other lesson* concerns the sense of purpose and resolve in practical actions. The switchover to an intensive development of such an enormous economy as ours is no simple matter and calls for considerable effort, time, and the loftiest sense of responsibility. But once transformations are launched, we must not confine ourselves to half-hearted measures. We must act consistently and energetically, and must not hesitate to take the boldest of steps.

And *one more lesson*—the main one, I might say. The success of any undertaking depends to a decisive degree on how actively and consciously the masses take part in it. To convince broad sections of the working people that the chosen path is correct, to interest them morally and materially, and to restructure the psychology of the cadres—these are the crucial conditions for the acceleration of our growth. The advance will be all the more rapid, the tighter our discipline and organisation will be, and the higher the responsibility of each for his job and its results.

Today, the prime task of the Party and the entire people is to reverse resolutely the unfavourable tendencies in the development of the economy, to impart to it the due dynamism and to give scope to the initiative and creativity of the masses, to truly revolutionary change.

There is no other way. In the absence of accelerated economic growth our social programmes will remain wishful thinking, even though, comrades, they cannot be put off. Soviet people must within a short time feel the results of the common effort to resolve cardinally the food problem, to meet the need for high-quality goods and services, to improve the medical services, housing, the conditions of life, and environmental protection.

The acceleration of socio-economic development will enable us to contribute considerably to the consolidation of world socialism, and will raise to a higher level our cooperation with fraternal countries. It will considerably expand our capacity for

economic ties with the peoples of developing countries, and with countries of the capitalist world. In other words, implementation of the policy of acceleration will have far-reaching consequences for the destiny of our Motherland.

B. Economic Policy Guidelines

Comrades, the draft Programme of the CPSU and the draft Guidelines define the main targets of our economic and social development. By the end of this century we intend to increase the national income nearly twofold while doubling the production potential and qualitatively transforming it. Labour productivity will go up by 2.3-2.5 times, energy consumption per rouble of national income will drop by 28.6 per cent and metal consumption by nearly 50 per cent. This will signify a sharp turn towards intensifying production, towards improving quality and effectiveness.

Subsequently, by intensifying these processes we intend to switch over to an economy having a higher level of organisation and effectiveness, with comprehensively developed productive forces, mature socialist relations of production, and a smoothly-functioning economic mechanism. That is our strategic line.

As was emphasised at the conference in the Central Committee of the CPSU in June 1985, the main factors behind this line are scientific and technological progress and a fundamental transformation of society's productive forces. It is impossible to effect cardinal changes with the previous material and technical foundation. The way out, as we see it, lies in thorough modernisation of the national economy on the basis of the latest scientific and technological advances, breakthroughs on the leading avenues of scientific and technological progress, and restructuring of the economic mechanism and management system.

1. Modernisation of the National Economy on the Basis of Scientific and Technological Progress

The CPSU has tremendous experience in carrying out major scientific-technological and socio-economic transformations. However significant they are, the scale and complexity of the work

we carried out in the past cannot be compared with what has to be done in the period ahead to modernise the national economy.

What do we need for this?

First of all, changing the structural and investment policy. The substance of the changes lies in shifting the centre of attention from quantitative indices to quality and efficiency, from intermediate results to end results, from building up production assets to renewing them, from expanding fuel and raw material resources to making better use of them, and also to speeding up the development of research-intensive industries and of the production and social infrastructures.

A big step forward is to be made in this direction in the current five-year period. It is intended to allocate upwards of 200 billion roubles of capital investments—more than during the past ten years—for modernising and technically reequipping production. Sizeable though these amounts are, the planning and economic bodies will have to continue the search for additional resources for these purposes.

Large-scale integrated programmes in the strategic areas have been drawn up, and their implementation has begun. The industries that play the key role in scientific and technological progress, that assure a quick economic return and the solution of urgent social problems, will move ahead more dynamically. Substantial funds and material, scientific, and manpower resources are being concentrated to speed up their development.

It is clear that the effectiveness of modernisation and also the economic growth rates depend to a crucial degree on *machine-building*. This is where the fundamental scientific and technological ideas are materialised, where new implements of labour and machine systems that determine progress in the other branches of the national economy are developed. Here the foundations are laid down for a broad advance to basically new, resource-saving technologies, higher productivity of labour and better quality of output.

The Congress delegates know that the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers recently adopted a decision on the further development of machine-building. In substance, it is a national programme for modernising this essential sector of industry. A single management body has been

set up in it. The machine-building complex has been set the goal of sharply raising the technical-economic level and quality of machines, equipment and instruments already by the end of the 12th five-year plan period. The capital investments allocated for modernising this industry will be 80 per cent greater than in the previous five years.

What, specifically, do we expect from the implementation of this programme? The output of machinery and equipment is to increase by more than 40 per cent, and their quality standards will be improved. The growing stream of machines of new generations will pave the way for a fundamental retooling of the national economy and a growth in its effectiveness. The resultant annual savings will amount to the labour of about 12 million people, more than 100 million tons of fuel, and many billions of roubles. Calculations show that the use of the Don-1500 harvester alone, for example, will lead to a considerable reduction in the number of grain harvesting machines, will release about 400,000 machine operators, and will reduce grain losses by millions of tons.

Large-scale introduction of computers and comprehensive automation of production will tremendously influence the rate of technical modernisation. Concrete targets in the development and large-scale application of modern computers and expansion of the manufacture of their components have been defined. The development of computer software and of management information systems is being put on an industrial footing. The Academy of Sciences of the USSR has set up an information science and computer technologies division to coordinate research and development.

Radical modernisation of the fuel and energy complex is the keynote of the Energy Programme. The Programme puts the emphasis on energy-saving technologies, on the replacement of liquid fuel by natural gas and coal, and on more sophisticated methods of oil refining. Advanced technologies are also to be employed in the extraction industry: open-cast coal mining, the use of hydromonitors in coal extraction, the development of improved and more reliable oil extraction equipment and the universal introduction of automated systems. In the course of the current five-year period two and a half times more nuclear power plant generating capacities will be started up than in the pre-

vious five years, and outmoded units at thermal power stations will be replaced on a large scale.

A great deal will have to be done in the metal-making and chemical industries, in introducing more highly productive equipment there. The production of fundamentally new and improved structural and other advanced materials will accelerate the development of electronics, machine-building, construction, and other branches of the economy.

The Party attaches enormous importance to technical re-equipment of the production infrastructure, in the first place, in transport and communications. Top priority will be given to the development of light industry and other industries that directly meet consumer demand. Advanced equipment for them is to be manufactured not only by specialised industries but also by other industries.

We will not be able to carry out technical modernisation unless we radically improve capital construction. This calls for raising the entire building industry complex to a new industrial and organisational level, shortening the investment cycle by a minimum of 50 per cent both in modernising enterprises and in the construction of new facilities. We cannot reconcile ourselves any longer to slow construction rates that freeze enormous sums and retard scientific and technological progress in the national economy.

All these tasks, comrades, are gigantic in scale and significance. How they are carried out will, in the final analysis, determine the fulfilment of our plans and the rates of our growth. Each sector and each enterprise must have a clear-cut programme for the continuous modernisation of production. The responsibility of the planning and economic bodies for the achievement of planned targets will increase accordingly. Party organisations should also direct their activities towards this.

It is especially important to prevent window dressing and the use of palliative instead of substantive measures. There are disquieting instances, and by no means solitary ones, of ministries and departments erecting new facilities under the guise of modernisation, of stuffing them with outdated equipment, and of drawing up costly projects that do not assure the rise of production to higher technical-economic levels.

Here is an illustration of that approach. The Bryansk Engineering Works, which puts out motors for diesel locomotives, is now in the middle of a 140-million rouble retooling programme. What results will this modernisation of capacities yield? It turns out that the programme does not provide for the introduction of advanced technologies, the number of workers has already been increased by nearly 1,000, and the return on the assets has dropped. The worst part of it is that they intend to use the new capacities to manufacture an outdated motor, although a more efficient model has been designed and tested.

What does the stance of the executives of the Ministry of the Heavy Machine-Building Industry and of the Ministry of Railways mean? Evidently some comrades have failed to grasp the profound importance of the tasks confronting them. Such facts deserve stern condemnation as undermining the Party's policy of modernisation and of accelerated scientific and technological progress. Such cases should be examined with all severity.

The need for modernisation poses new tasks for *scientific research*. The CPSU will consistently pursue a policy of strengthening the material and technical base of scientific research to the maximum, of providing scientists with the conditions for fruitful work. However, our country is entitled to expect, from its scientists, discoveries and inventions that will bring about genuinely revolutionary changes in the development of machinery and production methods.

Important measures to make the work of research establishments more effective have been outlined lately. They deal with incentives for scientists and new forms of interaction between science and production. A decision was recently adopted to set up inter-sectoral research-and-technological complexes, including the large institutes that are leaders in their respective fields, among them institutes under Academies of Sciences, design organisations and pilot plants.

Steps are also being taken to intensify the work of sectoral research institutes and to increase their contribution to speeding up scientific and technological progress. However, this process is going ahead at an impermissibly slow pace. Many institutes are still an appendage of ministry staffs; not infrequently they support departmental interests and are bogged down in red tape and paper work. The question of bringing science closer to pro-

duction, of including sectoral research institutes into production and research-and-production associations, was forcefully raised at the June conference. We must ascertain who is opposing this, what stand the ministries and their Party committees take on this issue, and how they are reacting to life's demands.

The research potential of higher educational establishments must also be used more effectively. Upwards of 35 per cent of our country's research and educational personnel, including about half of the holders of doctoral degrees, are concentrated there but they carry out no more than ten per cent of the research projects. The respective departments should draft and submit proposals for strengthening the links between university research and production. The proposals should also take into account the training of the next generation of researchers. Just as a forest cannot live on without undergrowth, a true scientist is inconceivable without students. This is a question of the future of science, and, therefore, of our country, too. Beginning with their freshman year, college and university students should be drawn into research work and into participation in applying research findings in production. This is the only way that real scientists and creatively-thinking specialists can be trained.

In sum, comrades, the orientation of science towards the needs of the national economy should be carried out more energetically. However, it is equally important to orient production towards science, to make it maximally receptive to scientific and technological advances. Regrettably, no few scientific discoveries and major inventions fail to find practical application for years, and sometimes for decades. I shall cite a few examples.

The non-wear and tear effect, which Soviet scientists discovered three decades ago, led to the development of fundamentally new lubricants that greatly increase the service life of machine parts subjected to friction and sharply reduce labour outlays. This discovery, which may yield a saving of many millions of roubles, has not yet been applied on a broad scale because of the inertness of some high-ranking executives of the USSR Ministry of Petrochemical Industry and of a number of other ministries and departments.

The Ministry of the Motor Vehicle Industry and planning bodies are to blame for the fact that for about ten years now a newly-invented anti-friction bearing, which makes machines

more reliable and failure-safe under the most rigorous operating conditions, has not been applied on a large scale. The Ministry of the Machine-Tool Industry has impermissibly held up the manufacture of unique hydraulic motors enabling extensive use of hydraulic techniques in mining and elsewhere, to increase labour productivity several-fold and to improve working conditions.

Unfortunately, this list could be continued. This kind of attitude to new inventions is not infrequently based on the ambitions of some groups of scientists, on departmental hostility towards inventions made "by others", and a lack of interest on the part of production managers in introducing them. It is no secret that even the examination of invention applications is sometimes an ordeal that drags on for years.

We cannot reach our targets in accelerating scientific and technological progress unless we find levers that will guarantee priority only to those research establishments and industrial enterprises whose work collectives actively introduce whatever is new and progressive and seek ways and means of manufacturing articles of high quality and effective yield.

We have already accumulated a definite amount of experience in improving the economic mechanism in the sphere of science and its interaction with production. It must be thoroughly analysed and then applied without delay, closely linking up material incentives for research collectives and individual researchers with their actual contribution to the resolving of scientific and technological problems.

At all levels of economic management there should be a new attitude to the introduction of new methods and technology. This also refers to the State Planning Committee of the USSR, which should go over more boldly to all-inclusive planning of scientific and technological progress, as well as to the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, which is reorganising its work too slowly. The Academy of Sciences of the USSR, ministries and departments should pay more attention to basic research and to applying its findings in production. This is a sacred duty of every scientist, engineer, designer, and manager of an enterprise.

Our activity in the sphere of *foreign economic contacts* must be tied up more closely with the new tasks. There should be a

large-scale, forward-looking approach to mutually advantageous economic relations. The member-countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance have worked out a policy of this kind. It presupposes a switchover in economic relations among them from primarily trade relations to deeper specialisation and cooperation in production, above all, in machine-building, and to the establishment of joint associations and research-and-production complexes.

We have no few departments and organisations that are responsible for separate spheres of foreign economic relations but they do not always coordinate their work. In setting the aim of actively using foreign economic contacts to speed up our development we have in mind a step-by-step restructuring of foreign trade and making our exports and imports more effective.

2. Solving the Food Problem: A Top-Priority Task

Comrades, a problem we will have to solve in the shortest time possible is that of fully supplying our country with food. This is the aim of the Party's present agrarian policy, formulated in the decisions taken by the CPSU Central Committee at its May 1982 Plenary Meeting and in the Food Programme of the USSR. In the period since their adoption a good deal has been done to expand the material and technical base of agriculture and of the related industries. The economy of the collective farms, state farms, inter-farm enterprises and processing plants has become stronger; the productivity of crop farming and livestock farming has risen.

There is progress, but the lag in agriculture is being overcome slowly. A decisive turn is needed in the agrarian sector to improve the food supply noticeably already during the 12th five-year plan period. It is planned to more than double the growth rate of farm production and to ensure a substantial increase in the per capita consumption of meat, milk, vegetables, and fruit.

Can we do this? We can and we must. The Party has therefore worked out additional measures to raise the efficiency of all sectors of the agro-industrial complex. Their substance consists in changing the socio-economic situation in the rural areas,

in creating the conditions for greater intensification and guaranteed farm produce. The emphasis is put on economic methods of management, broader autonomy of collective farms and state farms and their higher responsibility for the results of their work.

In carrying out this policy we will have to make more effective use of the production potential in the agro-industrial complex and concentrate efforts and resources on the most important sectors providing the highest returns. It is a question, first and foremost, of increasing soil fertility and creating the conditions for stable harvests. As the experience of recent years has shown, the key to success lies in large-scale application of intensive technologies. They have a tremendous effect. Their application made it possible to obtain, last year alone, an additional 16 million tons of grain and a substantial amount of other produce.

Reducing losses of farm produce during harvesting, transportation, storage, and processing is the most immediate source of augmenting food stocks. We have no small potentialities in this respect; an increase in consumption resources could amount to as much as 20 per cent, and in the case of some products to as much as 30 per cent. Besides, eliminating the losses would cost two to three times less than raising the same amount of produce.

The Central Committee and the Government have now defined major steps to reduce losses. Rapid expansion of agricultural machine-building will make it possible to equip the collective farms and state farms with highly productive machines capable of performing all the field jobs faster and better. We have also made additional outlays to increase the manufacture of machinery for the food industry and facilities for the processing and storage of food.

The Party and the state will persistently continue to strengthen the material and technical base of the agro-industrial complex. It is equally clear, however, that people will, as before, be the mainspring and inspiration of progress. Today, more than ever before, agriculture needs people who want to work actively, who have a high level of professional skill and a feeling for the new. Constant attention to the working and living conditions of the people in rural areas is the best guarantee of all our successes. All our plans are geared to this, and it is important that they should be carried out unswervingly.

All these are urgent measures, but the programme of action is not confined to them. The switchover of the agrarian sector to new methods of administration and management has to be completed. The establishment, in the centre and in the localities, of unified management bodies of the agro-industrial complex, called upon to carry out genuine and effective integration of agriculture and of the related industries, is undoubtedly a step of fundamental significance.

The establishment of this organisational framework is backed up by an effective economic mechanism. Proposals on this score have already been drafted. The main idea is to give broad scope to economic methods of management, to substantially broaden the autonomy of collective farms and state farms, to increase their interest in and responsibility for the end results. In substance, it is a question of creatively applying, in the conditions of today, Lenin's idea of the food tax.

It is intended to establish fixed plans for the purchase of produce from the collective farms and state farms for each year of the five-year period; these plans will not be altered. Simultaneously, the farms will be given the opportunity to use all the produce harvested over and above the plan, and in the case of fruit and potatoes and other vegetables a considerable part of the planned produce, as they see fit. The farms can sell it, additionally, to the state, can sell it, either fresh or processed, on the collective-farm market or through cooperative trade outlets, or use it for other needs, including the needs of personal subsidiary holdings. Additional allocations of material resources for which there is a heightened demand, and also other incentives, will encourage farms to sell grain to the state over and above the plan.

In future, the republics, territories, and regions will be given fixed quotas for the delivery of produce to centralised stocks; everything produced over and above that will be kept for the local supply system.

There is to be a transition to improved planning methods based on advanced standards. The role of cost accounting will be substantially increased. Past experience shows that neglect of the principles of self-support, material interest and responsibility for performance led to a deterioration of the financial and economic position of collective farms and state farms and also to

their considerable indebtedness. Genuine cost accounting, with the incomes of enterprises depending upon the end results, should become the rule for all links of the agro-industrial complex and, first and foremost, the collective farms and state farms. The contract and job-by-job systems of payment at the levels of teams, groups, and families to whom the means of production, including land, will be assigned for a period specified by contract, will become widespread.

There will be big opportunities for displaying initiative and resourcefulness. This also presupposes, however, a higher sense of responsibility for meeting the targets of the Food Programme, for the results of the financial and economic activity of collective farms, state farms, inter-farm enterprises and organisations. A reliable barrier must be erected in the way of mismanagement and parasitism, and an end must be put to excuses such as "objective circumstances", which some collective farms and state farms have been using to cover up their inaptitude and sometimes a lack of desire to work better. The farms will have to use chiefly their own funds to develop production, increase profits and incomes and provide incentives. The practice of providing bank loans will have to be substantially altered to stimulate a higher level of activity of collective farms and state farms.

As you see, comrades, conditions for rural economic management are undergoing a cardinal change. This calls for major changes in the style and methods of guidance of the agro-industrial complex. An end must be put to incompetent interference in production activity in rural areas. We expect the State Agro-Industrial Committee of the USSR and its local bodies to do everything so that our country receives weighty returns from the measures that are being taken.

3. Economic Management Must Measure Up to the New Demands

Comrades, the new economic tasks cannot be solved without an in-depth readjustment of the economic mechanism, without creating an integral, effective and flexible system of management that will make it possible to take fuller advantage of the possibilities of socialism.

It is obvious that economic management requires constant improvement. However, the situation today is such that we cannot limit ourselves to partial improvements. A radical reform is needed. Its meaning consists in truly subordinating the whole of our production to the requirements of society, to the satisfaction of people's needs, in orienting management towards raising efficiency and quality, accelerating scientific and technological progress, promoting a greater interest of people in the results of their work, initiative and socialist enterprise in every link of the national economy, and, above all, in the work collectives.

The Central Committee of the CPSU and its Political Bureau have defined guidelines for reorganising the economic mechanism. We set ourselves the aims of:

— heightening the efficiency of centralised guidance of the economy, strengthening the role of the centre in implementing the main goals of the Party's economic strategy and in determining the rates and proportions of national economic growth, its balanced development. Simultaneously, the practice of interference by the centre in the daily activities of the lower economic links must be overcome;

— resolutely enlarging the framework of the autonomy of associations and enterprises, increasing their responsibility for attaining the highest ultimate results. Towards this end, to transfer them to genuine cost accounting, self-support and self-financing, and to make the income level of collectives directly dependent on the efficiency of their work;

— going over to economic methods of guidance at all levels of the national economy, for which purpose to reorganise the system of material and technical supply, improve the system of price formation, financing and crediting, and work out effective incentives to eliminate overexpenditure;

— introducing modern organisational management structures, taking into account the trends towards concentration, specialisation and cooperation of production. This is a question of setting up complexes of interconnected industries, research and technological inter-sectoral centres, various forms of economic associations and territorial-production associations;

— ensuring the best possible combination of sectoral and ter-

ritorial economic management, integrated economic and social development of republics and regions, and the organisation of rational inter-sectoral contacts;

— carrying out all-round democratisation of management, heightening the part played in it by work collectives, strengthening control from below, and ensuring accountability and publicity in the work of economic bodies.

Comrades, we now unquestionably stand before the most thorough reorganisation of the socialist economic mechanism. The reorganisation has begun. The direction along which work is going ahead in the agro-industrial complex has been already spoken about. Management of the machine-building complex is being upgraded. Industrial enterprises are being transferred, in the main, to a two-level system of management. Beginning with the current year, new economic management methods which have gone through experimental testing have been introduced in enterprises and associations that turn out half of the total industrial output. Their introduction in the service sphere, in construction and in transport has begun. Collective forms of organising work and providing incentives, and economic contract systems are being applied on an ever wider scale.

We are only at the beginning of the road, however. Time and energetic efforts are needed to reorganise the economic mechanism in our country with its vast and complex economy. Difficulties may arise, and we are not guaranteed against miscalculations either, but still the main thing now is to move ahead purposefully, step by step, along the direction we have chosen, supplementing and perfecting the economic mechanism on the basis of the accumulated experience and eliminating everything that has outlived itself or has failed to justify itself.

Success will depend largely on the *reorganisation of the work of the central economic bodies, first and foremost, the State Planning Committee of the USSR*. It must indeed become our country's genuine scientific and economic headquarters, freed from current economic matters. We have begun this work. New management bodies of the inter-sectoral complexes are being set up, and the major part of the day-to-day management functions is being delegated directly to the enterprises and associations. The State Planning Committee and other economic agencies must concentrate their efforts on long-term planning, on ensur-

ing proportional and balanced economic development, on carrying out the structural policy, and on creating the economic conditions and incentives for attaining the best end results in each unit of the national economy. Considerable improvements are needed in the sphere of statistics.

Lately there has been a weakening of the *financial-credit influence on the economy*. The financial system does not sufficiently stimulate higher economic efficiency. The defective practice of income redistribution, with the losses of lagging enterprises, ministries and regions covered at the expense of those that operate profitably, has reached a large scale. This undermines cost accounting, promotes parasitism and prompts endless demands for assistance from the centre. Crediting no longer serves its purpose.

“Any radical reforms,” said Lenin, “will be doomed to failure unless our financial policy is successful.”¹ Accordingly, we must radically change the substance, organisation and methods of the work of the financial and credit bodies. Their chief aim is not to exercise petty control over the work of enterprises but to provide economic incentives and to consolidate money circulation and cost accounting, which is the best possible controller. Everything must be made dependent on the end result. The question of improving collection of the turnover tax, deductions from the profit and other budget revenues has obviously come on the agenda. Their size and the procedure for their payment should more effectively help reduce losses in production, raise quality of output and promote its sale.

Prices must become an active factor of economic and social policy. We shall have to carry out a planned readjustment of the price system as an integral whole in the interests of organising effective cost accounting and in conformity with the aims of increasing the real incomes of the population. Prices must be made more flexible; price levels must be linked up not only with the outlays but also with the consumer properties of the goods, their effectiveness and the degree to which products meet the needs of society and consumer demand. Ceiling prices and contract prices are to be employed more widely.

¹ V. I. Lenin, “Report to the All-Russia Congress of Representatives of Financial Departments of Soviets, May 18, 1918”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 1977, p. 383.

The system of *material and technical supply* also needs thorough improvement. It must be turned into a flexible economic mechanism which helps the national economy to function rhythmically and steadily. It is the direct duty of the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply to contribute actively to the establishment of direct long-term relations between producers and consumers on a contractual basis, and to improve the observance of the terms of delivery. Wholesale trade in the means of production should be developed.

In the final analysis, everything we are doing to improve management and planning and to readjust organisational structures is aimed at creating conditions for the *effective functioning of the basic link of the economic system: the association or enterprise*.

As shown by analysis, the results of the experiments that have been carried out could have been much better, if, on the one hand, there had been a corresponding reorganisation of the work of industrial ministries and central economic agencies, which continue their attempts to restrict the powers of enterprises, and, on the other hand, if the incentives for higher efficiency had been brought home to every section, work team and workplace. Special attention should be paid to this.

It is high time to put an end to the practice of ministries and departments exercising petty tutelage over enterprises. Ministries should concentrate their attention on technical policy, on intra-sectoral proportions, and on meeting the requirements of the national economy in high-quality products put out by their respective industries. Enterprises and organisations should be given the right independently to sell to one another what they produce over and above the plan, as well as raw and other materials, equipment, etc. which they do not use. They should also be given the legal right to make such sales to the population. What sense is there in destroying or dumping onto waste heaps articles that could come in useful in the household, in building homes, garages or cottages on garden and vegetable plots?

It would be difficult to overestimate the role of economic standards. When the work collectives of enterprises know, ahead of time, specifics of the planned period—delivery targets, prices, deductions from profits to the budget, standards for forming wage funds and cost-accounting incentives funds—they can

draw up creatively plans which provide for higher production growth rates and much higher efficiency without being afraid to reveal their as yet untapped potentialities. Moreover, enterprises should be given the possibility—following the example of the Volga Auto Works and the Sumy Engineering Works—themselves to earn the funds needed to expand and retool production.

It is especially important to give enterprises and organisations greater autonomy in the sphere of consumer goods manufacture and services. Their task is to react quickly to consumer demand. It is along these lines that we are reshaping the economic mechanism of light industry. The range of targets approved from above is being sharply limited for enterprises in this sphere; their plans will be drawn up chiefly on the basis of contracts with trade organisations, which, in turn, must see to it that their orders conform to the actual consumer demand. In other words the quantity, range, and quality of goods, that is, just what people need, will be the main thing, and not gross output. Besides, it is planned to establish inter-sectoral production and industrial-commercial associations for the manufacture and sale of light industry goods and to open more retail outlets operated by them.

The time has also come to solve another problem. An enterprise's wage fund should be directly tied in with the returns from the sale of its products. This will help to exclude the manufacture and supply of low-grade goods for which there is no demand, or, as they say, production for the warehouse. Incidentally, that approach should be applied not only in light industry. We can no longer reconcile ourselves to a situation in which the personnel of enterprises producing worthless goods lead an untroubled life, drawing their full pay and receiving bonuses and other benefits. Indeed, why should we pay for work which produces goods nobody wants to buy. One way or another all this goes against us, comrades! We must not forget about this.

A well-thought-out approach must also be taken to the question of a rational combination of *large, medium and small enterprises*. As experience shows, small, well-equipped plants have their own advantages in many cases. They can be quicker and more flexible in taking into account technological innovations and changes in demand, can faster meet the demand for small-

batch and separate items, and can make better use of available manpower, especially in small towns.

Another substantial aspect of readjustment is consolidation of the territorial approach to planning and management. This is especially important for our vast and multinational country with its diverse features. The actions of ministries and departments that neglect the conditions in and the requirements of regions, with resulting economic imbalances, were rightly criticised at Party conferences and at congresses of the communist parties of constituent republics.

Some suggestions are also being received on this score. It is evidently worthwhile giving thought to enlarging the powers of republican and local bodies—following the example of the agro-industrial complex—in the management of construction, intersectoral production units, the social and production infrastructures, and many consumer goods factories. The work of the State Planning Committee of the USSR and of the ministries should get a broader territorial orientation. The question of national-economic management on the basis of large economic areas deserves study.

Our short- and long-term plans are linked, to a considerable degree, with the tapping of the natural wealth of Siberia and the Soviet Far East. This is a very important matter that requires a statesmanlike approach ensuring integrated regional development. Special attention should be paid to providing people there with the conditions for fruitful work and a full-blooded life. That is the main question today, and fulfilment of the set targets depends on how it is solved.

Attention should be drawn at our Congress to the problems involved in the further socio-economic development of the Non-Black-Earth Zone of the Russian Federation. I will stress two points. The Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet Government have adopted special decisions for an upswing in the agriculture of the Non-Black-Earth Zone, and they must be carried out unswervingly and fully. That is in the first place. And in the second place, the local Party, government and economic bodies and work collectives must pay much more attention to making effective use of the potential accumulated there and of the allocated resources.

Consolidation of the territorial principle of management calls

for a higher level of economic guidance in each republic, region, city, and district. Proposals that come from the localities are at times not thought out thoroughly, not dictated by the interests of the national economy but rather by a dependant's mentality and sometimes even by self-seeking interests, which draw the economy into capital-intensive and low-productive projects. Due attention is not paid everywhere to raising the efficiency of production. In Kazakhstan, for example, the share of national income per unit of fixed production assets is a third less than the average for the Soviet economy. In Turkmenia, the productivity of social labour has not grown at all in 15 years. Thought should be given to how to tie in the resources allocated for social needs more closely with the efficiency of the regional economy.

Comrades, every readjustment of the economic mechanism begins, as you know, with a readjustment of thinking, with a rejection of old stereotypes of thought and actions, with a clear understanding of the new tasks. This refers primarily to the activity of our economic personnel, to the functionaries of the central links of administration. Most of them have a clear idea of the Party's initiatives, actively support them, boldly tackle complicated assignments, and seek and find the best ways of carrying them out. This attitude deserves utmost support. It is hard, however, to understand those who adopt a wait-and-see policy or who, like the Gogol character that thought up all kinds of fanciful ideas, do not actually do anything or change anything. There will be no reconciliation with the stand taken by functionaries of that kind. We will simply have to part ways with them. All the more so do we have to part ways with those who hope that everything will settle down and return to the old lines. That will not happen, comrades!

In our work on restructuring the economy and the economic mechanism it is more important than ever to rely on science. Life prompts us to take a new look at some theoretical ideas and concepts. This applies to such major problems as the interaction of the productive forces and the production relations, socialist ownership and its economic forms, commodity-money relations, the combination of centralism with the autonomy of economic organisations, and so on.

Practice has revealed the insolvency of the ideas that under

the conditions of socialism the *conformity of production relations to the nature of the productive forces* is ensured automatically, as it were. In real life, everything is more complicated. Indeed, the socialist production relations open up broad vistas for development of the productive forces. However, they must be constantly improved. And that means outdated economic management methods must be noticed in good time and replaced by new ones.

The forms of production relations and the economic management and guidance system now in operation took shape, basically, in the conditions of extensive economic development. These gradually grew out of date, began to lose their stimulating effect and in some respects became a brake. We are now striving to change the thrust of the economic mechanism, to overcome its costliness and to orient it towards a higher level of quality and efficiency, acceleration of scientific and technological progress and enhancement of the human factor. This is the main thing that will, in practice, signify further improvement of the socialist production relations and will provide new scope for the growth of the productive forces.

In this work we must not be stopped by long-established ideas, let alone by prejudices. If, for example, it is necessary and justifiable to apply economic standards instead of targets that are sent down as directives, this does not mean a retreat from the principles of planned guidance but only a change in its methods. The same can be applied to the need to broaden the autonomy, initiative and responsibility of associations and enterprises, and to enhance their role as socialist commodity producers.

Unfortunately, there is a widespread view when any change in the economic mechanism is regarded as practically being a retreat from the principles of socialism. In this connection I should like to emphasise the following: socio-economic acceleration and the consolidation of socialism in practice should be the supreme criterion in the improvement of management and of the entire system of the socialist production relations.

The *aspects of socialist property* as the foundation of our social system acquire great relevance. Socialist property has a rich content; it includes a multifaceted system of relations among people, collectives, industries and regions of the country in the use of the means of production and its results, and a whole

range of economic interests. This intricate complex of relations requires a definite combination and constant regulation, especially since it is in motion. Unless we gain a deep understanding of these changes in theoretical terms we cannot arrive at correct practical decisions and consequently take prompt steps to mould a genuine sense of responsibility to socialist property.

We must provide the working people with greater incentives for putting the national riches to the best possible use and multiplying them. How can this be done? It would be naive to imagine that the feeling of ownership can be inculcated by words. A person's attitude towards property is shaped, first and foremost, by the actual conditions in which he has been put, by his possibilities of influencing the organisation of production, and the distribution and use of the results of work. The problem is thus one of further intensifying socialist self-government in the economic sphere.

The role of work collectives in the use of socialised property must be raised decisively. It is important to carry out unswervingly the principle according to which enterprises and associations are wholly responsible for operating without losses, while the state does not bear any responsibility for their obligations. This is where the substance of cost accounting lies. You cannot be a master of your country if you are not a real master in your factory or collective farm, in your shop or livestock farm. It is the duty of the work collective to answer for everything, to multiply the social wealth. Multiplication of the social wealth, as well as losses, should affect the income of every member of the collective.

And, of course, a reliable barrier is needed against all attempts to extract unearned income from the socialised property. There are still "snatchers", persons who do not consider it a crime to steal from their plant everything that comes their way, and there are also sundry bribe-takers and grabbers who do not stop at using their position for selfish purposes. The full force of the law and of public condemnation should be applied to all of them.

Attention should also be paid to such a topical problem of regulating socialist property relations as ensuring unquestionable priority of the interests of the whole people over the interests of industries and regions. Ministries, departments and territorial

bodies are not the owners of means of production but merely institutions of state administration responsible to society for efficient use of the people's wealth. We cannot allow departmental and parochial interests to hinder realisation of the advantages of socialist property.

We also stand for full clarity on the question of cooperative property. It has far from exhausted its possibilities in socialist production, in providing better satisfaction of people's needs. Many collective farms and other cooperative organisations are managed effectively. And wherever the need exists, utmost support should be given to the establishment and growth of cooperative enterprises and organisations. They should become widespread in the manufacture and processing of products, in housing construction and in construction on garden and vegetable allotments, and in the sphere of services and trade.

It is also time to overcome prejudices regarding *commodity-money relations* and underestimation of these relations in planned economic guidance. Refusal to recognise the importance of their active influence on people's interest in working better and on production efficiency leads to a weakening of the cost-accounting system and to other undesirable consequences. Conversely, sound commodity-money relations on a socialist basis can create a situation and economic conditions under which the results depend entirely on the standards of the work done by the collective and on the ability and initiative of the managers.

Thus, comrades, we are obliged to assess the situation again and again and to resolutely reorganise everything that has become out of date, that has outlived itself. A profound understanding of this task by Party activists and by all personnel, as well as its comprehension by the broad masses are indispensable for success, are the point of departure in the exceptionally important work of building up a new economic mechanism and management system.

4. Putting Reserves of Economic Growth into Action

Comrades, the Party has worked out a strategy of deep-going transformations in the national economy and has begun to effect them. They will undoubtedly enable us to speed up economic growth. But this will require a good deal of time, and

we must increase the growth rates at once, today. The specific feature of the 12th five-year plan period consists in retooling the national economy on a new scientific and technological basis while simultaneously stepping up the rates of our advance.

Hence the need to utilise all of our reserves to the maximum. It is more sensible to start with those that do not require big outlays but yield quick and tangible returns. This is a matter of economic-organisational and socio-psychological factors, of making better use of the production capabilities that have been built up, of making the incentives more effective, of improving the level of organisation and tightening discipline, and of eliminating mismanagement. Our reserves are at hand, and with a dedicated approach plus good management they promise high returns.

Just look at the capacities in operation. The value of our country's fixed production assets exceeds 1.5 trillion roubles, but they are not all being used properly. This applies to a number of industries—to engineering, heavy industry, the power industry and agriculture. What is especially alarming is the fact that the most active assets—machinery, equipment, and machine tools—often stand idle or else are operated at half capacity. In the engineering industry, for example, metal-cutting machine tools are in use only slightly more than one shift a day. On the whole, our country annually loses billions of roubles' worth of industrial output because capacities are underloaded. Planning and economic bodies and work collectives at enterprises must do everything possible to ensure the operation of existing capacities at the designed level. In heavy industry alone, this would nearly double the output growth rates.

Failure to meet component delivery obligations is another hindrance. A violation of this kind in one place has a ripple effect throughout the national economy and lowers its efficiency. Jerky production also does tangible damage. It is no secret that at the beginning of the month many plants stand idle longer than they function. But at the end of the month they begin a headlong rush, as a result of which output quality is low. This chronic disease must be eradicated. Strict observance of component delivery obligations is the duty of work collectives and also of management at all levels. We will not be able to achieve our aims unless we bring order into planning and supply, create

the necessary stocks, and impose higher financial liability at all levels for failure to meet obligations and for spoilage.

There are also great reserves in the use of manpower. Some economic managers complain of a manpower shortage. I think the complaints are groundless in most cases. If you look into the matter more closely you will see that there is no shortage of labour. But there is a low level of labour productivity, inadequate work organisation and ineffective incentive schemes. Add to this the creation of superfluous jobs by planning and economic bodies. It is a well-known fact that some of our enterprises, design offices and research institutes have considerably larger staffs than their counterparts abroad with the same work load.

Once people at enterprises get down in earnest to improving work organisation and incentives, to tightening discipline and setting higher demands, reserves that had never been thought to exist previously are brought to light. Application of the Shchokin method and the certification of workplaces convincingly confirm this. When Byelorussian railwaymen went over to a new pay system, with one person doing two or more different jobs, about 12,000 workers were soon freed for jobs in other sectors.

Of course, more attention must also be paid to production mechanisation and automation. In tackling this problem one does not have to wait for machines and devices to be designed and made somewhere else. A great deal can be accomplished by using one's own capabilities. For instance, efforts in this direction in Zaporozhye Region led, in three years, to a nine per cent reduction in the number of workers employed in manual jobs in industry and a fifteen per cent reduction in the number of those in similar jobs in the building trades. I think that other regions, territories, and republics have no fewer possibilities. The important thing is to put persistent and dedicated effort into this, showing consideration for the people who have to perform manual operations, and striving to reduce production outlays.

Generally speaking, comrades, there are enormous economic reserves. We have not yet really begun to use many of them. The mentality of a substantial section of the managerial personnel at various levels took shape against the background of an abundance of resources. Many were spoiled by these riches, and that led to wastefulness. However, the situation changed long

ago. The former influx of manpower has dwindled, and we have begun to pay a heavy price for every ton of oil, ore, and coal we extract and deliver. We cannot close our eyes to these facts; we must reckon with them. We must economise everywhere and always: on the job and at home. We must not ignore mismanagement and wastefulness. Nearly the whole of this year's growth in the national income is to come from raising labour productivity and lowering materials and energy consumption.

That is not simple but wholly feasible. All the more so since our country has accumulated experience in making thrifty use of resources; but it is not being spread fast enough. Party, YCL, and trade union organisations should constantly promote thrift and encourage those who make economical and rational use of raw materials, electrical energy, and fuel. We must make it a firm rule that overexpenditure of resources is disadvantageous and savings are tangibly rewarded.

I would like to put special emphasis on the problem of *output quality standards*. This is more than our immediate and major reserve. Accelerated scientific and technological progress is impossible today without high quality standards. We are sustaining great material and moral losses because of flaws in design, deviations from technology, the use of low-grade materials and poor finishing. This affects the precision and reliability of machines and instruments and hinders satisfaction of consumer demand for goods and services. Last year millions of metres of fabrics, millions of pairs of leather footwear and many other consumer items were returned to factories or marked down as inferior-grade goods. The losses are significant: wasted raw materials and the wasted labour of hundreds of thousands of workers. Radical measures must be taken to rule out the manufacture of defective or low-grade goods. The full force of pecuniary and administrative influence and legislation must be applied for this purpose. There is also evidently a need to adopt a special law on the quality of output.

Recently the Central Committee of the CPSU called upon Party committees, government and economic bodies, trade union and YCL organisations and all working people to make maximum efforts to radically improve the quality of goods. This must be a matter of concern for every Communist, for every Soviet citizen, for all who respect their own work, for all who

cherish the honour of their enterprise, their industry, and the honour of our country.

A great deal of important and intensive work lies ahead of us. The first year of the five-year plan period is a year of persistent work, a year of tests for every manager and work collective. We must pass this test, draw all the reserves of the economy into production, and consolidate the foundation for further transformations.

The industry and talent of Soviet citizens are the key to attaining the goal that has been set. It is now up to efficient organisation and precise direction of this great force. The part to be played by socialist emulation in this effort cannot be overestimated. It should be spearheaded at raising the standards of work, economising and thriftiness, and reaching the targets set before each collective and at each workplace. Enthusiasm and the growing skills have been and, we are confident, will continue to be our reliable support.

C. THE BASIC GUIDELINES OF SOCIAL POLICY

Comrades, questions of social policy, concern for man's welfare, have always stood at the centre of our Party's attention.

The social sphere encompasses the interests of classes and social groups, nations and nationalities, the relationship between society and individual, the conditions of work and life, health and leisure. *It is the sphere in which the results of economic activity affecting the vital interests of the working people are realised, and the loftiest aims of socialism are carried into effect. It is the sphere in which the humanism of the socialist system, its qualitative difference from capitalism, is seen most distinctly and graphically.*

Socialism has eliminated the main source of social injustice—the exploitation of man by man, and inequality in relation to the means of production. Social justice reigns in all areas of socialist social relations. It is embodied in the real power of the people and the equality of all citizens before the law, the actual equality of nations, respect for the individual, and conditions for the all-round development of the personality. It is also embodied in broad social guarantees—employment, access to

education, culture, medical care and housing, concern for people in old age, and mother and child welfare. Strict observance in life of the principle of social justice is an important condition for the unity of the people, society's political stability, and dynamic development.

But life, as they say, does not stand still. So we must look at the further development of the social sphere with new eyes, and appreciate the full measure of its increasing significance. We are obliged to do so in keeping with the general course worked out by the Party for the acceleration of socio-economic development, and with the programme aim of our Party, that of achieving the complete wellbeing and a free all-round development of all members of society.

Lessons of the past, too, require that we pay greater attention to social issues. The Party's Central Committee holds that central and local bodies had underestimated relevant problems concerning the material base of the country's social and cultural sphere. As a result, a residual principle had actually taken shape governing allocation of resources for its development. There was a certain overemphasis on technocratic approaches, blunting attention to the social aspect of production, to everyday life and leisure; this could not but reduce the interest of the working people in the results of their work, slacken discipline and lead to other negative developments.

We are not at all indifferent to what ways and means are used to improve the material and spiritual aspects of life and what social consequences this entails. If private-owner, parasitic sentiments, and levelling tendencies begin to surface, this means that something is wrong about the choice of ways and means in our work, and has got to be rectified. During the discussion of the pre-Congress documents, Party members and non-members spoke with concern of the slackening of control over the measure of labour and consumption, of infringements of socialist justice, and of the need for stepping up the fight against unearned incomes. The gravity and importance of these questions is more than obvious.

In short, the attained level of development and the magnitude of the new tasks call for a long-term, deeply considered, integral, and strong social policy that would extend to all aspects of the life of society. It is essential for the planning and manage-

ment bodies, for central and local economic organisations to deal resolutely with the needs of the social sphere.

The objectives of social policy are thoroughly characterised in the drafts of the Party Programme and the Guidelines. Allow me to dwell on some issues related to its implementation.

1. Steady Improvement of the People's Standard of Living, Consistent Application of Social Justice

The long-term plans for the country's social and economic development envisage *raising the people's wellbeing to a qualitatively new level*. In the coming fifteen years, the volume of resources allocated for the improvement of the conditions of life is to be doubled. Real per capita incomes are to go up 60 to 80 per cent. The rise in incomes in the 12th five-year period is to cover millions of people. Huge funds are being earmarked for increasing the construction of homes and social and cultural facilities. Those are the plans. But we must mention the main thing: these plans will become reality only if every Soviet person works hard and efficiently. This applies to every person wherever he may work and whatever post he may occupy. What we accomplish is what we are going to have, and how we are going to live.

Socialist transformations have radically changed both the purpose of work and the attitude to work of the mass of workers and peasants. This is vividly reflected in the massive growth of socialist emulation. Relying on its wealth of experience, the Party intends to continue promoting these traditions, and to cultivate a conscious and creative attitude to work as the prime duty to society.

At election meetings and conferences, Communists have rightly raised the question of not only improving the forms of moral incentives, but also of greatly increasing material incentives and establishing due order in this important matter. It was rightly pointed out that the so-called "figure juggling", payment of unearned money and unmerited bonuses, and setting "guaranteed" pay rates unrelated to the worker's contributed work, are impermissible. It should be said quite emphatically on this score that when equal payments are fixed for the work of a good employee and that of a negligent one this is a gross violation of

our principles. And first of all it is an intolerable distortion of socialism's basic principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work", which expresses the substance of the social justice of the new social system.

It is essential that the government's wage policy should ensure that incomes strictly correspond to the quantity and quality of work done. Proceeding from this, the increase of wage rates and basic salaries of factory and office workers in productive fields envisaged in the 12th five-year period will be enacted for the first time essentially at the expense and within the limits of the sums earned by the enterprises themselves. This procedure will make a more active impact on the acceleration of technical progress and on heightening the efficiency of production.

Rates and salaries in the non-productive sphere will go up, drawing on centralised sources. A phased increase of the salaries of doctors and other medical workers was started last year. The increase of the rates and salaries of those employed in public education is to be completed in 1987, and a start is to be made that year in raising the salaries of cultural workers. Measures are being taken to extend the wage and salary advantages of factory and office workers in certain regions of Eastern Siberia and the Soviet Far East.

Many proposals made by working people refer to the role of social consumption funds in enforcing the principle of justice. These funds already account for nearly one-third of the consumed material goods and services. We hold that they are in no way charity. They play an important role in providing equal access for members of society to education and culture, equalising conditions for the raising of children, and easing the life of those who may, for one reason or another, need a grant or continuous assistance. At the same time, it is a means of encouraging and stimulating qualified, conscientious work. The Party intends to continue promoting the further growth and more effective use of these social funds. In the 12th five-year period they are to go up by 20 to 23 per cent.

Combating unearned incomes is an important function of the socialist state. We must admit today that owing to a slackening of control and for a number of other reasons groups of people have appeared with a distinct proprietary mentality and a scornful attitude to the interests of society.

Working people have legitimately raised the question of rooting out such things. The Central Committee agrees completely with these demands. It is considered necessary, already in the immediate future, to carry out additional measures against parasites, plunderers of socialist property, bribe-takers, and all those who embarked on a path alien to the work-oriented nature of our system. We should also give thought to proposals about perfecting our tax policy, including the introduction of a progressive inheritance tax.

But while combating unearned incomes, we must not permit any shadow to fall on those who do honest work to earn a supplementary income. What is more, the state will promote various forms of satisfying popular demand and providing services. We must attentively examine proposals for regulating individual labour. It stands to reason that such labour must be in full conformity with socialist economic principles, and rest on either cooperative principles or on contracts with socialist enterprises. Society, the population only stand to gain from this.

All the efforts to perfect the distributive relations will have little effect and the objective of enhancing the people's well-being will not be attained if we fail to *saturate the market with diverse goods and services*. That, indeed, is the purpose of the Comprehensive Programme for the Development of the Production of Consumer Goods and the Services.

In the current five years it is planned to secure higher growth rates for output of consumer goods and retail trade, and to considerably improve the organisation of trade and public catering. Heavy industry has been instructed to involve all enterprises in the production of manufactured goods and to ensure output of high-quality materials and equipment for light industry and the food industry.

We must build up an up-to-date services industry as quickly as possible. That is the job of central organisations, but also—no less, and perhaps even more—of the Councils of Ministers of Union Republics, and all bodies of local government. Resolute measures must be taken to eliminate the glaring disproportions between the supply and demand of services. This applies first of all to services that lighten domestic work and those connected with the improvement and renovation of flats, with tourism, and the servicing of

cars the demand for which is increasing at an especially swift rate. Responding to the proposals of the working people, we are promoting broad expansion of collective gardening and vegetable growing. This has got off the ground. But the work must be continued, and all artificial obstacles must be removed.

The social importance and acuteness of the *housing problem* have predetermined our serious attitude to it. To provide every family with a separate flat or house by the year 2000 is, in itself, a tremendous but feasible undertaking. In the current five years, and especially in the five-year periods to follow, the scale of house-building and of modernising available housing will increase. The building of cooperative and individual housing should be encouraged in every way. There are great reserves here for expanding the building of homes. Those who are backing the construction of youth complexes are doing the right thing. The motivation and energy of young people can do a lot in this respect.

Much is being said about the need for seriously improving the practice of distributing housing. These questions must be settled on a broad democratic basis and put under continuous public control. Proposals for fair changes in the system of house rents by gearing them to the size and quality of all the occupied living space merit attention. There have been many complaints about the low quality of house-building. It is essential to work out measures that would stimulate a substantial improvement of quality, and also an improvement of the layout, the amenities, and architecture of our towns and villages.

Comrades, the qualitative changes in the social sphere are impossible without *deep-going changes in the content of labour*. The main role here is to be played by the technical reconstruction of the economy: mechanisation, automation, computerisation and robotisation which, as I want to stress specially, must have an explicitly clear social orientation. Already in the current five years it is planned to sharply reduce the share of manual labour, and by the year 2000 to bring it down in the productive sphere to 15-20 per cent, relieving millions of people of manual operations. The further change of labour in the context of the scientific and technological revolution sets high

demands on education and the professional training of people. In substance, the task of *establishing a single system of continuous education* is now on the agenda.

In recent years, the Central Committee has taken important steps in that direction. A reform has been launched of the *general and vocational school*. It should be said that the rate and extent of the measures taken under the reform are not satisfactory as yet. A more profound approach is required to the study of the scientific basis of contemporary production and of the leading trends of its intensification. And what is especially urgent is that all pupils should learn the use of computers. In sum, it is essential that the Leninist principle of combining education with productive labour should be implemented more fully, that the effectiveness of education should be considerably raised, and that radical improvements should be carried out in the training of young people for independent life and labour and in bringing up politically conscious builders of the new society.

The Party is setting the task of *restructuring higher and specialised secondary education*. In recent years, the growing output of specialists was not accompanied by the requisite improvement in the quality of their training. The material base of the higher school is lagging behind gravely. The use of engineers and technicians must be considerably improved.

At present, proposals have been drawn up to alter the prevailing situation. It is in the interests of society to raise the prestige of the work of engineers. The structure of higher and specialised secondary education is to be revised, so that the training of specialists will be abreast of the times and they acquire substantial theoretical knowledge and practical skills. The relationship of higher educational institutions and specialised secondary schools with various branches of the economy should evidently follow new lines, and their mutual interest in raising the level of training and retraining of cadres, in cardinally improving their use in production, should be enhanced.

Nothing is more valuable to every person and, for that matter, to society than health. The *protection and improvement of the health of people* is a matter of cardinal importance. We must consider the problems of health from broad social

positions. Health depends above all on the conditions of work and life, and on the standard of living. It stands to reason, of course, that the public health service is also of tremendous importance. We must meet the needs of the population in high-quality medical treatment, health protection and pharmaceuticals as quickly as possible, and, moreover, everywhere. All this puts the question of the material and technical base of the health service in a new way, calling for the solution of many urgent scientific, organisational, and personnel problems. Considerable funds will be needed, of course, and we must see to it that they are made available.

It has long since been noted, and most aptly, that health cannot be bought in a pharmacy. The main thing is a person's way of life and, among other things, how sensibly and wholesomely a person uses his or her spare time. The opportunities for this are at hand, but the organisational side of the matter is very poorly run. Much depends on the initiative of the public, on people's vocational activity. But in towns and villages, and within work collectives, they often wait for instructions and count on assistance from above. Why do we make poor use of what is already at our disposal—of palaces, clubs, stadiums, parks, and many other facilities? Why don't the Soviets, the trade unions, and the Komsomol tackle these questions properly? Why not start a movement for more active building of simple playgrounds and gymnasiums on the residential principle? And finally, why not organise sports, tourist and other clubs on a cooperative basis?

A fight has been mounted across the country against hard drinking and alcoholism. In the name of the health of society and of the individual we have taken resolute measures and started a battle against traditions that were shaped and cultivated over the centuries. While we should have no illusions about what has been accomplished, we can safely say that incidents of drunkenness on the job and in public places have become fewer. The situation within families is improving, the number of industrial injuries has gone down, and discipline has been tightened. But extensive, persevering and varied efforts are still needed to secure a final break with prevailing habits. There must be no indulgence here!

We face the acute task of ensuring the *protection of nature*

and rational use of its resources. Socialism, with its plan-governed organisation of production and humane world outlook, is quite capable of creating a harmonious balance between society and nature. A system of measures to that effect has already been implemented in our country, and quite considerable funds are being allocated for this purpose. There are also practical results.

Still, in a number of regions the state of the environment is alarming. And the public, notably our writers, are quite right in calling for a more careful treatment of land and its riches, of lakes, rivers, and the plant and animal world.

Scientific and technical achievements are being introduced much too slowly in nature protection. The projects of new and the reconstruction of operating enterprises are still being based on outdated notions, with wasteless and low-waste production techniques being introduced on too small a scale. During the processing of minerals, most of the extracted mass goes to waste, polluting the environment. More resolute economic, legal and educational measures are required here. All of us living today are accountable to our descendants and to history for the environment.

2. Improvement of Social-Class Relations and Relations Among the Peoples of the USSR

Comrades, analysing problems involved in *interrelationship of classes and social groups* is of vital importance for a Marxist-Leninist party. By carefully taking into account both the community and the specific nature of their interests in its policy, the Communist Party ensures society's strong unity and successful fulfilment of its most important and complex tasks.

The working class holds a vanguard place in Soviet society. Owing to its position in the socialist production system, its political experience, high political awareness, good organisation, labour and political activity, the working class unites our society and plays the leading role in improving socialism, in communist construction. Constant concern for the consolidation of the alliance of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia is the cornerstone of the policy

pursued by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It is precisely this which enables us to muster forces for the speedy solution of the economic and social tasks we have set ourselves.

The unity of socialist society by no means implies a levelling of public life. Socialism encourages diversity of people's interests, requirements and abilities, and vigorously supports the initiative of public organisations that express this diversity. Moreover, socialism needs this diversity, which it regards as an essential condition for the further promotion of people's creative activity and initiative, and the competition of minds and talents, without which the socialist way of life and the movement forward would be inconceivable.

Generally speaking, the problem is as follows: unless we elevate emulation to a new, incomparably higher level in production, in the economy, as well as in the fields of science and the arts, we shall not be able to cope with the task of accelerating the country's socio-economic progress. To improve the socialist way of life is to ensure the maximum opportunities for fostering collectivism, the cohesion of society, and the individual's activity.

The *problems of consolidating the family* are attracting public attention. Our achievements in cultivating the new, socialist type of family are indisputable. Socialism has emancipated women from economic and social oppression, securing for them the opportunity to work, obtain an education and participate in public life on an equal footing with men. The socialist family is based on the full equality of men and women and their equal responsibility for the family.

Yet, the formation of the new type of family is no simple matter. It is a complicated process that involves many problems. In particular, although the divorce rate has dropped in the past few years, it is still high. There is still a large number of unhappy families. All this has a negative effect, above all, on the upbringing of children, as well as on the morale of men and women, on their labour and public activity. It stands to reason that society cannot be indifferent to such phenomena. The strong family is one of its principal pillars.

Young families need special care. Young people must be well prepared for family life. More thought should be given to the

system of material assistance to newlyweds, above all in solving their housing and everyday problems. It would apparently be a good thing to consider the proposals for improving relevant legislation with a view to heightening the citizens' responsibility for consolidating the family. But that is not all. It is necessary to organise the practical work of state and public organisations so that it will promote in every way a strengthening of the family and its moral foundations. This means the creation of conditions for family participation in public festivities and in cultural and sports events, and for family recreation. Families in which successive generations work in the same profession should be widely honoured; good family traditions should be given every support and young people should be brought up on the basis of the experience of older generations. Here a big contribution can be made by the mass information media, television, literature, cinema and the theatre.

Securing living and working conditions for women that would enable them to successfully combine their maternal duties with active involvement in labour and public activity is a prerequisite for solving many family problems. In the 12th five-year period we are planning to extend the practice of letting women work a shorter day or week, or to work at home. Mothers will have paid leaves until their babies are 18 months old. The number of paid days-off granted to mothers to care for sick children will be increased. Lower-income families with children of up to 12 years of age will receive child allowances. We intend to fully satisfy the people's need for preschool children's institutions within the next few years.

Thought should also be given to appropriate organisational forms. Why not reinstitute women's councils within work collectives or residentially, integrating them in a single system with the Soviet Women's Committee at its head? Women's councils could help to resolve a wide range of social problems arising in the life of our society.

Concern for the older generation, for war and labour veterans, should rank as one of the top priorities. The Party and the Soviet Government will do everything possible for the pensioners' wellbeing to rise with the growth of society's prosperity. In the 12th five-year period it is planned to

increase the minimum old-age, disability, and loss-of-breadwinner pensions paid to factory and office workers, and to raise the previously fixed pensions of collective farmers. But man lives not by bread alone, as the saying goes. According to the information reaching the Central Committee, many retired veterans feel left out of things. Apparently, additional measures should be taken by government and public organisations, centrally and locally, to assist the veterans in becoming more actively involved in production and socio-political life. After all, more than 50 million Soviet people are veterans.

The setting up of a national mass organisation of war and labour veterans could be a new step in this direction. It could be instrumental in involving highly experienced people in social and political affairs, and first of all in educating the rising generation. The pensioners' involvement, both on a co-operative and on an individual, family basis, in the services or trade, producing consumer goods or turning out farm produce could be highly useful. The new organisation could be helpful in improving everyday and medical services for pensioners and expanding their leisure opportunities. As we see it, it will certainly have a lot of work to do.

Comrades, of tremendous importance for the multinational Soviet state is *development of relations among the peoples of the USSR*. The foundation for solving the nationalities problem in our country was laid by the Great October Socialist Revolution. Relying on Lenin's doctrine and on the gains of socialism the Communist Party has done enormous transformative work in this area. Its results are an outstanding achievement of socialism which has enriched world civilisation. National oppression and inequality of all types and forms have been done away with once and for all. The indissoluble friendship among nations and respect for national cultures and for the dignity of all peoples have been established and have taken firm root in the minds of tens of millions of people. The Soviet people is a qualitatively new social and international community, cemented by the same economic interests, ideology and political goals.

However, our achievements must not create the impression that there are no problems in the national processes. Contradictions are inherent in any kind of development, and are unavoidable in this sphere as well. The main thing is to see their

emergent aspects and facets, to search for and give prompt and correct answers to questions posed by life. This is all the more important because the tendency towards national isolation, localism, and parasitism still persist and make themselves felt quite painfully at times.

In elaborating guidelines for a long-term nationalities policy, it is especially important to see to it that the republics' contribution to the development of an integrated national economic complex should match their grown economic and spiritual potential. It is in the supreme interests of our multinational state, and each of the republics, to promote cooperation in production, collaboration and mutual assistance among the republics. It is the task of Party organisations and the Soviets to make the fullest possible use of available potentialities in the common interests and to persistently overcome all signs of localism.

We are legitimately proud of the achievements of the multinational Soviet socialist culture. By drawing on the wealth of national forms and characteristics, it is developing into a unique phenomenon in world culture. However, the healthy interest in all that is valuable in each national culture must by no means degenerate into attempts to isolate oneself from the objective process by which national cultures interact and come closer together. This applies, among other things, to certain works of literature and art and scholarly writings in which, under the guise of national originality, attempts are made to depict in idyllic tones reactionary nationalist and religious survivals contrary to our ideology, the socialist way of life, and our scientific world outlook.

Our Party's tradition traceable to Lenin of being particularly circumspect and tactful in all that concerns the nationalities policy and the interests of every nation or nationality, national feelings, calls at the same time for resolute struggle against national narrow-mindedness and arrogance, nationalism and chauvinism, no matter what their guise may be. We Communists must unswervingly follow Lenin's wise teachings, must creatively apply them to the new conditions, and be extremely heedful and principled as regards relations among peoples in the name of the further consolidation of fraternal friendship among all the peoples of the USSR.

The social policy elaborated by the Party has many aspects to it and is quite feasible. However, its success will largely hinge on the social orientation of the cadres, on persistence and initiative in carrying out our plans. Concern for people's needs and interests must be an object of unflagging attention on the part of the Party, government and economic organisations, of trade unions and of each executive. If we succeed in securing a decisive switch to the social sphere, many of the problems that face us today and will face us tomorrow will be solved far more quickly and much more effectively than has so far been the case.

III. FURTHER DEMOCRATISATION OF SOCIETY AND PROMOTION OF THE PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST SELF-GOVERNMENT

Comrades, Lenin regarded democracy, the creative initiative of working people, as the principal force behind the development of the new system. Unmatched in his faith in the people, he showed concern for raising the level of the political activity and culture of the masses, stressing that illiterate people were outside politics. Nearly seventy years have elapsed since then. The general educational and cultural level of Soviet people has risen immeasurably and their socio-political experience has grown richer. This means that the possibility and need of every citizen to participate in managing the affairs of the state and society have grown enormously.

Democracy is the wholesome and pure air without which a socialist public organism cannot live a full-blooded life. Hence, when we say that socialism's great potential is not being used to the full in our country, we also mean that the *acceleration of society's development is inconceivable and impossible without a further development of all the aspects and manifestations of socialist democracy.*

Bearing that in mind, the Party and its Central Committee are taking measures aimed at deepening the democratic character of the socialist system. Among them are steps to heighten the activities of the Soviets, the trade unions, the Komsomol, the work collectives and the people's control bodies, and to promote publicity. But all that has been and is being done should be assessed in terms of the scale and complexity of our new tasks, rather than by yesterday's standards. As stressed in the new edition of the Party Programme, these tasks call for

consistent and unswerving development of the *people's socialist self-government*.

In socialist society, particularly under the present circumstances, government should not be the privilege of a narrow circle of professionals. We know from theory and from our extensive experience that the socialist system can develop successfully only when the people really run their own affairs, when millions of people are involved in political life. This is what the working people's self-government amounts to, as Lenin saw it. It is the essence of Soviet power. The elements of self-government develop within rather than outside our statehood, increasingly penetrating all aspects of state and public life, enriching the content of democratic centralism and strengthening its socialist character.

The Party is the guiding force and the principal guarantor of the development of socialist self-government. Playing the leading role in society, the Party is itself the highest form of a self-governing socio-political organisation. By promoting inner-Party democracy and intensifying the activity of Communists at all levels of the political system, the CPSU sets the right direction for the process of furthering the people's socialist self-government and broadening the participation of the masses and of each person in the affairs of the country.

The result of the revolutionary creativity of the working people, the *Soviets of People's Deputies* have stood the test of time, displaying their viability and vast potentialities in securing full power for the people, in uniting and mobilising the masses. The very logic of the development of socialist democracy shows the urgent need for making the maximum use of these potentialities of Soviet representative bodies.

The fact that the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Supreme Soviets of the Union and Autonomous Republics are becoming increasingly businesslike and effective in their activity with each passing year is most welcome. It is their duty to consistently improve legislation, supervise law enforcement and check on the actual outcome of the work done by each state body and each executive. At their sessions, the Supreme Soviets should place greater emphasis on discussing proposals submitted by trade unions, the Komsomol, and other public organisations, the reports of administrative bodies, the situation

in different branches of the economy, and the development of the various regions.

I should like to draw special attention of Congress delegates to the activity of *local Soviets*. Today they can and must serve as one of the most effective means of mobilising the masses for the effort to accelerate the country's socio-economic development. As they receive the electorate's mandate, local government bodies undertake responsibility for all aspects of life on their territory. If someone may be allowed to say, "This is none of my business", this approach is certainly unacceptable to the Soviets. Housing and education, public health and consumer goods, trade and services, public transport and the protection of nature are principal concerns of the Soviets. Whenever we hear complaints from working people on these subjects, which is still fairly often, it means that the Soviets lack efficiency and initiative, and that their control is slack. But while making legitimate demands on the Soviets, we should not be blind to the fact that for the time being their ability to tackle many of the local problems is limited; there exists excessive centralisation in matters which are not always clearly visible from the centre and can be much better solved locally.

That is why we resolutely follow a course of promoting the autonomy and activity of local government bodies. Proposals to this effect are currently being worked out by the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers. Their goal is to make each Soviet a complete and responsible master in all things concerning the satisfaction of people's everyday needs and requirements; in using the allocated funds, the local potentialities and reserves; in coordinating and supervising the work of all organisations involved in servicing the population. In this connection, we must make a thorough examination of the relationship between Soviets and the centrally-managed enterprises in their territories, and increase the local governing bodies' interest in the results of their work.

The sessions of Soviets should be conducted far more effectively, the analytical and supervisory activity of standing committees should be more thorough, and the practice of deputies' enquiries should be improved. The committees' recommenda-

tions and the deputies' proposals and observations should be carefully considered and taken into account by the executive bodies.

While mapping out further improvements of the work of the Soviets, we should remember that none of them will yield the desired results unless backed by the deputies' initiative. The Party will continue to see to it that deputies are elected from among the worthiest people who are capable of effectively running state affairs, and that the composition of the Soviets is systematically renewed. In this connection, it is apparently time to make necessary corrections in our election procedures as well. There is quite a number of outstanding problems here awaiting solution.

The Party has always deemed it its duty to heighten the authority of the people's representatives, and, at the same time, to enhance their responsibility to the electorate in every way possible. The title of a deputy is not just something that goes with one's office; it is not an honorary privilege; it means a lot of hard work at the Soviet and among the population. And we must do all we can for the strict observance of the law on the status of deputies, and see to it that each deputy should be afforded every opportunity to exercise his or her authority.

The development of the people's self-government calls for a *further strengthening of democratic principles in administration*, in the activity of the Soviets' executive committees, of their apparatus, and of all other government bodies. Most of the people working in them are competent and take what they do close to heart. However, one should always remember that, even if its executives are masterminds, no apparatus will ever get what it wants unless it relies on the working people's motivated support and participation in government. The times are making increasingly exacting demands on the work of the apparatus. And there are quite a few shortcomings here; one often encounters departmental approach and localism, irresponsibility, red tape and formal indifference to people. One of the main reasons for this is the slackening of control over the activity of the apparatus by the working people, the Soviets themselves, and public organisations.

Bearing all this in mind, the Party has set itself the task of putting to use all the instruments that actually enable every

citizen to actively influence administrative decision-making, verify the fulfilment of decisions, and receive necessary information about the activity of the apparatus. This should be the purpose of a system of regular reports to work collectives and general meetings by all administrative bodies. Much can be done in this area by people's control committees, groups and teams, by voluntary trade union inspectors, and the mass media.

The elective bodies themselves should be more exacting and strict towards their own apparatus. One cannot overlook the fact that executives who remain in office for long periods tend to lose their feel for the new, to shut themselves off from the people by instructions they have concocted themselves, and sometimes even hold back the work of elective bodies. Apparently it is time to work out a procedure which would enable Soviets, as well as all public bodies, to evaluate and certify the work of the responsible executives of their apparatus after each election, making desirable personnel changes.

Our time demands ever more active involvement on the part of *public organisations* in governing the country. When the work of our public organisations is considered from this angle, however, it becomes clear that many of them show a lack of initiative. Some of them try to operate above all through their regular staff, in a bureaucratic way, and lean only a little on the masses. In other words, the popular, creative, independent nature of public organisations is far from being fully realised.

In our country, the *trade unions* are the largest mass organisation. On the whole, they do a lot to satisfy the requirements of factory and office workers and collective farmers, to promote emulation, tighten discipline and heighten labour productivity. Still, trade union committees are in many cases lacking in perseverance and resolve when it comes to defending the working people's legitimate interests, ensuring labour protection and safety, and constructing and running health-building, sports and cultural facilities. Understandably, such passivity suits those managers for whom production sometimes obscures the people. The trade unions, however, should always give priority to social policy objectives, to promoting the working people's interests. Properly speaking, this is the basic purpose of their activity. The All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and other trade union bodies enjoy extensive rights and control considerable

funds, both the state's and their own. It is up to them, therefore, to make extensive and confident use of them, instead of waiting for somebody else to fulfil the tasks they are charged with.

Comrades, our future largely depends on the kind of young people we are bringing up today. That is the task of the whole Party, of all the people. It is the most important and fundamental task of the *Lenin Young Communist League*. Our young people are hard-working, ready for exploits and self-sacrifice, and devoted to socialism. Nonetheless, it is the duty of the older generations to do everything they can for those who will replace them to be still more intelligent, more capable and better educated, worthy of taking the baton and carrying into the future the ideals of justice and freedom bequeathed to us by the Great October Revolution.

As Lenin said, it is impossible to master communism through books alone, it is impossible to cultivate a sense of responsibility without charging people with responsible tasks. The young people of the 1980s are broad-minded, well-educated and vigorous. I should say, they are ready for action and look for a chance to show their worth in all areas of public life. So, the YCL must make every effort to support their drive in all areas—the national economy, science and engineering, in achieving high levels of knowledge and culture, in political life, and in defending the Motherland. This effort, more than any other, should be of a questing nature, interesting and appealing to young people, and closely linked to the needs of the young in production, study, home life, and leisure.

Together with the YCL, the Party, government and economic bodies should consistently seek to promote deserving young people to leadership positions in management, production, science and culture. We say: in our country, all roads are open to young people. That is true. But persistent efforts are needed for these words not to lose lustre and the road for young people to be really wide.

By and large, the CPSU Central Committee deems it advisable to take further steps to increase the role of the trade unions, the YCL, the unions of creative workers and voluntary societies in the system of the people's socialist self-government. In particular, it is planned to extend the range of questions which government bodies can settle only with the participation or prior

agreement of trade union, YCL or women's organisations and to grant these organisations the right to suspend, in some cases, the implementation of administrative decisions.

Our Party Programme aims at the most effective exercise of all forms of *direct democracy*, of direct participation by the popular masses in the elaboration, adoption and execution of governmental and other decisions. An enormous role is played here by the *work collectives* operating in all spheres of the life of society, and chiefly in the national economy. The granting of broader powers to enterprises, the introduction of cost accounting, and promotion of the spirit of socialist enterprise will become truly effective only if the working man himself displays greater activity. We cannot put up with instances which still exist, where workers do not know the programmes of their own enterprises, where their suggestions do not receive due attention and are not taken into account. These instances show that in some places the force of inertia determines the state of affairs, hinders the involvement of factory and office workers in management and impedes the process of fostering among them the feeling that they are full-fledged masters of production.

The Law on Work Collectives adopted about three years ago has indisputably stimulated initiatives by work collectives. But we cannot yet say this Law is producing the results we expected. This is evident from the CPSU Central Committee's examination of its application at the Minsk Motor Works and elsewhere. Our conclusion is unambiguous: it is necessary to radically improve the mechanism that enables us to make the democratic principles and norms of the Law operative in everyday practice. Step by step we must extend the range of issues on which the work collective's decisions are final, enhance the role of the general meetings of factory and office workers and raise responsibility for implementing their decisions. There has arisen an idea of having a council, say, of the work collective made up of representatives of the management, Party, trade union and YCL organisations, team councils, rank-and-file workers, and specialists, function, in the period between general meetings, both at the level of teams and the enterprise as a whole.

Today the advanced teams which apply the cost-accounting principle are already becoming primary self-government units with elected managers. Life shows the viability of this practice.

It has confirmed that in applying democratic economic management principles it is advisable to extend the principle of electiveness to all team leaders and then gradually to some other categories of managerial personnel—foremen, shift, sector or shop superintendents, and state-farm department managers. Long years of experience testify that this is the direction in which we must look for modern forms of combining centralism and democracy, of combining one-man management and the principle of electiveness in running the national economy.

Undeviating observance of the democratic principles of guiding collective farms and other cooperative organisations, including observance of their rules, is a matter which receives our constant attention. In recent times our efforts in this sphere have somehow relaxed, and too many organisations have been interfering in the activities of cooperative societies. Party and government bodies must see to it that collective-farm or cooperative self-government is exercised unflinchingly, that any attempts to resort to pressure or to practise armchair management are thwarted.

Our Constitution provides for nation-wide discussions and referendums on major issues of our country's life and for discussions on decisions to be passed by local Soviets. We must expedite the drafting of a law on this highly important question. We must make better use of such reliable channels for the development of direct democracy as citizens' meetings, constituents' mandates, letters from people, the press, radio, TV and all other means of eliciting public opinion and of quickly and considerately responding to the people's needs and mood.

Broader publicity is a matter of principle to us. It is a political issue. Without publicity there is not, nor can there be, democracy, political creativity of the citizens and participation by the citizens in administration and management. This is an earnest, if you like, of a responsible statesmanlike attitude to the common cause on the part of millions upon millions of factory workers, collective farmers and members of the intelligentsia, and a point of departure in the psychological reorientation of our cadres.

When the subject of publicity comes up, calls are sometimes made for exercising greater caution when speaking about the shortcomings, omissions, and difficulties that are inevitable in

any ongoing effort. There can only be one answer to this, a Leninist answer: Communists want the truth, always and under all circumstances. The experience of the past year has shown how forcefully Soviet people support an uncompromising appraisal of everything that impedes our advance. But those who have grown used to doing slipshod work, to practising deception, indeed feel really awkward in the glare of publicity, when everything done in the state and in society is under the people's control and is in full public view. Therefore, we must make publicity an unfailingly operative system. It is needed in the centre and no less, perhaps much more, in the localities, wherever people live and work. The citizen wants to know, and should know, not only decisions taken on a nation-wide scale but also decisions taken locally by Party and government bodies, factory managements and trade unions.

The whole range of the *Soviet citizen's socio-political and personal rights and freedoms* should promote the broadening and further development of socialist democracy. The Party and the state regard the deepening of these rights and freedoms and the strengthening of their guarantees as their primary duty. But the gist of socialism is that the rights of citizens do not, and cannot, exist outside their duties, just as there cannot be duties without corresponding rights.

It is essential to stimulate the activity of our citizens, of one and all, in constructive work, in eliminating shortcomings, abuses and all other unhealthy phenomena, all departures from our legal and moral standards. Democracy was and remains a major lever for *strengthening socialist legality*, and stable legality was and remains an inseparable part of our democracy.

A good deal of work has been done lately to strengthen law and order in all spheres of the life of society. But the efforts in this direction must not be slackened in any way. We must continue to improve Soviet legislation. Our legislation—the civil, labour, financial, administrative, economic and criminal laws—must help more vigorously in introducing economically viable management methods, in exercising effective control over the measure of labour and consumption and in translating the principles of social justice into reality.

We must persistently increase the responsibility of the law-enforcement and other bodies, and strengthen the legal service in

the Soviets and in the national economy, and state arbitration, and also improve the legal education of the population. As before, full use must be made of Soviet legislation in combating crime and other breaches of the law, so that the people in towns and villages know that the state is concerned about their peace and personal inviolability, and that not a single wrongdoer evades the punishment he deserves.

We must very strictly observe the democratic principles of justice, the equality of citizens before the law and other guarantees that protect the interests of the state and of every citizen. In this context it is necessary to take vigorous steps to enhance the role of the procurators' supervision, to improve the functioning of courts of law and the bar, and to complete, in the very near future, the drafting of a law, as provided for by the Constitution, on the procedure of filing appeals in court against unlawful actions by officials that infringe upon the rights of citizens. Naturally, the more vigorously Party and government bodies, trade unions, the YCL, work collectives, and volunteer public order squads, and the public at large, are involved in such effort, the more fully legality and law and order will be ensured.

In the context of the growing subversive activity by imperialist special services against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, greater responsibility devolves upon the *state security bodies*. Under the Party's leadership and scrupulously observing Soviet laws, these bodies are conducting extensive work to expose enemy intrigues, to frustrate all kinds of subversion and to protect our country's sacred frontiers. We are convinced that Soviet security forces and border-guards will always meet the demands made of them, will always display vigilance, self-control and tenacity in the struggle against any encroachment on our political and social system.

Taking into account the complicated international situation and the growing aggressiveness of the reactionary imperialist quarters, the CPSU Central Committee and its Political Bureau pay unflagging attention to *our country's defence capability, to the combat might of the Armed Forces of the USSR*, to the tightening of military discipline. The Soviet Army and Navy have modern arms and equipment, well-trained servicemen and skilled officers and political cadres who are completely dedicated to the people. They acquit themselves with honour in the most

complicated, and at times rigorous, situations. Today we can declare with all responsibility that the defence capability of the USSR is maintained on a level that makes it possible to protect reliably the peaceful life and labour of the Soviet people.

The Party and the Government have always been striving to ensure that the Soviet soldier and officer are constantly aware of our society's care and attention while performing their arduous duties, and that our Armed Forces are a school of civic responsibility, fortitude and patriotism.

It is clear, comrades, that here, at this Congress, we are merely charting the general framework and the main outlines for perfecting our democracy, statehood, and the entire Soviet political system. Implementation of the Congress decisions undoubtedly will bring about fresh manifestations of the people's initiative and new forms of mass social and political creative activity.

IV. BASIC AIMS AND DIRECTIONS OF THE PARTY'S FOREIGN POLICY STRATEGY

Comrades,

The tasks underlying the country's economic and social development also determine the CPSU's strategy in the world arena. Its main aim is crystal clear—to provide the Soviet people with the possibility of working under conditions of lasting peace and freedom. Such, in essence, is the Party's primary programme requirement of our foreign policy. To fulfil it in the present situation means, above all, to terminate the material preparations for nuclear war.

After having weighed all the aspects of the situation that has taken shape, the CPSU has put forward a coherent programme for the total abolition of weapons of mass destruction before the end of this century, a programme that is historic in terms of its dimensions and significance. Its realisation would open for mankind a fundamentally new period of development and provide an opportunity to concentrate entirely on constructive labour.

As you know, we have addressed our proposals not only through the traditional diplomatic channels but also directly to world public opinion, to the peoples. The time has come to realise thoroughly the harsh realities of our day: nuclear weapons harbour a hurricane which is capable of sweeping the human race from the face of the earth. Our address further underscores the open, honest, Leninist character of the CPSU's foreign policy strategy.

Socialism unconditionally rejects war as a means of settling political and economic contradictions and ideological disputes

among states. Our ideal is a world without weapons and violence, a world in which each people freely chooses its path of development, its way of life. This is an expression of the humanism of communist ideology, of its moral values. That is why for the future as well the *struggle against the nuclear threat, against the arms race, for the preservation and strengthening of universal peace* remains the fundamental direction of the Party's activities in the international arena.

There is no alternative to this policy. This is all the more true in periods of tension in international affairs. It seems that never in the decades since the war has the situation in the world been so explosive, and consequently complex and uncongenial as in the first half of the 1980s. The right-wing group that came to power in the USA and its main NATO fellow-travellers made a steep turn from detente to a policy of military strength. They have adopted doctrines that reject good-neighbour relations and cooperation as principles of world development, as a political philosophy of international relations. The Washington Administration remained deaf to our calls for an end to the arms race and an improvement of the situation.

Perhaps it may not be worth churning up the past? Especially today when in Soviet-US relations there seem to be signs of a change for the better, and realistic trends can now be detected in the actions and attitudes of the leadership of some NATO nations. We feel that it is worthwhile, for the drastic frosting of the international climate in the first half of the 1980s was a further reminder that nothing comes of itself: peace has to be fought for, and this has to be a persevering and purposeful fight. We have to look for, find, and use even the smallest opportunity in order—while this is still possible—to reverse the trend towards an escalation of the threat of war. Realising this, the Central Committee of the CPSU at its April Plenary Meeting once again analysed the character and dimensions of the nuclear threat and defined the practical steps that could lead to an improvement of the situation. We were guided by the following considerations of principle.

First. The character of present-day weapons leaves any country no hope of safeguarding itself solely with military and technical means, for example, by building up a defence system, even the most powerful one. The task of ensuring security is increasingly

seen as a political problem, and it can only be resolved by political means. In order to progress along the road of disarmament what is needed is, above all, the will. Security cannot be built endlessly on fear of retaliation, in other words, on the doctrines of "containment" or "deterrence". Apart from the absurdity and amorality of a situation in which the whole world becomes a nuclear hostage, these doctrines encourage an arms race that may sooner or later go out of control.

Second. In the context of the relations between the USSR and the USA, security can only be mutual, and if we take international relations as a whole it can only be universal. The highest wisdom is not in caring exclusively for oneself, especially to the detriment of the other side. It is vital that all should feel equally secure, for the fears and anxieties of the nuclear age generate unpredictability in politics and concrete actions. It is becoming extremely important to take the critical significance of the time factor into account. The appearance of new systems of weapons of mass destruction steadily shortens time and narrows down the possibilities for adopting political decisions on questions of war and peace in crisis situations.

Third. The USA, its military-industrial machine remains the locomotive of militarism, for so far it has no intention of slowing down. This has to be taken into consideration, of course. But we are well aware that the interests and aims of the military-industrial complex are not at all the same as the interests and aims of the American people, as the actual national interests of that great country.

Naturally, the world is much larger than the USA and its occupation bases on foreign soil. And in world politics one cannot confine oneself to relations with only one, even a very important, country. As we know from experience, this only promotes the arrogance of strength. Needless to say, we attach considerable significance to the state and character of the relations between the Soviet Union and the USA. Our countries coincide on quite a few points, and there is the objective need to live in peace with each other, to cooperate on a basis of equality and mutual benefit, and on this basis alone.

Fourth. The world is in a process of swift changes, and it is not within anybody's power to maintain a perpetual status quo in it. It consists of many dozens of countries, each having per-

fectly legitimate interests. All without exception face a task of fundamental significance: without neglecting social, political, and ideological differences all have to master the science and art of restraint and circumspection on the international scene, to live in a civilised manner, in other words, under conditions of civil international intercourse and cooperation. But to give this cooperation wide scope there has to be an all-embracing system of international economic security that would in equal measure protect every nation against discrimination, sanctions, and other attributes of imperialist, neocolonialist policy. Alongside disarmament such a system can become a dependable pillar of international security in general.

In short, the modern world has become much too small and fragile for wars and a policy of strength. It cannot be saved and preserved if the way of thinking and actions built up over the centuries on the acceptability and permissibility of wars and armed conflicts are not shed once and for all, resolutely and irrevocably.

This means the realisation that it is no longer possible to win an arms race, or nuclear war for that matter. The continuation of this race on earth, let alone its spread to outer space, will accelerate the already critically high rate of stockpiling and perfecting nuclear weapons. The situation in the world may assume such a character that it will no longer depend upon the intelligence or will of political leaders. It may become captive to technology, to technocratic military logic. Consequently, not only nuclear war itself but also the preparations for it, in other words, the arms race, the *aspiration to win military superiority can, speaking in objective terms, bring no political gain to anybody.*

Further, this means understanding that the present level of the balance of the nuclear potentials of the opposite sides is much too high. For the time being it ensures *equal danger* to each of them. But only for the time being. Continuation of the nuclear arms race will inevitably heighten this equal threat and may bring it to a point where even parity will cease to be a factor of military-political deterrence. Consequently, it is vital, in the first place, greatly to reduce the level of military confrontation. In our age, genuine equal security is guaranteed not by the highest possible, but by the lowest possible level of stra-

tegic parity, from which nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction must be totally excluded.

Lastly, this means realising that in the present situation there is no alternative to cooperation and interaction between all countries. Thus, the objective—I emphasise, objective—conditions have taken shape in which confrontation between capitalism and socialism can proceed *only and exclusively in forms of peaceful contest.*

For us peaceful coexistence is a political course which the USSR intends to go on following unswervingly, ensuring the continuity of its foreign policy strategy. The CPSU will pursue a vigorous international policy stemming from the realities of the world we live in. Of course, the problem of international security cannot be resolved by one or two, even very intensive, peace campaigns. Success can only be achieved by consistent, methodical, and persevering effort.

Continuity in foreign policy has nothing in common with a simple repetition of what has been done, especially in tackling the problems that have piled up. What is needed is a high degree of accuracy in assessing one's own possibilities, restraint, and an exceptionally high sense of responsibility when decisions are made. What is wanted is firmness in upholding principles and stands, tactical flexibility, a readiness for mutually acceptable compromises, and an orientation on dialogue and mutual understanding rather than on confrontation.

As you know, we have made a series of unilateral steps—we put a moratorium on the deployment of intermediate-range missiles in Europe, cut back the number of these missiles, and stopped all nuclear explosions. In Moscow and abroad there have been talks with leaders and members of the governments of many countries. The Soviet-Indian, Soviet-French, and Soviet-US summits were necessary and useful steps.

The Soviet Union has made energetic efforts to give a fresh impetus to the negotiations in Geneva, Stockholm, and Vienna, the purpose of which is to curb the arms race and strengthen confidence between states. Negotiations are always a delicate and complex matter. Of cardinal importance here is to make an effort to achieve a mutually acceptable balance of interests. To turn weapons of mass destruction into an object of political

scheming is, to say the least, immoral, while in political terms this is irresponsible.

Lastly, concerning our Statement of January 15 of this year. Taken as a whole, our programme is essentially an alloy of the philosophy of shaping a safe world in the nuclear-space age with a platform of concrete actions. The Soviet Union offers approaching the problems of disarmament in their totality, for in terms of security they are linked with one another. I am not speaking of rigid linkages or attempts at "giving way" in one direction in order to erect barricades in another. What I have in mind is a plan of concrete actions strictly measured out in terms of time. The USSR intends to work perseveringly for its realisation, regarding it as the *central direction of its foreign policy for the coming years*.

The *Soviet military doctrine* is also entirely in keeping with the letter and spirit of the initiatives we have put forward. Its orientation is unequivocally defensive. In the military sphere we intend to act in such a way as to give nobody grounds for fears, even imagined ones, about their security. But to an equal extent we and our allies want to be rid of the feeling that we are threatened. The USSR undertook the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and it will abide strictly by that obligation. But it is no secret that scenarios for a nuclear strike against us do exist. We have no right to overlook this. The Soviet Union is a staunch adversary of nuclear war in any variant. Our country stands for removing weapons of mass destruction from use, for limiting the military potential to reasonable adequacy. But the character and level of this ceiling continue to be restricted by the attitudes and actions of the USA and its partners in the blocs. Under these conditions we repeat again and again: *the Soviet Union lays no claim to more security, but it will not settle for less*.

I should like to draw attention to the problem of verification, to which we attach special significance. We have declared on several occasions that the USSR is open to verification, that we are interested in it as much as anybody else. All-embracing, strictest verification is perhaps the key element of the disarmament process. The essence of the matter, in our opinion, is that *there can be no disarmament without verification and that verification without disarmament makes no sense*.

There is yet another matter of principle. We have stated our attitude to Star Wars quite substantively. The USA has already drawn many of its allies into this programme. There is the danger that this state of things may become irreversible. Before it is too late, it is imperative to find a realistic solution *guaranteeing that the arms race does not spread to outer space*. The Star Wars programme cannot be permitted to be used as a stimulus for a further arms race or as a roadblock to radical disarmament. Tangible progress in what concerns a drastic reduction of nuclear potentials can be of much help in surmounting this obstacle. For that reason the Soviet Union is ready to make a substantial step in that direction, to resolve the question of intermediate-range missiles in the European zone separately—without linking it to problems of strategic armaments and outer space.

The Soviet programme has touched the hearts of millions of people, and among political leaders and public personalities interest in it continues to grow. The times today are such that it is hard to brush it off. The attempts to sow doubt in the Soviet Union's constructive commitment to accelerate the solution of the pressing problem of our day—the destruction of nuclear weapons—and to tackle it in practical terms are becoming less and less convincing. Nuclear disarmament should not be the exclusive domain of political leaders. The whole world is now pondering over this, for it is a question of life itself.

But, also, it is necessary to take into account the reaction of the centres of power that hold in their hands the keys to the success or failure of disarmament negotiations. Of course, the US ruling class, to be more exact its most egoistical groups linked to the military-industrial complex, have other aims that are clearly opposite to ours. For them disarmament spells out a loss of profits and a political risk, for us it is a blessing in all respects—economically, politically, and morally.

We know our principal opponents and have accumulated a complex and extensive experience in our relations and talks with them. The day before yesterday, we received President Reagan's reply to our Statement of January 15. The US side began to set forth its considerations in greater detail at the talks in Geneva. To be sure, we shall closely examine everything the US side

has to say on these matters. However, since the reply was received literally on the eve of the Congress, the US Administration apparently expects, as we understand it, that our attitude to the US stand will be made known to the world from this rostrum.

What I can say right away is that the President's letter does not give ground for amending in any way the assessment of the international situation as had been set forth in the report before the reply was received. The report says that the elimination of nuclear arms is the goal all the nuclear powers should strive for. In his letter the President agrees in general with some or other Soviet proposals and intentions as regards the issues of disarmament and security. In other words, the reply seems to contain some reassuring opinions and statements.

However these positive pronouncements are drowning in various reservations, "linkages" and "conditions" which in fact block the solution of radical problems of disarmament. Reduction in the strategic nuclear arsenals is made conditional on our consent to the Star Wars programme and reductions, unilateral, by the way, in the Soviet conventional arms. Linked to this are also problems of regional conflicts and bilateral relations. The elimination of nuclear arms in Europe is blocked by the references to the stand taken by Great Britain and France and the demand to weaken our defences in the eastern part of the country, while the US military forces in that region remain as they are. The refusal to stop nuclear tests is justified by arguments to the effect that nuclear weapons serve as a factor of "containment". This is in direct contradiction with the purpose reaffirmed in the letter—the need to do away with nuclear weapons. The reluctance of the USA and its ruling circles to embark on the path of nuclear disarmament manifests itself most clearly in their attitude to nuclear explosions the termination of which is the demand of the whole world.

To put it in a nutshell, it is hard to detect in the letter we have just received any serious readiness by the US Administration to get down to solving the cardinal problems involved in eliminating the nuclear threat. It looks as if some people in Washington and elsewhere, for that matter, have got used to living side by side with nuclear weapons linking with them their plans in the international arena. However, whether they want it or not,

the Western politicians will have to answer the question: are they prepared to part with nuclear weapons at all?

In accordance with an understanding reached in Geneva there will be another meeting with the US President. The significance that we attach to it is that it ought to produce practical results in key areas of limiting and reducing armaments. There are at least two matters on which an understanding could be reached: the cessation of nuclear tests and the abolition of US and Soviet intermediate-range missiles in the European zone. And then, as a matter of fact, if there is readiness to seek agreement, the question of the date of the meeting would be resolved of itself: we will accept any suggestion on this count. But there is no sense in empty talks. And we shall not remain indifferent if the Soviet-US dialogue that has started and inspired some not unfounded hopes of a possibility for changes for the better is used to continue the arms race and the material preparations for war. It is the firm intention of the Soviet Union to justify the hopes of the peoples of our two countries and of the whole world who are expecting from the leaders of the USSR and the USA concrete steps, practical actions, and tangible agreements on how to curb the arms race. We are prepared for this.

Naturally, like any other country, we attach considerable importance to the security of our frontiers, on land and at sea. We have many neighbours, and they are different. We have no territorial claims on any of them. We threaten none of them. But as experience has shown time and again, there are quite a few persons who, in disregard of the national interests of either our country or those of countries neighbouring upon us, are endeavouring to aggravate the situation on the frontiers of the Soviet Union.

For instance, counter-revolution and imperialism have turned Afghanistan into a bleeding wound. The USSR supports that country's efforts to defend its sovereignty. We should like, in the nearest future, to withdraw the Soviet troops stationed in Afghanistan at the request of its government. Moreover, we have agreed with the Afghan side on the schedule for their phased withdrawal as soon as a political settlement is reached that will ensure an actual cessation and dependably guarantee the non-resumption of foreign armed interference in the internal affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. It is in our vital,

national interest that the USSR should always have good and peaceful relations with all its neighbours. This is a vitally important objective of our foreign policy.

The CPSU regards the *European direction* as one of the main directions of its international activity. Europe's historic opportunity and its future lie in peaceful cooperation among the nations of that continent. And it is important, while preserving the assets that have already been accumulated, to move further: from the initial to a more lasting phase of detente, to mature detente, and then to the building of dependable security on the basis of the Helsinki process and a radical reduction of nuclear and conventional weapons.

The significance of the *Asian and Pacific direction* is growing. In that vast region there are many tangled knots of contradictions and, besides, the political situation in some places is unstable. Here it is necessary, without postponement, to search for the relevant solutions and paths. Evidently, it is expedient to begin with the coordination and then the pooling of efforts in the interests of a political settlement of painful problems so as, in parallel, on that basis to at least take the edge off the military confrontation in various parts of Asia and stabilise the situation there.

This is made all the more urgent by the fact that in Asia and other continents the *flashpoints of military danger* are not being extinguished. We are in favour of vitalising collective quests for ways of defusing conflict situations in the Middle East, Central America, Southern Africa, in all of the planet's turbulent points. This is imperatively demanded by the interests of general security.

Crises and conflicts are fertile soil also for international terrorism. Undeclared wars, the export of counter-revolution in all forms, political assassinations, the taking of hostages, the high-jacking of aircraft, and bomb explosions in streets, airports, and railway stations—such is the hideous face of terrorism, which its instigators try to mask with all sorts of cynical inventions. The USSR rejects terrorism in principle and is prepared to cooperate actively with other states in order to uproot it. The Soviet Union will resolutely safeguard its citizens against acts of violence and do everything to defend their lives, honour, and dignity.

Looking back over the past year one will see that, by all the evidence, the prerequisites for improving the international situation are beginning to form. But prerequisites for a turn are not the turn itself. The arms race continues and the threat of nuclear war remains. However, international reactionary forces are by no means omnipotent. The development of the world revolutionary process and the growth of mass democratic and anti-war movements have significantly enlarged and strengthened the *huge potential of peace, reason, and good will*. This is a powerful counter-balance to imperialism's aggressive policy.

The destinies of peace and social progress are now linked more closely than ever before with the dynamic character of the *socialist world system's economic and political development*. The need for this dynamism is dictated by concern for the welfare of the peoples. But for the socialist world it is necessary also from the standpoint of counteraction to the military threat. Lastly, it helps demonstrate the potentialities of the socialist way of life. We are watched by both friends and foes. We are watched by the huge and heterogeneous world of developing nations. It is looking for its choice, for its road, and what this choice will be depends to a large extent on socialism's successes, on the credibility of its answers to the challenges of time.

We are convinced that socialism can resolve the most difficult problems confronting it. Of vital significance for this is the increasingly vigorous interaction whose effect is not merely the adding up but the multiplication of our potentials and which serves as a stimulus for common advancement. This is reflected also in joint documents of countries of the socialist community.

Interaction between governing communist parties remains the *heart and soul of the political cooperation among these countries*. During the past year there has been practically no fraternal country with whose leaders we have not had meetings and detailed talks. The forms of such cooperation are themselves being updated. A new and perhaps key element, the multilateral working meetings of leaders of fraternal countries, is being established. These meetings allow for prompt and friendly consultations on the entire spectrum of problems of socialist construction, on its internal and external aspects.

In the difficult international situation the prolongation of the *Warsaw Treaty* by a unanimous decision of its signatories was

of great significance. This Treaty saw its second birth, so to speak, and today it is hard to picture world politics as a whole without it. Take the Sofia Conference of the Treaty's Political Consultative Committee. It was a kind of threshold of the Geneva dialogue.

In the *economic sphere* there is now the Comprehensive Programme of Scientific and Technological Progress. Its importance lies in the transition of the CMEA countries to a coordinated policy in science and technology. In our view, changes are also required in the work of the very headquarters of socialist integration—the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. But the main thing is that in carrying out this programme there is less armchair administration and fewer committees and commissions of all sorts, that more attention is given to economic levers, initiative, and socialist enterprise, and that work collectives are drawn into this process. This would indeed be a Party approach to such an extraordinary undertaking.

Vitality, efficiency, and initiative—all these qualities meet the requirements of the times, and we shall strive to have them spread throughout the system of relations between fraternal parties. The CPSU attaches growing significance to live and broad communication between citizens of socialist countries, between people of different professions and different generations. This is a source of mutual intellectual enrichment, a channel for exchanges of views, ideas, and the *experience of socialist construction*. Today it is especially important to analyse the character of the socialist way of life and understand the processes of perfecting democracy, management methods and personnel policy on the basis of the development of several countries rather than of one country. A considerate and respectful attitude to each other's experience and the employment of this experience in practice are a huge potential of the socialist world.

Generally speaking, one of socialism's advantages is its ability to learn: to learn to resolve the problems posed by life; to learn to forestall the crisis situations that our class adversary tries to create and utilise; to learn to counter the attempts to divide the socialist world and play off some countries against others; to learn to prevent collisions of the interests of different socialist countries, harmonise them by mutual effort, and find mutually acceptable solutions even to the most intricate problems.

It seems to us that it is worth taking a close look also at the relations in the socialist world as a whole. We do not see the community as being separated by some barrier from other socialist countries. The CPSU stands for honest, aboveboard relations with all communist parties and all countries of the socialist world system, for comradely exchanges of opinion between them. Above all, we endeavour to see what unites the socialist world. For that reason the Soviet Communists are gladdened by every step towards closer relations among all socialist states, by every positive advance in these relations.

One can say with gratification that there has been a measure of improvement of the Soviet Union's relations with its great neighbour—*Socialist China*. The distinctions in attitudes, in particular to a number of international problems, remain. But we also note something else—that in many cases we can work jointly, cooperate on an equal and principled basis, without prejudice to third countries.

There is no need to explain the significance of this. The Chinese Communists called the victory of the USSR and the forces of progress in the Second World War a prologue to the triumph of the people's revolution in China. In turn, the formation of People's China helped to reinforce socialism's positions in the world and disrupt many of imperialism's designs and actions in the difficult postwar years. In thinking of the future, it may be said that the potentialities for cooperation between the USSR and China are enormous. They are great because such cooperation is in accordance with the interests of both countries; because what is dearest to our peoples—socialism and peace—is indivisible.

The CPSU is an inalienable component of the international communist movement. We the Soviet Communists are well aware that every advance we make in building socialism is an advance of the entire movement. For that reason the CPSU sees its primary internationalist duty in ensuring our country's successful progress along the road opened and blazed by the October Revolution.

The communist movement in the non-socialist part of the world remains the principal target of political pressure and persecution by reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie. All the fraternal parties are constantly under fire from anti-communist

propaganda, which does not scruple to use the most despicable means and methods. Many parties operate underground, in a situation of unmitigated persecution and repressions. Every step the Communists take calls for struggle and personal courage. Permit me, comrades, on behalf of the 27th Congress, on behalf of the Soviet Communists to express sincere admiration for the dedicated struggle of our comrades, and profound fraternal solidarity with them.

In recent years the communist movement has come face to face with many new realities, tasks, and problems. There are all indications that it has entered upon a qualitatively new phase of development. The international conditions of the work of Communists are changing rapidly and profoundly. A substantial restructuring is taking place in the social pattern of bourgeois society, including the composition of the working class. The problems facing our friends in the newly independent states are not simple. The scientific and technological revolution is exercising a contradictory influence on the material condition and consciousness of working people in the non-socialist world. All this requires the ability to do a lot of reappraising and demands a bold and creative approach to the new realities on the basis of the immortal theory of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. The CPSU knows this well from its own experience.

The communist movement's immense diversity and the tasks that it encounters are likewise a reality. In some cases this leads to disagreements and divergences. The CPSU is not dramatising the fact that complete unanimity among communist parties exists not always and not in everything. Evidently, there generally cannot be an identity of views on all issues without exception. The communist movement came into being when the working class entered the international scene as an independent and powerful political force. The parties that comprise it have grown on national soil and pursue common end objectives—peace and socialism. This is the main, determining thing that unites them.

We do not see the diversity of our movement as a synonym for disunity, much as unity has nothing in common with uniformity, hierarchy, interference by some parties in the affairs of others, or the striving of any party to have a monopoly over what is right. The communist movement can and should be strong by virtue of its class solidarity, of equal cooperation among all

the fraternal parties in the struggle for common aims. This is how the CPSU understands unity and it intends to do everything to foster it.

The trend towards strengthening the potential of peace, reason, and good will is enduring and in principle irreversible. At the back of it is the desire of people, of all nations to live in concord and to cooperate. However, one should look at things realistically: the balance of strength in the struggle against war is shaping in the course of an acute and dynamic confrontation between progress and reaction. An immutable factor is the CPSU's solidarity with the forces of national liberation and social emancipation, and our course towards close interaction with socialist-oriented countries, with revolutionary-democratic parties, and with the non-aligned movement. The Soviet public is prepared to go on promoting links with non-communist movements and organisations, including religious organisations that are against war.

This is also the angle from which the CPSU regards its relations with the *social democratic movement*. It is a fact that the ideological differences between the Communists and the Social Democrats are deep, and that their achievements and experience are dissimilar and non-equivalent. However, an unbiassed look at the standpoints and views of each other is unquestionably useful to both the Communists and the Social Democrats, useful in the first place for furthering the struggle for peace and international security.

We are living in a world of realities and are building our international policy in keeping with the specific features of the present phase of international development. A creative analysis of this phase and vision of prospects have led us to a conclusion that is highly significant. Now, as never before, it is important to find ways for closer and more productive cooperation with governments, parties, and mass organisations and movements that are genuinely concerned about the destinies of peace on earth, with all peoples in order to *build an all-embracing system of international security*.

We see the Fundamental Principles of this system in the following:

1. *In the military sphere*

— renunciation by the nuclear powers of war—both nuclear

and conventional—against each other or against third countries;

— prevention of an arms race in outer space, cessation of all nuclear weapon tests and the total destruction of such weapons, a ban on and the destruction of chemical weapons, and renunciation of the development of other means of mass annihilation;

— a strictly controlled lowering of the levels of military capabilities of countries to limits of reasonable adequacy;

— disbandment of military alliances, and as a stage towards this—renunciation of their enlargement and of the formation of new ones;

— balanced and proportionate reduction of military budgets.

2. In the political sphere

— strict respect in international practice for the right of each people to choose the ways and forms of its development independently;

— a just political settlement of international crises and regional conflicts;

— elaboration of a set of measures aimed at building confidence between states and the creation of effective guarantees against attack from without and of the inviolability of their frontiers;

— elaboration of effective methods of preventing international terrorism, including those ensuring the safety of international land, air, and sea communications.

3. In the economic sphere

— exclusion of all forms of discrimination from international practice; renunciation of the policy of economic blockades and sanctions if this is not directly envisaged in the recommendations of the world community;

— joint quest for ways for a just settlement of the problem of debts;

— establishment of a new world economic order guaranteeing equal economic security to all countries;

— elaboration of principles for utilising part of the funds released as a result of a reduction of military budgets for the good of the world community, of developing nations in the first place;

— the pooling of efforts in exploring and making peaceful

use of outer space and in resolving global problems on which the destinies of civilisation depend.

4. *In the humanitarian sphere*

— cooperation in the dissemination of the ideas of peace, disarmament, and international security; greater flow of general objective information giving an idea of each other's life; reinforcement of the spirit of mutual understanding and concord in relations between them;

— extirpation of genocide, apartheid, advocacy of fascism and every other form of racial, national or religious exclusiveness, and also of discrimination against people on this basis;

— extension—while respecting the laws of each country—of international cooperation in the implementation of the political, social, and personal rights of people;

— decision in a humane and positive spirit of questions related to the reuniting of families, marriage, and the promotion of contacts between people and between organisations;

— strengthening of and quests for new forms of cooperation in culture, art, science, education, and medicine.

These Principles stem logically from the provisions of the Programme of the CPSU. They are entirely in keeping with our concrete foreign policy initiatives. Guided by them it would be possible to make peaceful coexistence the highest universal principle of relations between states. In our view, these Principles could become the point of departure and a sort of guideline for a direct and systematic dialogue—both bilateral and multilateral—among leaders of countries of the world community.

And since this concerns the destinies of peace, such a dialogue is particularly important among the permanent members of the Security Council—the five nuclear powers. They bear the main burden of responsibility for the destinies of humankind. I emphasise—not a privilege, not a foundation for claims to “leadership” in world affairs, but responsibility, about which nobody has the right to forget. Why then should their leaders not gather at a *round table* and discuss what could and should be done to strengthen peace?

As we see it, the entire existing mechanism of arms limitation negotiations should also start to function most effectively. We must not “grow accustomed” to the fact that for years these

talks have been proceeding on a parallel course, so to speak, with a simultaneous buildup of armaments.

The USSR is giving considerable attention to a joint examination, at international forums as well as within the framework of the Helsinki process, of the world economy's problems and prospects, the interdependence between disarmament and development, and the expansion of trade and scientific and technological cooperation. We feel that in the future it would be important to convene a *World Congress on Problems of Economic Security* at which it would be possible to discuss as a package everything that encumbers world economic relations.

We are prepared to consider seriously any other proposal aimed in the same direction.

Under all circumstances success must be achieved in the battle to prevent war. This would be an epoch-making victory of the whole of humanity, of every person on earth. The CPSU sees active participation in this battle as the essence of its foreign policy strategy.

V. THE PARTY

Comrades,

The magnitude and novelty of what we have to do make exceptionally high demands on the character of the political, ideological, and organisational work conducted by the CPSU, which today has more than 19 million members welded together by unity of purpose, will, and discipline.

The Party's strength is that it has a feel for the time, that it feels the pulse of life, and always works among the people. Whenever the country faces new problems the Party finds ways of resolving them, restructures and remoulds leadership methods, demonstrating its ability to measure up to its historic responsibility for the country's destiny, for the cause of socialism and communism.

Life constantly verifies our potentialities. Last year was special in this respect. As never before there was a need for unity in the Party ranks and unity in the Central Committee. We saw clearly that it was no longer possible to evade pressing issues of society's development, to remain reconciled to irresponsibility, laxity, and inertness. Under these conditions the Political Bureau, the CC Secretariat, and the Central Committee itself decided that the cardinal issues dictated by the times had to be resolved. An important landmark on this road was the April Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee. We told the people frankly about the difficulties and omissions in our work and about the plans for the immediate future and the long term. Today, at this Congress, we can state with confidence that the course

set by the April Plenary Meeting received the active support of the Communists, of millions of working people.

The present stage, which is one of society's qualitative transformation, requires the Party and each of its organisations to make new efforts, to be principled in assessing their own work, and to show efficiency and dedication. The draft new edition of the Party Programme and the draft amendments in the Party Rules presented to the Congress proceed from the premise that the task of mobilising all the factors of acceleration can only be carried out by a Party that has the interests of the people at heart, a Party having a scientifically substantiated perspective, asserting by its labour the confidence that the set targets would be attained.

The Party can resolve new problems successfully if it is itself in uninterrupted development, free of the "infallibility" complex, critically assesses the results that have been attained, and clearly sees what has to be done. The new requirements being made of cadres, of the entire style, methods, and character of work are dictated by the magnitude and complexity of the problems and the need to draw lessons from the past without compromise or reservations.

At present, comrades, we have to focus on the practical organisation of our work and the placing and education of cadres, of the body of Party activists, and to take a fresh look at our entire work from the Party's point of view—at all levels, in all echelons. In this context, I should like to remind you of Lenin's words: "When the situation has changed and different problems have to be solved, we cannot look back and attempt to solve them by yesterday's methods. Don't try—you won't succeed!"¹

1. To Work in a New Way, to Enhance the Role and Responsibility of Party Organisations

The purpose of restructuring Party work is that each Party organisation—from republican to primary—should vigorously implement the course set by the April Plenary Meeting and live in an atmosphere of quest, of renewal of the forms and

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Ninth All-Russia Congress of Soviets", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, 1976, p. 173.

methods of its activity. This can only be done through the efforts of all the Communists, the utmost promotion of democracy within the Party itself, the application of the principle of collective leadership at all levels, the promotion of criticism and self-criticism, control, and a responsible attitude to the work at hand. It is only then that the spirit of novelty is generated, that inertness and stagnation become intolerable.

We feel just indignation about all sorts of shortcomings and those responsible for them—people who neglect their duties and are indifferent to society's interests: hackworker and idler, grabber and writer of anonymous letters, petty bureaucrat and bribe-taker. But they live and work in a concrete collective, town, or village, in a given organisation and not some place away from us. Then who but the collective and the Communists should openly declare that in our working society each person is obliged to work conscientiously and abide strictly by the norms of socialist human association, which are the same for everybody? What and who prevents this?

This is where the task of enhancing the role of the Party organisation rises to its full stature. It does not become us, the Communists, to put the blame on somebody else. If a Party organisation lives a full-blooded life founded on relations of principle, if Communists are engaged in concrete matters and not in a chit-chat on general subjects, success is assured. It is not enough to see shortcomings and defects, to stigmatise them. It is necessary to do everything so that they should not exist. *There is no such thing as the Communists' vanguard role in general: it is expressed in practical deeds.*

Party life that is healthy, businesslike, multiform in its concrete manifestations and concerns, characterised by openness and publicity of plans and decisions, by the humaneness and modesty of Communists—that is what we need today. We, the Communists, are looked upon as a model in everything—in work and behaviour. We have to live and work in such a way that the working person could say: "Yes, this is a real Communist." And the brighter and cleaner life is within the Party, the sooner we shall cope with the complex problems which are typical of the present time of change.

Guided by the decisions of the April and subsequent Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee and working boldly

and perseveringly, many Party organisations have achieved good results. In defining the ways for advancement, the CPSU Central Committee relies chiefly on that experience, striving to make it common property. For example, the decisions on accelerating scientific and technological progress are based to a large extent on the innovatory approach to these matters in the Leningrad Party organisation, and its experience in the drafting of the programmes for the intensification and integration of science and production, and socio-economic planning. Party organisations in the Ukraine should be commended for creating scientific and technological complexes and engineering centres and for their productive work in effectively utilising recycled resources. The measures to form a unified agro-industrial complex in the country underwent a preliminary trial in Georgia and Estonia.

Many examples could be given of a modern approach to work. A feel for the new, and active restructuring in accordance with the changing conditions are a characteristic of the Byelorussian, Latvian, Sverdlovsk, Chelyabinsk, Krasnodar, Omsk, Ulyanovsk, and other Party organisations. Evidence of this is also provided by many election meetings, conferences, and republican congresses. They were notable for their businesslike formulation of issues, the commitment of Communists to seeking untapped resources and ways of speeding up our progress, and exactingness in assessing the work of elective bodies.

But not everybody can see the need for restructuring, and not everywhere. There still are many organisations, as is also confirmed by the election campaign, in which one does not feel the proper frame of mind for a serious, self-critical analysis, for drawing practical conclusions. This is the effect of adherence to the old, the absence of a feel for the time, a propensity for excessive organisation, the habit of speaking vaguely, and the fear of revealing the real state of affairs.

We shall not be able to move a single step forward if we do not learn to work in a new way, do not put an end to inertness and conservatism in any of their forms, if we lose the courage to assess the situation realistically and see it as it actually is. To make irresponsibility recede into the past, we have to make a rule of calling things by their names, of judg-

ing everything openly. It is about time to stop exercises in misplaced tact where there should be exactingness and honesty, a Party conscience. Nobody has the right to forget Lenin's stern warning: "False rhetoric and false boastfulness spell moral ruin and lead unfailingly to political extinction."¹

The consistent implementation of the *principle of collectivism* is a key condition for a healthy life in every Party organisation. But in some organisations the role of plenary meetings and of the bureaus as collegiate bodies was downgraded, and the joint drafting of decisions was replaced by instructions issued by one individual, and this often led to gross errors. Such side-tracking from the norms of Party life was tolerated in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kirghizia. A principled assessment was given at the Congress of the Republic's Communist Party, of the activities not only of the former First Secretary but also of those who connived at unscrupulousness and servility.

It is only strict compliance with and the utmost strengthening of the principle of collective leadership that can be a barrier to subjectivist excesses and create the conditions for the adoption of considered and substantiated decisions. A leader who understands this clearly has the right to count on long and productive work.

More urgently than before there is now the *need to promote criticism and self-criticism and step up the efforts to combat window-dressing*. From the recent past we know that where criticism and self-criticism are smothered, where talk about successes is substituted for a Party analysis of the actual situation, all Party activity is deformed and a situation of complacency, permissiveness, and impunity arises that leads to the most serious consequences. In the localities and even in the centre there appeared quite a few officials who are oversensitive to critical remarks levelled at them and who go so far as to harass people who come up with criticism.

The labour achievements of the people of Moscow are widely known. But one can say confidently that these accomplishments would have been much greater had the city Party organisation

¹ V. I. Lenin, "No Falsehood! Our Strength Lies in Stating the Truth!", *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, p. 297.

not lost since some time ago the spirit of self-criticism and a healthy dissatisfaction with what had been achieved, had complacency not surfaced. As was noted at a city Party conference, the leadership of the City Committee had evaded decisions on complex problems while parading its successes. This is what generated complacency and was an impediment to making a principled evaluation of serious shortcomings.

Perhaps in their most glaring form negative processes stemming from an absence of criticism and self-criticism manifested themselves in Uzbekistan. Having lost touch with life the republic's former top leadership made it a rule to speak only of successes, paper over shortcomings, and respond irritably to any criticism. In the republican Party organisation discipline slackened, and persons for whom the sole principle was lack of principles, their own wellbeing, and careerist considerations were in favour. Toadyism and unbridled laudation of those "senior in rank" became widespread. All this could not but affect the state of affairs. The situation in the economy and in the social sphere deteriorated markedly, machinations, embezzlement, and bribery thrived, and socialist legality was grossly transgressed.

It required intervention by the CPSU Central Committee to normalise the situation. The republic was given all-sided assistance. Many sectors of Party, governmental, and economic work were reinforced with cadres. These measures won the approval and active support of the Communists and the working people of Uzbekistan.

There is something else that causes concern. The shortcomings in the republic did not appear overnight, they piled up over the years, growing from small to big. Officials from all-Union bodies, including the Central Committee, went to Uzbekistan on many occasions and they must have noticed what was happening. Working people of the republic wrote indignant letters to the central bodies about the malpractices. But these signals were not duly investigated.

The reason for this is that at some stage some republics, territories, regions, and cities were placed out of bounds to criticism. As a result, in the localities there began to appear districts, collective farms, state farms, industrial facilities, and so on that enjoyed a kind of immunity. From this we have to

draw the firm conclusion that *in the Party there neither are nor should be organisations outside the pale of control and closed to criticism, there neither are nor should be leaders fenced off from Party responsibility.*

This applies equally to ministries, departments, and any enterprises and organisations. The CPSU Central Committee considers that the role of Party committees of ministries and departments must be enhanced significantly, that their role in restructuring the work of the management apparatus and of industries as a whole must be raised. An examination of the reports of the Party committees of some ministries in the Central Committee shows that they are still using their right of control very timidly and warily, that they are not catalysts of the new, of the struggle against departmentalism, paper work, and red tape.

The Party provides political leadership and defines the general prospect for development. It formulates the main tasks in socio-economic and intellectual life, selects and places cadres, and exercises general control. As regards the ways and means of resolving specific economic and socio-cultural problems, wide freedom of choice is given to each management body and work collective, and managerial personnel.

In improving the forms and methods of leadership, the Party is emphatically against confusing the functions of Party committees with those of government and public bodies. This is not a simple question. In life it is sometimes hard to see the boundary beyond which Party control and the organisation of the fulfilment of practical tasks become petty tutelage or even substitution for government and economic bodies. Needless to say, each situation requires a specific approach, and here much is determined by the political culture and maturity of leaders. The Party will endeavour to organise work so that everyone on his job will act professionally and energetically, unafraid to shoulder responsibility. Such is the principled Leninist decision on this question and we should abide strictly by it at all levels of Party activity.

2. For the Purity and Integrity of the Image of Party Member, for a Principled Personnel Policy

Comrades,

The more consistently we draw the Party's huge creative potential into the efforts to accelerate the development of Soviet society, the more tangible becomes the profound substantiation of the conclusion drawn by the April Plenary Meeting *about the necessity of enhancing the initiative and responsibility of cadres and about the importance of an untiring struggle for the purity and integrity of the image of Party member.*

The Communist Party is the political and moral vanguard. During the past five years it has admitted nearly 1,600,000 new members. Its roots in the working class, in all strata of society are growing increasingly stronger. In terms of per hundred new members there are 59 workers and 26 trained specialists working in various branches of the economy, while four-fifths of all those admitted are young people.

By and large, the Party's composition is formed and its ranks grow in accordance with the Rules, but as in any matter the process of admittance to the Party requires further improvement. Some organisations hasten the growth of the Party ranks to the detriment of their quality, and do not set high standards for new members. Our task is to show tireless concern for the purity of the Party ranks and dependably close the Party to uncommitted people, to those who join it out of careerist or other mercenary considerations.

We have to go on improving the ideological education of Communists and insist upon stricter compliance with Party discipline and unqualified fulfilment of the requirements set by the Rules. In each Party organisation the Communists should themselves create an atmosphere of mutual exactingness that would rule out all possibility of anyone disregarding Party norms. In this context, we should support and disseminate the experience of many Party organisations in which Communists report regularly to their comrades, and where character references to Party members are discussed and endorsed at Party meetings. This helps to give all Party members without exception a higher sense of responsibility to their organisation.

We suffer quite a lot of damage because some Communists behave unworthily or commit acts that discredit them. Of late a number of senior officials have been discharged from their posts and expelled from the Party for various abuses. Some of them have been indicted. There have been such cases, for example, in the Alma-Ata, Chimkent, and some other regions as well as in some republics, and also in ministries and departments. Phenomena of this kind are, as a rule, generated by violations of Party principles in selecting and educating cadres, and in controlling their work. The Party will resolutely go on getting rid of all who discredit the name of Communist.

At this Congress I should like to say a few more words about *efficiency*. This is a question of principle. Any disparity between what is said and done hurts the main thing—the prestige of Party policy—and cannot be tolerated in any form. The Communist Party is a Party whose words are matched by deeds. This should be remembered by every leader, by every Communist. It is by the unity of words and deeds that the Soviet people will judge our work.

Important resolutions have been adopted and interesting ideas and recommendations have been put forward both in the centre and in the localities since the April Plenary Meeting. But if we were to analyse what of this has been introduced into life and been mirrored in work, it will be found that alongside unquestionable changes much has still got stuck on the way to practical utilisation. No restructuring, no change can take place unless every Communist, especially a leader, appreciates the immense significance of practical actions, which are the only vehicles that can move life forward and make labour more productive. Organisational work cannot be squandered on bombast and empty rhetoric at countless meetings and conferences.

And another thing. The Party must declare a determined and relentless war on bureaucratic practices. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin held that it was especially important to fight them at moments of change, during a transition from one system of management to another, where there is a need for maximum efficiency, speed, and energy. Bureaucracy is today a serious obstacle to the solution of our principal problem—the acceleration of the country's socio-economic development and the fundamental restructuring

of the mechanism of economic management linked to that development. This is a troubling question and appropriate conclusions are required. Here it is important to bear in mind that bureaucratic distortions manifest themselves all the stronger where there is no efficiency, publicity, and control from below, where people are held less accountable for what they do.

Comrades, of late many new, energetic people who think in modern terms have been appointed to high positions. The Party will continue the practice of including experienced and young cadres in the leadership. More women are being promoted to leadership positions. There are now more of them in Party and local government bodies. The criteria for all promotions and changes are the same: political qualities, efficiency, ability, and actual achievements of the person concerned and the attitude to people. I feel it is necessary to emphasise this also because some people have dropped the Party tradition of maintaining constant contact with rank-and-file Communists, with working people. This is what undermines the very essence of Party work.

The person needed today to head each Party organisation is one who has close ties with the masses and is ideologically committed, thinks in an innovative way, and is energetic. It is hardly necessary to remind you that with the personality of a leader, of a Party leader in the first place, people link all the advantages and shortcomings of the concrete, actual life they live. The secretary of a district committee, a city committee or a regional committee of the Party is the criterion by which the rank-and-file worker forms an opinion of the Party committee and of the Party as a whole.

Cadres devoted to the Party cause and heading the efforts to implement its political line are our main and most precious asset. Party activists, all Communists should master the great traditions of Bolshevism and be brought up in the spirit of these traditions. In the Party, at each level, a principled stand and Party comradeship should become immutable norms. This is the only attitude that can ensure the Party's moral health, which is the earnest of society's health.

3. To Reinforce Ideology's Link to Life and Enrich People's Intellectual World

Comrades,

"You cannot be an ideological leader without . . . theoretical work, just as you cannot be one without directing this work to meet the needs of the cause, and without spreading the results of this theory. . ."¹ That is what Lenin taught us.

Marxism-Leninism is the greatest revolutionary world view. It substantiated the most humane objective that humankind has ever set itself—the creation of a just social system on earth. It indicates the way to a scientific study of society's development as an integral process that is law-governed in all its huge diversity and contradictoriness, teaches to see the character and interaction of economic and political forces, to select correct orientations, forms, and methods of struggle, and to feel confident at all steep turns in history.

In all its work the CPSU proceeds from the premise that fidelity to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine lies in creatively developing it on the basis of the experience that has been accumulated. The intricate range of problems stemming from the present landmark character of the development of our society and of the world as a whole is in the focus of the Party's theoretical thinking. The many-sided tasks of acceleration and its interrelated aspects—political, economic, scientific, technological, social, cultural-intellectual, and psychological—require further in-depth and all-embracing analysis. We feel a pressing need for serious philosophical generalisations, well-founded economic and social forecasts, and profound historical researches.

We cannot escape the fact that our philosophy and economics, as indeed our social sciences as a whole, are, I would say, in a state that is some distance away from the imperatives of life. Besides, our economic planning bodies and other departments do not display the proper interest in carrying rational recommendations of social scientists into practice.

Time sets the question of the social sciences broadly tackling the concrete requirements of practice and demands that social scientists should be sensitive to the ongoing changes in life, keep

¹ V. I. Lenin, "What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats", *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, 1972, p. 298.

new phenomena in sight, and draw conclusions that would correctly orient practice. Viability can only be claimed by those scientific schools that come from practice and return to it enriched with meaningful generalisations and constructive recommendations. Scholasticism, doctrinairism, and dogmatism have always been shackles for a genuine addition to knowledge. They lead to stagnation of thought, put a solid wall around science, keeping it away from life and inhibiting its development. Truth is acquired not by declarations and instructions, it is born in scientific discussion and debate and is verified in action. The Central Committee favours this way of developing our social sciences, a way that makes it possible to obtain significant results in theory and practice.

The atmosphere of creativity, which the Party is asserting in all areas of life, is particularly productive for the social sciences. We hope that it will be used actively by our economists and philosophers, lawyers and sociologists, historians and literary critics for a bold and innovative formulation of new problems and for their creative theoretical elaboration.

But in themselves ideas, however attractive, do not give shape automatically to a coherent and active world view if they are not coupled to the socio-political experience of the masses. *Socialist ideology draws its energy and effectiveness from the interaction of advanced ideas with the practice of building the new society.*

The Party defines the basic directions of ideological work in the new edition of the CPSU Programme. They have been discussed at Plenary Meetings of the CPSU Central Committee and at the USSR Practical-Scientific Conference held in December 1984. I shall mention only a few of them.

The most essential thing on which the entire weight of Party influence must be focused is that every person should understand the urgency and landmark character of the moment we are living in. Any of our plans would hang in the air if people are left indifferent, if we fail to awaken the labour and social vigour of the masses, their energy and initiative. *The prime condition for accelerating the country's socio-economic development is to turn society towards new tasks and draw upon the creative potential of the people, of every work collective for carrying them out.*

It is an indisputable fact that intelligent and truthful words exercise a tremendous influence. But their significance is multiplied a hundred-fold if they are coupled to political, economic, and social steps. This is the only way to get rid of tiresome edification and to fill calls and slogans with the breath of real life.

Divergence of words from reality dramatically devalues ideological efforts. No matter how many lectures we deliver on tact and how much we censure callousness and bureaucracy, this evaporates if a person encounters rudeness in offices, in the street, in a shop. No matter how many talks we may have on the culture of behaviour, they will be useless if they are not reinforced by efforts to achieve a high level of culture in production, association between people and human relations. No matter how many articles we may write about social justice, order, and discipline, they will remain unproductive if they are not accompanied by vigorous actions on the part of the work collective and by consistent enforcement of the law.

People should constantly see and feel the great truth of our ideology and the principled character of our policy. Work and the distribution of benefits should be so organised and the laws and principles of socialist human relationships so scrupulously observed that every Soviet citizen should have firm faith in our ideals and values. Dwellings, food supplies, the quality of consumer goods, and the level of health care—all this most directly affects the consciousness and sentiment of people. It is exactly from these positions that we should approach the entire spectrum of problems linked to the educational work of Party and government bodies, and mass organisations.

Exceedingly favourable social conditions are created for boosting the effectiveness of ideological work in the drive to speed up socio-economic development. But nobody should count on ideological, political, labour, and moral education being thereby simplified. It must always be borne in mind that however favourable it may be the present situation has its own contradictions and difficulties. No concession in its assessments should be allowed.

It is always a complex process to develop the social consciousness, but the distinctive character of the present stage has made many pressing problems particularly sharp. First, the very magnitude of the task of acceleration determines the social

atmosphere, its character and specific features. As yet not everybody has proved to be prepared to understand and accept what is taking place. Second, and this must be emphasised, the slackening of socio-economic development was the outcome of serious blunders not only in economic management but also in ideological work.

It cannot be said that there were few words on this matter or that they were wrong. But in practice purposeful educational work was often replaced by artificial campaigns leading propaganda away from life with an adverse effect on the social climate. The sharpness of the contradictions in life was often ignored and there was no realism in assessing the actual state of affairs in the economy, as well as in the social and other spheres. Vestiges of the past invariably leave an imprint. They make themselves felt, being reflected in people's consciousness, actions, and behaviour. The lifestyle cannot be changed in the twinkling of an eye, and it is still harder to overcome inertia in thinking. Energetic efforts must be made here.

Policy yields the expected results when it is founded on an accurate account of the interests of classes, social groups, and individuals. While this is true from the standpoint of administering society, it is even truer where ideology and education are concerned. Society consists of concrete people, who have concrete interests, their joys and sorrows, their notions about life, about its actual and sham values.

In this context I should like to say a few words about *work with individuals as a major form of education*. It cannot be said that it receives no attention, but in the ideological sphere the customary "gross" approach is a serious hindrance. The relevant statistics are indeed impressive. Tens and hundreds of thousands of propagandists, agitators, and lecturers on politics, the study circles and seminars, the newspapers and journals with circulations running into millions, and the audiences of millions at lectures. All this is commendable. But does not the living person disappear in this playing around with figures and this "coverage"? Do not ideological statistics blind us, on the one hand, to selfless working people meriting high recognition by society and, on the other, to exponents of anti-socialist morality? That is why maximum concreteness in education is so important.

An essential feature of ideological work today is that it is conducted in a situation marked by a sharp confrontation between socialist and bourgeois ideology. Bourgeois ideology is an ideology serving capital and the profits of monopolies, adventurism and social revenge, an ideology of a society that has no future. Its objectives are clear: to use any method to embellish capitalism, camouflage its intrinsic anti-humaneness and injustice, to impose its standards of life and culture; by every means to throw mud at socialism and misrepresent the essence of such values as democracy, freedom, equality, and social progress.

The psychological warfare unleashed by imperialism cannot be qualified otherwise than as a specific form of aggression, of information imperialism which infringes on the sovereignty, history, and culture of peoples. Moreover, it is direct political and psychological preparations for war, which, of course, have nothing in common with a real comparison of views or with a free exchange of ideas, about which they speak hypocritically in the West. There is no other way for evaluating actions, when people are taught to look upon any society uncongenial to imperialism through a gun sight.

Of course, there are no grounds for overestimating the influence of bourgeois propaganda. Soviet people are quite aware of the real value of the various forecasters and forecasts, they clearly see the actual aims of the subversive activities of the ruling monopoly forces. But we have no right to forget that psychological warfare is a struggle for the minds of people, for their understanding of the world, their vital, social and intellectual bearings. We are contending with a skilful class adversary, whose political experience is diverse and centuries-old in terms of time. He has built up a mammoth mass propaganda machine equipped with sophisticated technical means and having a huge well-trained staff of haters of socialism.

The insidiousness and unscrupulousness of bourgeois propagandists must be countered with a high standard of professionalism on the part of our ideological workers, by the morality and culture of socialist society, by the openness of information, and by the incisive and creative character of our propaganda. We must be on the offensive in exposing ideological subversion and in bringing home truthful information about the actual achievements of socialism, about the socialist way of life.

We have built a world free of oppression and exploitation and a society of social unity and confidence. We, patriots of our homeland, will go on safeguarding it with all our strength, increasing its wealth, and fortifying its economic and moral might. The inner sources of Soviet patriotism are in the social system, in our humanistic ideology. True patriotism lies in an active civic stand. Socialism is a society with a high level of morality. One cannot be ideologically committed without being honest, conscientious, decent and critical of oneself. Our education will be all the more productive, the more vigorously the ideals, principles and values of the new society are asserted. Struggle for the purity of life is the most effective way of promoting the effectiveness and social yield of ideological education and creating guarantees against the emergence of unhealthy phenomena.

To put it in a nutshell, comrades, whatever area of ideological work we take, life must be the starting point in everything. Stagnation is simply intolerable in such a vital, dynamic, and multifaceted matter as information, propaganda, artistic creativity, and amateur art activity, the work of clubs, theatres, libraries, and museums—in the entire sphere of ideological, political, labour, moral, and atheistic education.

In our day, which is dynamic and full of changes, the *role of the mass media* is growing significantly. The time that has passed since the April Central Committee Plenary Meeting has been a rigorous test for the whole of the Party's work in journalism. Editorial staffs have started vigorously tackling complex problems that are new in many respects. Newspapers, journals, and television programmes have begun to pulse with life, with all its achievements and contradictions; there is a more analytical approach, civic motivation, and sharpness in bringing problems to light and in concrete criticism of shortcomings and omissions. Many constructive recommendations have been offered on pressing economic, social, and ideological issues.

It is even more important today to make sure that the mass media are effective. The Central Committee sees them as an instrument of creation and of expression of the Party's general viewpoint, which is incompatible with departmentalism and parochialism. Everything dictated by principled considerations, by the interests of improving our work will continue to be supported by the Party. The work of the mass media becomes all

the more productive, the more thoughtfulness and timeliness and the less pursuit after the casual and the sensational there are in it.

Our television and radio networks are developing rapidly, acquiring an up-to-date technical level. They have definitely entered our life as all-embracing media carrying information and propagating and asserting our moral values and culture. Changes for the better have clearly appeared here: television and radio programmes have become more diversified and interesting, and there is a visible aspiration to surmount established stereotypes, to take various interests of audiences into account more fully.

But can it be said that our mass media and propaganda are using all their opportunities? For the time being, no. There still is much dullness, inertia has not been overcome, and deafness to the new has not been cured. People are dissatisfied with the inadequate promptness in the reporting of news, with the superficial coverage of the effort to introduce all that is new and advanced into practice. Justified censure is evoked by the low standard of some literary works, television programmes, and films that lack not only ideological and aesthetic clarity but also elementary taste. There has to be a radical improvement of film distribution and of book and journal publishing. The leadership of the Ministry of Culture, the State Television and Radio Committee, the State Film Committee, the State Publishing Committee of the USSR, and the news agencies have to draw practical conclusions from the innumerable critical remarks from the public. The shortcomings are common, but the responsibility is specific, and this must be constantly in the minds of ideological cadres.

The Party sees the main objective of its *cultural policy* in giving the widest scope for identifying people's abilities and making their lives intellectually rich and many-sided. In working for radical changes for the better in this area as well, it is important to build up cultural-educational work in such a way as to fully satisfy people's cultural requirements and interests.

Society's moral health and the intellectual climate in which people live are in no small measure determined by the state of *literature and art*. While reflecting the birth of the new world,

our literature has been active in helping to build it, moulding the citizen of that world—the patriot of his homeland and the internationalist in the true meaning of the word. It thereby correctly chose its place, its role in the efforts of the entire people. But this is also a criterion which the people and the Party use to assess the work of the writer and the artist, and which literature and Soviet art themselves use to approach their own tasks.

When the social need arises to form a conception of the time one lives in, especially a time of change, it always brings forward people for whom this becomes an inner necessity. We are living in such a time today. Neither the Party nor the people need showy verbosity on paper, petty dirty-linen-washing, time-serving, and utilitarianism. What society expects from the writer is artistic innovation and the truth of life, which has always been the essence of real art.

But truth is not an abstract concept. It is concrete. It lies in the achievements of the people and in the contradictions of society's development, in heroism and the succession of day-to-day work, in triumphs and failures, in other words, in life itself, with all its versatility, dramatism, and grandeur. Only a literature that is ideologically motivated, artistic, and committed to the people educates people to be honest, strong in spirit, and capable of shouldering the burden of their time.

Criticism and self-criticism are a natural principle of our society's life. Without them there can be no progress. It is time for literary and art criticism to shake off complacency and servility to rank, which erodes healthy morals, and to remember that criticism is a social duty and not a sphere serving an author's vanity and ambitions.

Our unions of creative workers have rich traditions, and they play a considerable role in the life of art and of the whole of society, for that matter. But even here changes are needed. The main result of their work is measured not by resolutions and meetings, but by talented and imaginative books, films, plays, paintings, and music which are needed by society and which can enrich the people's intellectual life. In this context, serious consideration should be given to suggestions by the public that the *standard for judging works nominated for distinguished prizes should be raised.*

Guidance of intellectual and cultural life is not a simple matter. It requires tact, an understanding of creative work, and most certainly a love of literature and art, and respect for talent. Here much depends upon the ability to propagate the Party's cultural policy, to implement it in life, on fairness in evaluations, and a well-wishing attitude to the creative work and quests of the writer, the composer, and the artist.

Ideological work is creative work. It offers no universal means that are suitable to all occasions; it requires constant quest and the ability to keep abreast of life. Today it is particularly important to have a profound understanding of the nature of present-day problems, a sound scientific world view, a principled stand, a high cultural level, and a sense of responsibility for work in any sector. *To raise society's level of maturity and build communism means steadfastly to enhance the maturity of the individual's consciousness and enrich his intellectual world.*

The Party thinks highly of the knowledge, experience, and dedication of its ideological activists. Here, at our Congress, a word of the highest appreciation must be said to the millions of Party members who have fulfilled and continue to fulfil honourably an extremely important Party assignment in one of the main sectors of its work. We must continue to assign to ideological work such comrades who by personal example have proved their commitment, are able to think analytically, and know how to hear out and talk with people, in short, highly trained in political and professional terms, and capable of successfully carrying out the new tasks of our time.

VI. THE RESULTS OF THE DISCUSSION OF THE NEW EDITION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME AND OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE PARTY RULES

Comrades, the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee examines the Party's programme goals, its present-day economic and political strategies, the problems of improving inner-Party life, and the style and methods of work, that is, all that constitutes the core of the drafts of the new edition of the Programme and of the amendments to the CPSU Rules. Therefore, there is no need to set them forth here in detail. Let me only dwell on some of the points of principle, taking into account the results of the Party-wide and nation-wide discussion of the drafts of these documents.

What are these results? First of all, the conclusions and provisions of the CPSU Programme and Rules have met with widespread approval. The Communists and all Soviet people support the Party's policy of accelerating the country's socio-economic development and its Programme's clear orientation towards the communist perspective and the strengthening of world peace. They point out that the new historical tasks are based on in-depth analysis of the urgent problems of the development of society.

The new edition of the Programme has also evoked a wide response abroad. Progressives take note of its profoundly humanist character, its addressing itself to man, its passionate call for mutual understanding among nations and for ensuring a peaceful future to mankind. Our friends abroad are inspired by the Soviet Union's unremitting striving for lasting comradely relations and all-round cooperation with all the countries of the

socialist world system and its firm support of the peoples' anti-imperialist struggle for peace, democracy, social progress, and the consolidation of independence. Many of the sober-minded public figures in bourgeois countries take note of the peaceful orientation of our Programme, of the CPSU line for disarmament and for normal, sound relations with all the countries.

The preparation and discussion of the pre-Congress documents have invigorated the Party's ideological and political work and furthered the social activity of millions of working people.

The drafts of the new edition of the Programme and of the Rules have been thoroughly discussed at meetings of primary Party organisations, at district, city, area, regional and territorial election conferences, and at congresses of the Communist Parties of Union Republics. Since the beginning of the discussion, over six million letters were received in connection with the draft Programme alone. They came from workers, collective farmers, scientists, teachers, engineers, doctors, Army and Navy servicemen, Communists and non-Party people, veterans and young people. Assessing the new edition of the Programme as a document that meets the vital interests of the Soviet people, they made numerous proposals, and suggested additions and more precise wordings. I believe it would be useful to dwell on some of them.

Stressing the novelty of the draft under discussion, the authors of some of the letters suggest adopting it at the Congress as the fourth Party Programme. It will be recalled that the adoption of new Party programmes, initially the second and then the third, was necessitated by the fact that the goals set in the preceding Programme had been reached. In our case, the situation is different.

The Party's basic tasks of developing and consolidating socialism, of improving it in every way on a planned basis, and of ensuring Soviet society's further advance to communism, remain in force. The document submitted for your consideration reiterates the theoretical and political guidelines which have stood the test of time.

At the same time, much has changed in our life in the quarter of a century since the adoption of the third Party Programme. New historical experience has been accumulated. Not all of the estimates and conclusions turned out to be correct. The idea of

translating the tasks of the full-scale building of communism into direct practical action has proved to be premature. Certain miscalculations were made, too, in fixing deadlines for the solution of a number of concrete problems. New problems related to improving socialism and accelerating its development, as well as certain questions of international politics, have come to the fore and become acute. All this has to be reflected in the Party's programme document.

Thus, the assessment of the submitted document as a new edition of the third Party Programme is justified in reality and is of fundamental importance. It affirms the main goals of the CPSU, the basic laws governing communist construction, and at the same time shows that the accumulated historical experience has been interpreted in a creative manner, and that the strategy and tactics have been elaborated in conformity with specificities of the present turning point.

The public has paid great attention to those provisions of the Programme which describe the stage of social development reached by the country and the goals yet to be attained through its implementation. Various opinions were expressed on this score. While some suggest that references to developed socialism should be completely removed from the Programme, others, on the contrary, believe that this should be dealt with at greater length.

The draft sets forth a well-balanced and realistic position on this issue. The main conclusions about modern socialist society confirm that our country has entered the stage of developed socialism. We also show understanding for the task of building developed socialism set down in the programme documents of the fraternal parties of other socialist countries.

At the same time, it is proper to recall that the thesis on developed socialism has gained currency in our country as a reaction to the simplistic ideas about the ways and period of time for carrying out the tasks of communist construction. Subsequently, however, the accents in the interpretation of developed socialism were gradually shifted. Things were not infrequently reduced to just registering successes, while many of the urgent problems related to the switching over of the economy to intensification, to raising labour productivity, improving supplies to the population, and overcoming negative things were not given

due attention. Willy-nilly, this was a peculiar vindication of sluggishness in solving outstanding problems. Today, when the Party has proclaimed and is pursuing the policy of accelerating socio-economic development, this approach has become unacceptable.

The prevailing conditions compel us to focus theoretical and political thought not on recording what has been achieved, but on substantiating the ways and methods of accelerating socio-economic progress, on which depend qualitative changes in various spheres of life. An incalculably deeper approach is wanted in solving the cardinal issues of social progress. The strategy of the CPSU set out in the new edition of the Programme is centred on the need for change, for stepping up the dynamism of society's development. It is through socio-economic acceleration that our society is to attain new frontiers, whereupon the advantages of the socialist system will assert themselves to the fullest extent and the problems that we have inherited from the preceding stages will be resolved.

Divergent opinions have been expressed, too, concerning details of the Programme provisions. Some people hold that the Programme should be a still more concise document, a kind of brief declaration of the Party's intentions. Others favour a more detailed description of the parameters of economic and social development. Some letters contain proposals for a more precise chronology of the periods that Soviet society will pass through in its advance to communism.

According to Lenin's principles of drafting programme documents and the traditions that have shaped up, the Programme should present a comprehensive picture of the modern world, the main tendencies and laws governing its development, and a clear, well-argued account of the aims which the Party is setting itself and which it is summoning the masses to achieve. At the same time, however, Lenin stressed that the Programme must be strictly scientific, based on absolutely established facts, and that it should be economically precise and should not promise more than can be attained. He called for maximum realism in characterising the future society and in defining objectives. "We should be as cautious and accurate as possible," Lenin wrote. "...But if we advance the slightest claim to something that we cannot give, the power of our Programme will be

weakened. It will be suspected that our Programme is only a fantasy.”¹

It seems to me that the submitted edition of the Programme is meeting these demands. As for the chronological limits in which the Programme targets are to be attained, they do not seem to be needed. The faults of the past are a lesson for us. The only thing we can say definitely today is that the fulfilment of the present Programme goes beyond the end of the present century.

The tasks that we are to carry out in the next 15 years can be defined more specifically, and have been set out in the new edition of the Programme, and in greater detail in the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR until the Year 2000. And, of course, the 12th five-year plan, a big step in the economy's conversion to intensive development through the acceleration of scientific and technological progress, will occupy an important place in the fulfilment of our programme aims.

Many of the responses and letters received by the CPSU Central Committee Commission which drew up the new edition of the CPSU Programme are devoted to social policy. Soviet people approve and support measures aimed at enhancing the people's wellbeing, asserting social justice everywhere, and clearing our life of everything that is contrary to the principles of socialism. They make proposals that are aimed at ensuring an increasingly full and strict fulfilment of the principle of distributing benefits according to the quantity and quality of labour, and at improving the social consumption funds; at tightening control over the measure of labour and the measure of consumption, at doing away firmly with unearned incomes and attempts at using public property for egoistic ends; at eliminating unjustified distinctions in the material remuneration of equal work in various branches of the economy, at doing away with any levelling of pay, etc. Some of these proposals are reflected in the draft. Others must be carefully examined by Party, government and economic bodies, accounted for in legislative acts and decisions, and in our practical work.

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B.), March 6-8, 1918", *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 1977, p. 148.

The provisions of the Programme concerning the development of the people's socialist self-government have aroused considerable interest during the countrywide discussion. Unanimous support is expressed for the all-round democratisation of socialist society and the maximum and effective enlistment of all the working people in running the economic, social and political processes. The concrete steps taken in this field have also been commended, and ideas expressed that the capacity of work collectives as the primary cell of immediate, direct democracy should be shown more clearly when dealing with the problems of improving the administration of the affairs of society and the state. These ideas have been taken into account.

Concern for enhancing the role of cultural and moral values in our society prompted suggestions that the education of Soviet people should proceed more distinctly in the spirit of communist ideals and ethical norms, and struggle against their antipodes. The Programme Commission saw fit to accept these proposals, so that the principles of lofty ideological commitment and morality should imbue the content of the provisions of the Party Programme still more fully.

About two million people expressed their ideas concerning the CPSU Rules. Having examined the results of the discussion, the Central Committee of the Party has deemed it essential to introduce in the draft Rules a number of substantive additions and clarifications aimed at heightening the vanguard role of the Communists, the capability of primary Party organisations, at extending inner-Party democracy, and at ensuring unflinching control over the activity of every Party organisation, every Party worker.

In support of the idea of making more exacting demands on Communists, some comrades suggest carrying out a purge to free the Party of those whose conduct and way of life contradict our norms and ideals. I do not think there is any need for a special campaign to purge the ranks of the CPSU. Our Party is a healthy organism: it is perfecting the style and methods of its work, is eradicating formalism, red tape, and conventionalism, and is discarding everything stagnant and conservative that interferes with our progress; in this way it is freeing itself of persons who have compromised themselves by their poor work and unworthy behaviour. The Party organisations will continue to

carry out this work consistently, systematically, and unswervingly.

The new edition of the Programme and also the proposed changes in the Party Rules register and develop the Bolshevik principles of Party building, the style and methods of Party work and the behavioural ethics of Communists that were elaborated by Lenin and have been tried and tested in practice.

On the whole, comrades, the discussion of the CPSU Programme and Rules has been exceptionally fruitful. It has helped to amplify many ideas and propositions, to clarify formulations and to improve wordings. Allow me, on behalf of our Congress, to express profound gratitude to the Communists and all Soviet people for their businesslike and committed participation in discussing the pre-Congress documents.

It is the opinion of the Central Committee of the Party that the submitted drafts, enriched by the Party's and people's experience, correspond to the spirit of the times and to the demands of the period of history through which we are now living. They confirm our Party's fidelity to the great doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, they provide scientifically substantiated answers to fundamental questions of domestic and international affairs, and they give the Communists and all working people a clear perspective.

* * *

Comrades, those are the programme aims of our further development which have been submitted for the consideration of the 27th Congress.

What leads us to think that the outlined plans are feasible? Where is the guarantee that the policy of accelerating socio-economic progress is correct and will be carried out?

First and foremost, the fact that our plans rest on the firm foundation of Marxist-Leninist theory, that they are based on the inexhaustible riches of Lenin's ideas.

The CPSU draws its strength from the enormous potentialities of socialism, from the vigorous creative efforts of the masses. At crucial turning points in history the Leninist Party has on more than one occasion demonstrated its ability to find correct roads of progress, to inspire, rally and organise the many-million masses of working people. That was the case during the revolution, in the years of peaceful construction and in the years

of wartime trials, and in the difficult postwar period. We are confident this will be the case in future, too.

We count on the support of the working class because the Party's policy is their policy.

We count on the support of the peasantry because the Party's policy is their policy.

We count on the support of the people's intelligentsia because the Party's policy is their policy.

We count on the support of women, young people, veterans, all social groups and all the nations and nationalities of our Soviet homeland because the Party's policy expresses the hopes, interests and aspirations of the entire people.

We are convinced that all conscientious and honest Soviet patriots support the Party's strategy of strengthening the might of our country, of making our life better, purer, more just.

Those are the powerful social forces that stand behind the CPSU. They follow it, they have faith in the Communist Party.

The surging tide of history is now speeding towards the shallows that divide the second and third millennia. What lies ahead, beyond the shallows? Let us not prophesy. We do know, however, that the plans we are putting forward today are not ordinary but daring ones, and that our daily affairs are permeated with the spirit of socialist ethics and justice. In this troubled age the aim of our social and, I would add, vital strategy consists in that people should cherish our planet, the skies above, and outer space, exploring it as the pioneers of a *peaceful* civilisation, ridding life of nuclear nightmares and completely releasing all the finest qualities of Man, that unique inhabitant of the Universe, for constructive efforts only.

The Soviet people can be confident that the Party is fully aware of its responsibility for our country's future, for a durable peace on Earth, and for the correctness of the charted policy. Its practical implementation requires above all persistent work, unity of the Party and the people, and cohesive actions by all working people.

That is the only way we will be able to carry out the behests of the great Lenin—to move forward energetically and with a singleness of will. History has given us no other destiny. But what a wonderful destiny it is, comrades!

Concluding Remarks at the 27th Congress of the CPSU

March 6, 1986

Dear Comrades,

The 27th Congress is about to close.

It is up to history to give an objective evaluation of its importance. But already today we can say: the Congress has been held in an atmosphere of Party fidelity to principle, in a spirit of unity, exactingness, and Bolshevik truth; it has frankly pointed out shortcomings and deficiencies and made a profound analysis of the internal and external conditions in which our society develops. It has set a lofty moral and spiritual tone for the Party's activity, for the country's life.

Coming to this rostrum, delegates put all questions frankly, and did not mince words in showing what is impeding our common cause, what is holding us back. Not a few critical statements were made about the work of all links of the Party, of government and economic organisations, both at the centre and locally. In fact, not a single sphere of our life has escaped critical analysis. All this, comrades, is in the spirit of the Party's finest traditions, in the Bolshevik spirit.

More than sixty years ago, when summing up the discussion on the Political Report of the RCP(B) Central Committee to the 11th Party Congress, Lenin expressed a thought that is of fundamental importance. He said: "All the revolutionary parties that have perished so far, perished because they became conceited, because they failed to see the source of their strength and

feared to discuss their weaknesses. We, however, shall not perish, because we are not afraid to discuss our weaknesses and will learn to overcome them.”¹

It is in this way, in Lenin’s way, that we have acted here at our Congress. And that is the way we shall continue to act!

The Congress has answered the vital questions that life itself has put before the Party, before society, and has equipped every Communist, every Soviet citizen, with a clear understanding of the coming tasks. It has shown that we were right when we advanced the concept of socio-economic acceleration at the April 1985 Plenary Meeting. The idea of acceleration imbued all our pre-Congress activity. It was at the centre of attention at the Congress. It was embodied in the Political Report of the Central Committee, the new edition of the Party Programme, and the amendments to the Party Rules, as well as in the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for the 12th Five-Year Plan Period and till the Year 2000. These documents were wholeheartedly endorsed and approved by the delegates to the Congress.

The adopted and approved general line of the Party’s domestic and foreign policy—that of the country’s accelerated socio-economic development, and of consolidating world peace—is the main political achievement of the 27th CPSU Congress. From now on it will be the law of life for the Party, for its every organisation, and a guide to action for Communists, for all working people.

We are aware of the great responsibility to history that the CPSU is assuming, of the huge load it has taken on by adopting the strategy of acceleration. But we are convinced of the vital need for this strategy. We are confident that this strategy is a realistic one. Relying on the inexhaustible potentials and advantages of socialism, on the living creativity of the people, we shall be able to attain all the projected goals.

To secure the country’s accelerated socio-economic development means to provide new powerful stimuli to the growth of the productive forces and to scientific and technological pro-

¹ V. I. Lenin, “Eleventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B). March 27-April 2, 1922”, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 311.

gress through the improvement of socialism's economic system, and to set in motion the tremendous untapped potentialities of our national economy.

To secure acceleration means conducting an active and vigorous social policy by closely linking the improvement of the working people's well-being with the efficiency of labour, and by combining all-round concern for people with the consistent implementation of the principles of social justice.

To secure acceleration means to provide scope for the initiative and activity of every working person, every work collective, by deepening democracy, by steadily developing the people's socialist self-government, and by ensuring more openness in the life of the Party and society.

To secure acceleration means to bring ideological and organisational work closer to the people and direct it towards the elimination of difficulties and the practical solution of our tasks by associating this work more closely with the actual problems of life, by getting rid of hollow verbiage and didacticism, by increasing people's responsibility for their jobs.

Comrades, we can and must accomplish all this!

The CPSU is entering the post-Congress period better organised, more cohesive, more efficient, with a well-considered long-term policy. It is determined to act with purpose, aware of all the complexity, the great scope and novelty of the tasks it faces, undaunted by difficulties and obstacles.

It is up to us to reach every Soviet citizen and bring home the essence and spirit of the Congress decisions. Not only must we explain its basic concepts; we must also organise all work in line with present-day demands.

Very many interesting proposals were made and many profound thoughts expressed at our Congress and in the pre-Congress period. They must be carefully examined, and everything valuable and useful should be put into effect.

The most important thing now is to convert the energy of our plans into the energy of concrete action. This was very well expressed by a delegate to our Congress, Vasily Gorin, chairman of a Belgorod collective farm. "All over the country," he said, "in every work collective, a difficult but, we are sure, irreversible process of renovation and reconstruction is now under way. It passes through the hearts and minds of Soviet people and calls

for complete dedication on the part of each and everyone. Above all in their work.”

Yes, comrades, acceleration and radical changes in all spheres of our life are not just a slogan but a course that the Party will follow firmly and undeviatingly.

Many delegates noted that departmentalism, localism, paper work, and other bureaucratic practices are a big obstacle to what is new and progressive. I wish to assure you, comrades, that the Central Committee will resolutely eliminate all the obstacles to the acceleration of socio-economic progress, tighten discipline and order, and create the organisational, moral and material prerequisites for the maximum development of creative activity, bold search, and socialist enterprise. I am confident that this will win the broad and active support of the entire Party and of all working people.

The Party committees, from top to bottom, are the organisers of the work of implementing the instructions of the Congress. What we now need is a concrete, businesslike and consistent style of work, with our deeds matching our words, use of the most effective ways and means, thorough consideration of people's opinions, and efficient coordination of the actions of all social forces.

Sluggishness, formalism, indifference, the habit of letting good ideas get bogged down in empty and endless discussions and attempts to “adjust to the readjustment”, must all be completely overcome.

One of the main conclusions of the Congress is that all Party committees should act as genuine bodies of political leadership. In the final analysis, the success of all our efforts to implement the general line of the 27th Party Congress will be determined by the conscious participation of the broadest masses of the people in building communism. Everything depends on us, comrades! The time has come for vigorous and united action. The Party calls on every Communist, every Soviet citizen, to join actively in the large-scale work of putting our plans into practice, of perfecting Soviet society, of renovating our socialist home.

Comrades, the Congress has strongly reaffirmed that socialism and peace, and peace and constructive endeavour, are indivisible. Socialism would fail to carry out its historic mission if it did not place itself at the head of the struggle to deliver mankind

from the burden of military worry and violence. The main goal of Soviet policy is security and a just peace for all nations. We regard the struggle against war and military preparations, against the propagation of hatred and violence, as an inseparable part of the democratisation of all international relations, of a genuine improvement of the political climate in the world.

In one respect the nuclear danger has put all states on an equal footing: in a big war nobody will be able to stand aside or to profit from the misfortunes of others. Equal security is the imperative of the times. Ensuring this security is becoming increasingly a political issue, one that can be resolved only by political means. It is high time to replace weapons by a more stable foundation for the relations among states. We see no alternative to this, nor are we trying to find one.

Unfortunately, however, there are still those in the international community who lay claim to special security, one that is suited only to themselves. Such is the thinking in Washington. Appeals to force are still in fashion there, and force continues to be regarded as the most convincing argument when it comes to world politics. It looks as though some people are simply afraid of the possibility that has appeared for a serious and long-term thaw in Soviet-American relations and in international relations as a whole.

This is not the first time we have come up against this kind of situation. Now, too, the militaristic, aggressive forces would of course prefer to preserve and perpetuate the confrontation. But what should we do, comrades? Slam the door? It is possible that this is exactly what they want us to do. But we are very clearly aware of our responsibility for the future of our country and for the future of the world. We do not intend, therefore, to play into the hands of those who would like to force mankind to get used to the nuclear threat and to the arms race.

Soviet foreign policy is oriented towards search for mutual understanding, towards dialogue, and the establishment of peaceful coexistence as the universal norm in relations among states. We have a clear idea of how to achieve this and, indeed, a concrete programme of work for maintaining and consolidating peace.

The Soviet Union is acting and will continue to act in the world arena in an open and responsible way, energetically and

in good faith. We intend to work persistently and constructively for the elimination of nuclear weapons, for a radical curbing of the arms race, and for reliable international security equal for all countries. A mandate to preserve peace and to curb the arms race resounded forcefully in the speeches of the delegates to our Congress. The Party will unswervingly carry out this mandate.

We call on the leaders of countries that have a different social system to take a responsible approach to the key issue of world politics today: the issue of war and peace.

The leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet state will do its utmost to secure for our people the opportunity to work in conditions of freedom and lasting peace. As reaffirmed by the Congress, our Party and the Soviet Union have many allies, supporters and partners abroad in the struggle for peace, freedom, and the progress of mankind.

We are sincerely pleased to see here the leaders of the socialist countries. Allow me, on behalf of the Congress, wholeheartedly to thank the communist parties' and peoples of these countries for their solidarity with the CPSU and the Soviet Union!

For a number of fraternal parties in socialist countries this year is also a congress year. The problems and tasks that the very course of history has set the ruling communist parties are similar in many respects. And by responding to them, each party contributes to the treasure-chest of world socialism's combined experience. We wish you every success, dear friends!

The CPSU is grateful for the warm words said about it by representatives of communist, revolutionary-democratic, socialist and social-democratic parties, of democratic, liberation, and anti-war forces and movements. We highly appreciate their understanding and support of the idea advanced by the Congress of establishing an all-embracing system of international security and the plan for eliminating nuclear arms before the end of the century. The CPSU is convinced that they are consonant with the true interests of all nations, all countries and all humanity.

Comrades, our Congress has shown that at the present stage, which is a turning point in our country's social development, the Leninist Party is equal to its historic tasks. On behalf of the delegates representing our entire Party I should like to say from this rostrum that we Communists set great store by the confidence

placed in us by the workers, the farmers, the intelligentsia, by all Soviet people. We put above all else the interests of the people, of our Motherland, of socialism and peace. We will spare neither effort nor energy to translate into practice the decisions of the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Reply to a Joint Message of the Leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and Greece

To Mr. Raúl ALFONSÍN, President of Argentina
Mr. Rajiv GANDHI, Prime Minister of India
Mr. Miguel de la MADRID, President of Mexico
Mr. Julius NYERERE
Mr. Ingvar CARLSSON, Prime Minister of Sweden
Mr. Andreas PAPANDREOU, Prime Minister of Greece

I am deeply grieved to note that Olof Palme, who fell at the hands of a dastardly assassin, is no longer among you. His tragic death caused sharp pain to all those who cherish peace, for which he had so ardently and tirelessly fought.

Esteemed gentlemen, on behalf of the Soviet leadership I should like to express our deep respect to you for the purposeful consistency of your efforts to curb the arms race and prevent a nuclear war. As we see it, your joint initiatives are fully consistent with the job of arranging constructive and progressive collaboration among states and nations on the scale of the whole world. Especially now, when the very survival of the human race is at stake.

The ideas of universal security without nuclear weapons contained in your letter are strongly consonant with the concept of an all-embracing system of international security that we have advanced at the recent 27th Congress of the CPSU. One of the main pillars of such a system—and here we are at one with you—must be the complete and irreversible destruction of nuclear arms.

It seems to me our views also coincide in that ending nuclear

tests can be and must become an important step towards delivering humanity from the nuclear arms race with all its pernicious consequences.

It is evidently no accident that you are raising this issue now, shortly before the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions runs out. The additional time we have given the US Administration to consider our proposals, is ending. We cannot keep prolonging it on a unilateral basis indefinitely. By not having any nuclear explosions, both test and peaceful explosions, for the eighth month running, we have already incurred certain losses militarily and economically.

Still, responding to your call to the USSR and the USA not to have any nuclear tests until the next Soviet-American summit, we herewith declare:

The Soviet Union will carry out no nuclear explosions even after March 31, until the first nuclear explosion by the United States.

As concerns the verification problem, I should like to stress once more that we attach great importance to it, since we want the accords to be strictly abided by, and all concerned to be certain of this.

In the case of the nuclear test ban, verification of compliance may be ensured by national technical means, and likewise by international procedures, with on-site inspections whenever necessary. We are offering the Americans to agree on letting observers of either side, on a reciprocal basis and upon appropriate inquiries, visit places where unclear phenomena are registered in order to eliminate possible doubts about their being connected with nuclear explosions.

We are prepared to accept your offer of helping to verify the ending of nuclear tests, including on-site inspections, provided, of course, that it is also accepted by the other side.

It goes without saying that a treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in international law is needed to settle the test problem once and for all. We suggest getting down to drafting it at once, renewing or starting relevant talks in any shape or form—whether bilateral, tripartite, or multilateral, and do so without linking the matter with any other issues. As for those who fear that questions of verification may be relegated to the background in the negotiations, we suggest tackling these questions from the outset,

simultaneously, so as to promptly secure a comprehensive agreement.

Let me reassure you that the Soviet Union will, for its part, continue doing its utmost for the settlement of the urgent problem of halting nuclear tests, and for the final destruction of nuclear arsenals.

Respectfully,

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, March 14, 1986

Speech on Soviet Television

March 29, 1986

Good evening, dear comrades!

At our meeting tonight I would like to share my views with you on the situation that has shaped around the Soviet Union's moratorium on nuclear tests.

A few days ago the United States carried out another nuclear explosion. It is clear to all of us that the time was not chosen at random. The blast came just before the end of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium. Yesterday it was learned that in the next few days the United States intends to set off another nuclear device.

Like people of good will in all countries, Soviet people are incensed by these actions of the United States. They write about this in their letters to the Party's Central Committee and ask it to comment on the resulting situation. They ask what they should make of it, what conclusions they should draw, why the United States has taken such a step, and how our country's leadership intends to act in these conditions.

We consider it our duty to respond to these questions, and this, in effect, is the reason for my appearance on TV tonight.

Frankly speaking, we regard the present actions of the American Administration, which is continuing nuclear tests despite the pressing demands of the peoples, as a pointed challenge to the Soviet Union, but also, for that matter, to the whole world, to all peoples, including the American people.

Now that mountains of inflammable nuclear material have been stockpiled in the world, the question of ending nuclear tests has acquired tremendous importance. That is quite clear.

First, the ending of nuclear tests is the most tangible way of achieving an end to the arms race. Without such tests it is impossible to either perfect or develop new types of nuclear weapons. In short, if we, the United States and the other nuclear powers were to reach an accord on ending nuclear explosions, it would be possible to get the entire process of nuclear disarmament off the ground.

Further. Continued testing inflicts tremendous and perhaps not yet fully understood harm on the environment, on the natural surroundings in which all of us live. Are we not obliged, after all, to show concern for our own home? And not only for ourselves, but also for our children and grandchildren.

And, finally, in this difficult endeavour we need not, as it were, start from scratch. A definite distance has already been traversed and joint experience acquired: that is, tests in the atmosphere, in water and on land have not been conducted for many years now; nor have there been explosions in outer space.

It was with due account precisely for these circumstances that, eight months ago, on the day of the 40th anniversary of the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, after thoroughly weighing all the pros and cons, the Soviet Union put forward an initiative of extraordinary importance—to stop all nuclear explosions both for military and peaceful purposes. And it called on the United States of America and other nuclear states to follow suit—to start advancing along the road of nuclear disarmament.

I have already said before that in view of the unabating international tension this had not been an easy decision for us to take. If you like, this step required an awareness of the responsibility resting on the governments of the nuclear powers, and also political goodwill. To do what it did, the Soviet leadership had the mandate of its people, who know the price of peace and are sincerely determined to safeguard and consolidate it, to secure cooperation with all nations.

Acting in this way, we proceeded from the deep conviction that the world has entered a stage which calls for new approaches to international security. Today, in the nuclear and space era, there is no room for antiquated thinking. All must ultimately realise that everything has changed radically. What is at stake

now is not only safeguarding peace, but also the very survival of mankind.

Those, in substance, were the motives behind our decision to announce the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests.

The good initiative of the Soviet Union—and I am immensely pleased to say this—has been regarded with understanding and general approval in the world. Our action has been highly appreciated by the working people of all countries: Communists and Social Democrats, Liberals and Conservatives, Christians and Moslems, a multitude of public organisations, prominent political figures, scientists and cultural figures, and millions of ordinary people.

But how did the other side conduct itself? That is, the US Administration.

In words, it stands for the elimination of nuclear weapons. It has made a good deal of statements on that score. But in fact, there is again a gap between the words and practical policy. The US government has continued to conduct nuclear tests despite the Soviet Union's call and example, despite the persistent demands of the American people and the peoples of the whole world.

We set certain hopes on the Geneva meeting with the President of the United States of America and expected to come to terms with him on this matter as well. As you remember, encouraging statements were made there by both sides as well as jointly, to the effect that nuclear war is inadmissible, that such a war cannot be won, that neither side would seek nuclear superiority.

The results of the Geneva meeting prompted us to take yet another step of good will: to extend the moratorium until March 31 of this year. We thereby reconfirmed our responsible attitude towards the dialogue between the leaders of the two powers, and we hoped, of course, that the US Administration would take reciprocal steps.

I think you will agree that our statement of January 15 of this year, which set forth a concrete and realistic programme for the elimination of nuclear arms, is yet another proof of our true intentions—to put an end to nuclear confrontation. In taking this step, we thought least of all of how to gain extra “propaganda points”, as journalists say in such cases, of outsmarting or out-

playing the other side. We consider such an approach to the burning problems of present-day politics inadmissible. Our actions were motivated by our responsibility both to the Soviet people and to other peoples, the responsibility for the removal of the nuclear threat, for the preservation and strengthening of peace.

In February the leaders of six non-aligned states, expressing the prevailing sentiments in world public opinion, urged the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States to refrain from nuclear explosions until the next Soviet-American meeting. We consented to this.

It would have seemed natural for the US Administration to support the Soviet Union's initiative with practical actions and to respond to the expectations of the peoples. And, at any rate, to confirm precisely through deeds its own statements made in Geneva. But that did not happen.

All signs show that the ruling circles of the United States have placed the narrow selfish interests of the military-industrial complex above the interests of the whole of mankind and the American people itself. The manner in which this is done is also quite significant: it is demonstrative, arrogant, spurning the opinion of the world community. There is neither a sense of realism nor of responsibility.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the US ruling circles continue to lay emphasis on the pursuance of a militaristic line, to bank on force, so as to dictate their will to other countries and peoples. Statements are made for all to hear that this is precisely the way they will also influence the policy of the Soviet Union.

What can be said about that? Those attempts are inept. Power politics was never successful against our country in the past, and today it is simply ludicrous. The peoples of other countries are also ever more vigorously rejecting the outdated policy of diktat in international relations.

The Soviet political leadership is now faced with the difficult question of how to react to this behaviour of the United States.

Our position is clear. We believe that the world has now entered a period when responsible decisions must be taken. Yes, precisely a period when they are absolutely necessary. We will not deviate from the policy of preserving and strengthening peace,

which was most emphatically confirmed by the 27th Congress of the CPSU. Fulfilling the wish of its people, the USSR will continue stepping up its efforts to ensure universal security, and will do so in cooperation with all countries and their peoples.

As for our unilateral moratorium, I can say that it remains in effect till March 31, 1986. But even after that date, as was announced, we will not conduct nuclear explosions if the United States acts likewise. We are again giving the US Administration a chance to take a responsible decision—to end nuclear explosions.

Otherwise, the Soviet Union will resume testing. This must be absolutely clear. We regret it, but our own security and that of our allies will force us to do so. I am saying all this so that nothing is left unsaid on that issue.

At the same time, I cannot stress enough that our main intention is to stop the nuclear arms race. The simplest, most explicit and effective step in that direction would be to put an end to nuclear explosions.

We have proposed that talks be started immediately on a total prohibition of nuclear weapons testing, covering the questions of verification. All possible variants are acceptable to the Soviet Union—bilateral Soviet-American talks, tripartite talks with the participation of Great Britain, or multilateral ones within the framework of the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

We have now come to the conclusion that the situation requires immediate action. It is not too late yet to halt the nuclear arms race. What is needed is a first major step in that direction. It could be a step halting nuclear testing by everyone concerned—first of all by the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as by the other nuclear powers. We attach tremendous significance to the solution of this problem, which concerns the fate of all nations.

I am ready to meet with President Reagan as soon as possible in London, Rome, or in any other European capital that will agree to receive us, in order to reach agreement on this question. And I do not see any political, technical or any other insurmountable obstacles to this. What is needed is the requisite political goodwill and understanding of our mutual responsibility. We propose that we meet, exchange views on this crucial

problem and issue instructions to draft an appropriate agreement.

We hope that this proposal of the Soviet Union will be duly appraised and correctly received by the President of the United States, and by the governments of the countries of Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, of the whole world.

Time is running out. On behalf of the Soviet people we call on the American people and its government, on the peoples and governments of all countries, to work vigorously, to take practical action, for the ban on nuclear explosions to become a fact, an inviolable rule of inter-state relations.

Mankind has come to a frontier that requires an extreme sense of responsibility. The consequences of the nuclear arms race can become dangerously unpredictable. We must act together. This concerns each and everyone of us.

This is what I wanted to tell you, dear comrades, over the TV tonight. Goodbye.

Answers to the Algerian Magazine

Révolution Africaine

Question. The CPSU has just experienced a turning point in its history. Its 27th Congress was innovatory and adopted a bold strategy both for the Party and for the development of the economy and Soviet society. Could you please tell us what prompted these moves?

Answer. Well, there seems to be every reason for us to agree with your estimate of the 27th Congress. It really is of historic significance for the Soviet Communists, for it has set a grand task—for *Soviet socialist society to attain a new quality*. So we are experiencing what is indeed a turning point in the country's life.

But there is something that should be made clear. These days, nobody, save career anti-Sovietees, denies our achievements. I am sure the readers of your magazine know we have grown from a backward, ravaged country to a both socio-politically and economically advanced power.

Our revolution had many enemies, too many. I mean not only the imperialist predators who were doing all they could to throw us back to the semi-colonial past. I also mean wholesale

The Algerian weekly *Révolution Africaine*, press organ of the National Liberation Front Party, asked General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to answer a number of questions, and to meet Zoubir M. Souissi, its Editor-in-Chief. The conversation took place on March 31, 1986. A. N. Yakovlev, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part.

Here are given the answers of Mikhail Gorbachev and the transcript of his conversation with the Algerian journalist.

illiteracy, poverty and centuries of oppression. But such is the lot of a truly popular revolution: it is always resisted by the forces that are on their way out. You know this from the experience of your own country.

Dreadful trials fell to the lot of our nation. It is enough to mention the nazi invasion which took a toll of millions upon millions of lives, and left our cities and villages lying in ruins. But the Soviet people overcame this by heroic efforts. In just a few years, the country veritably came back to life.

Today we have a mighty industrial potential, and our national economy is making steady headway. In the last quarter of a century alone, fixed assets have grown sevenfold. Our industry has been progressing at double the rate of industrialised capitalist states. The living standard of the Soviet people has risen considerably. Real per capita incomes have gone up 160 per cent in the past 25 years.

I know there are those in the West who like to hold forth on what they describe as the Soviet Union's lag in modern science and technology. I suppose the outstanding discoveries and achievements made by Soviet science and engineering in the most diverse spheres are more eloquent than any denial. It is enough to recall the world's first artificial satellite and Yuri Gagarin's flight which ushered in the space era, and the success of the recent Venus-Halley's Comet project. This unique project is a blend of the achievements of Soviet physics and machine-building, mathematics and instrument-making, other branches of science and technology, and the craftsmanship of the working class.

But I'm not going to enter into pointless polemics with people who would slander even themselves if the price were right. I'm simply certain that in all fields of knowledge we have highly-qualified personnel, excellent industrial workers. Incidentally, our engineers, technicians, workers, and doctors have been working in Algeria for many years now and, as far as I know, they are doing good work. Their Algerian colleagues consider such cooperation most valuable.

We may, of course, be asked why such deep-going changes have been projected by the 27th Party Congress if Soviet society made good headway in the preceding decades. It's like this: while giving credit to what has been done, we want to move ahead

faster, on a new qualitative basis. The creative potentialities of socialism are such that we can now tackle much more complicated and ambitious tasks than we did before. Complacency is contrary to the very character of the Communist Party, the character of socialist society and our morality.

That is why our mistakes and oversights, as well as our gains, were openly and honestly discussed at the 27th Congress. To some extent, we were reassured by the potentialities of development which, as they say, lie on the surface. The development of the economy was largely extensive, with additional manpower and material resources being marshalled to build up production. The structure of economic management had not changed in decades, although the development of the productive forces necessitated a remodelling of production relations. This explains the decline in the rates of growth, and the insufficiently vigorous introduction of the latest scientific and technical achievements in the economy.

Forthright discussion of shortcomings was essential. The aim was to mobilise to the utmost the advantages of the socialist mode of production with its inherent capacity for continuous regeneration and perfection. I'd like to cite here the words of Karl Marx who, recalling the revolutions of the 19th century, said that they "criticise themselves constantly, . . . come back to the apparently accomplished in order to begin it afresh, deride with unmerciful thoroughness the inadequacies, weaknesses and paltrinesses of their first attempts."¹ A powerful statement, indeed.

So, in brief, the Congress realistically assessed our potentialities and we saw that we can do better. There you have the chief motivation for the need to speed up the country's socio-economic development.

As for the international aspects of the acceleration strategy, I'd like to stress the following points. Socialism is not developing on a desert island. The two social systems—socialist and capitalist—are competing with each other. This competition—which we want to be peaceful and solely peaceful—binds us to work for speedier socio-economic advance. Socialism has no right to lag behind. Considering the resources at our disposal, and this means

¹ Karl Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte", in: Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979, pp. 106-107.

not just the industrial, scientific and technical potential, but, above all, people who love their country and are ready to do everything for its prosperity, the Party has justifiably and confidently opted for the country's accelerated development.

Question. One gets the impression that economic issues and the social advance of the USSR were your prime concerns at the Congress. The strategic avenues of development have been fitted to the acceleration process which you have launched. What are the main directions, means and goals of the new policy?

Answer. I've already answered this question to a certain extent. But it seems I should stress once again: the economy and, of course, social policy are the main concerns of the Communist Party as the ruling party.

As for the acceleration strategy, it covers all aspects of life: the economy, science and technology, the social sphere and the spiritual life of society. In some cases its influence is direct, and in others indirect.

We have set out to rebuild our national economy on the basis of the latest achievements of scientific and technical progress, and are creating the best possible conditions for the development of science—both fundamental and applied. We are changing our structural and investment policies to ensure accelerated growth of machine-building and other vanguard industries. I'd like to stress here that these are not mere intentions or wishes, but an organic part of what we are doing now.

Another important link in our economic strategy are the radical economic reforms, a restructuring of the economic mechanism. Its purpose is to ensure a harmonious blend of the advantages of centralised planning with greater independence and responsibility of industrial amalgamations and enterprises. The direction of the effort is obvious—to subordinate all our production to the requirements of society, to orient management to boosting efficiency and quality. In short, we want our entire national economy to work dynamically, like a self-regulating mechanism.

For us the acceleration strategy also implies development of the political system, a system of socialist democracy in which all power belongs to the people. We see our task in promoting the socialist self-government of the people, in the fullest possible involvement of the working people in running the affairs of the

state and society. In essence, large-scale democracy creates that indispensable climate in which the creative potentialities of both society and the individual reveal themselves in full. And it begins with intra-party democracy, with free and open examination of all problems troubling society, as was the case in the pre-Congress discussion and at the 27th Congress proper.

It is impossible to cover the topic of socialist democracy in a relatively brief answer. We should have to closely examine our government and public institutions, and speak of how the Soviets of People's Deputies, assisted by millions of activists, are organising their work. But I'd like to draw your attention to the following point. The Congress took a resolute stand on the question of publicity of the activity of the government and of Party and other mass organisations. As we see it, there cannot be more or less truth. The truth is one and it should be complete.

We speak about everything in the open because we believe in our strength and we know not only what to do, but also how to do it. Let me add that the Party's prestige cannot increase unless it sets the right objectives and closely heeds the voice of the working people, unless it knows their opinion and admits its mistakes without fear.

And, of course, the backbone of the acceleration strategy is a strong and integral social policy. Production does not exist for itself. It exists for the people. It cannot be otherwise under socialism, with no private property, with all enterprises belonging to the people and supplying their needs. We have no money-bags to subordinate production to their own interests.

I'd like to add that when we restructure secondary and higher education, when we work for the improvement of health care, when we build more health resorts, holiday homes, cultural centres and sports complexes, the whole effort eventually boils down to creating proper material conditions for the harmonious development of the individual, for the creative endeavour of people. This effort not only adds to the wealth of society, but contributes to the spiritual enrichment of man.

Question. You advocate new approaches to the organisation of production and the evaluation of the labour factor. You want both to be more efficient. But that means changing habits and views. How is the CPSU preparing to cope with this new situation?

Answer. An interesting question, though, I believe, the 27th Congress resolutions have already furnished the requisite answer.

As for the organisation of work, our orientation here is on upgrading cost accounting, on making all enterprises in town and country yield a profit and pay their own way, on wide use of economic incentives and of the instrumentarium of commodity-money relations, on encouragement of socialist initiative, and the establishment of direct ties between producers and consumers.

When we began management experiments in the economy—and these are now expanding—we saw the very first steps yielding handsome returns. The gain is twofold: it benefits society, which gets more of the high-quality products it needs, and it benefits the work collective which is given the right to spend a large portion of what it has earned as it sees fit.

As for the measure of the work, the labour contribution, of every person, the Marxist formula we are guided by is well known: “From each according to his ability, to each according to his work”. That is social justice, with every person getting as much of the good things of life as his work entitles him to.

You mentioned in your question the changing of habits and views and wanted to know how the CPSU is going to handle this new situation.

We have declared war on conservatism, red tape, mismanagement, breaches of discipline and inertness in everything. I think the Party’s activities after the April 1985 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee and during the preparations for the 27th Party Congress, as well as the proceedings of the Congress, suggest that our policy is being met with understanding among Communists and the mass of the working people, and has their vigorous support. But, of course, there is a lot to be done yet, and executives and all the working people—workers, farmers and intellectuals—should adapt themselves to the new approaches.

Question. You do not conceal that you have financial difficulties in meeting objectives that will accelerate the social and economic development of the USSR. How do you propose to obtain the funds needed to achieve this new qualitative stage if international relations do not improve in favour of peace and cooperation?

Answer. There is something amiss here. We do not complain of our financial situation, though it is true that we do not have money to throw away. All the more so since we have to divert some resources to strengthening the country's defences because of reckless imperialist policies. And this we will continue to do: the peaceful labour of the Soviet people and of our friends and allies will be protected as reliably as before.

But we have the funds required to finance the country's accelerated social and economic development. We draw above all on our internal accumulations. That is the only sure way. We know better than anyone that imperialism has introduced in present-day international economic relations such uncivilised methods as various forms of discrimination, sanctions, economic blockades, embargoes, trade bans, and so on.

Our material potential is quite sufficient to fulfil our plans. Our policy of technical retooling and modernisation of existing enterprises is not only requiring expenses but is also producing additional resources. It is probably needless to prove that society develops and makes headway on the basis of rising labour productivity and more effective production. A great deal will come from the accelerated circulation of funds, not to mention energy-saving technologies, radical improvement of capital construction, and so on.

Unquestionably, in the interests of development, we will also make the most of our broad economic ties with other countries. This is a normal thing. But, I repeat, we do not make our plans dependent on the intentions of other states in relation to our country, although, of course, we believed and believe firmly in broad international business ties.

Question. The competition in the military field with the West, and especially the Star Wars scheme, are undoubtedly a major obstacle to your economic and social plans. But the Geneva summit and your Statement of January 15, 1986, should have opened up prospects for mankind's more peaceful and more beneficial progress. What should be expected from your coming meeting with the head of the American Administration?

Answer. Well, let us go back to the Geneva summit. We took it seriously, and made some concrete proposals in anticipation of it. Let me recapitulate them.

On August 6 of last year the Soviet Union set a half-year unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. We proposed that Washington should follow our example and thus make the moratorium permanent, *eternal*. In reply we received an invitation to another nuclear test in Nevada.

Before the new year of 1986, which the UN has proclaimed a Year of Peace, we declared that we were extending the moratorium on nuclear explosions by another three months. More American nuclear explosions were the answer.

Lastly, not so long ago, in response to an appeal by the leaders of six countries, we decided to observe the moratorium until the first nuclear explosion from the American side. And immediately the Pentagon hastened to hold fresh nuclear tests. We will have to draw conclusions from that. Other peace-loving countries and the world public will also doubtless draw the due conclusions. It is particularly clear today who is who in world politics. Militarism, whose ideology predominates in the leading imperialist countries, has exposed itself to the utmost.

Now about our proposals of January 15 of this year. I will not repeat their content. Everybody knows it. It is more than an invitation to a serious dialogue. We have set forth an integral and honest programme of how to make the world safer to live in, of how to rid it of nuclear weapons, to prevent an arms race in space, and to cut down appreciably on conventional armaments.

The US pondered for a long time, for more than a month. I have already had occasion to speak about the American reply. We heard neither a clear "yes" nor any constructive ideas of the Administration on how to overcome the evil logic of the arms race.

Furthermore, take the initiative on the elimination of medium-range missiles from Europe, echoing in a way the former American judgements on this problem—even this is ignored. We have discovered—and this is true not just of Geneva but of other negotiations—that as soon as we make a step forward to meet the American position, the US takes a step back.

Is it possible to improve Soviet-American relations without finding practical solutions as to curtailing the arms race? Is it possible to move towards confidence while filling your arsenals with ever more sophisticated weapons of war? We are convinced

that the road leading to peace goes in the opposite direction, from the arms race to disarmament.

To take that road it is essential to discard the old mentality, to discard the ancient Roman legionnaires' postulate, "If you would have peace, be ready for war", which imperialist leaders still consider applicable to international relations.

The summit meeting had half opened the door to hope. But how this ray of light frightened the people associated with the US military-industrial complex! How heftily they leaned against the "door" to slam it shut!

My comrades in the Party leadership and I are trying to understand what the American Administration is after. Does it want war? But I think Washington has a good idea of what a nuclear war is like. What do all these attempts to perpetuate confrontation, to whip it up, mean in that case? And what is the latest outburst of warlike rhetoric supposed to mean? The US actions in Nicaragua and against Libya and Afghanistan, the incursion of warships into Soviet territorial waters, the support of the caveman apartheid regime in the RSA, and much else that characterises United States behaviour on the international scene today—what is it all leading to, and whose specific interests does it serve?

We are also aware of the designs of wearing out the Soviet Union by means of the arms race. That is an old and, frankly, anything but clever idea. Nothing will come of it, and the Americans are simply wasting their money and energy for nothing in the bid to implement a doctrine that has long since failed.

But these designs concern not only the Soviet Union. They injure the interests of the developing countries and affect the USA's own allies. Even the United States is itself sinking ever deeper into the quagmire of internal and external problems engendered by its imperial, militarist policy.

Washington's post-Geneva actions go counter to the agreements reached. The anti-Geneva syndrome is growing there, which, naturally, creates no few difficulties in Soviet-American relations.

Question. Peace is not only elimination of nuclear weapons and their non-deployment in space. For many nations, those which are still oppressed, it begins with the winning of the fundamental right to national sovereignty. But many peoples that

for decades have been fighting for the liberation of their countries cannot satisfy their aspirations due to lack of more vigorous and consistent support in the international arena. How can you explain the present decline of the national liberation movement in the world?

Answer. A bit of history. The last few decades have seen the collapse of colonial empires, the outbreak of anti-colonial revolutions, the revival and emergence of dozens upon dozens of new states. Today the newly-free countries make up almost half of humanity and largely determine the nature and course of world developments. I am sure that their role, the role of the non-aligned movement in international affairs, in determining the course to be followed by civilisation, will grow. So the results of national liberation movements are of everlasting significance.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries declare for all to hear: our sympathies are fully on the side of the peoples fighting for freedom, national independence and social progress. We have given and will continue to give them extensive assistance—political, moral and material. And I want to stress that in doing so the Soviet Union does not seek for itself any unilateral political or economic benefits.

It is also true that having won political independence and taken their destiny into their own hands, the newly-free peoples are fighting a hard battle against their economic backwardness and poverty, and to consolidate their sovereignty. The imperialist forces, particularly US imperialism, are ready to do anything to bring down and crush the newly-free countries and to arrest the course of history—to engage in economic sabotage, political provocation and direct pressure. A “doctrine of new globalism” has been hastily concocted to serve as a foundation for this course. To be sure, there is nothing new about it; it is an attempt to go back to the old and so to say classic system of brigandage.

The US piratical actions off the Libyan coast are nothing but the old “gunboat diplomacy”. The whole world sees them as such. Evidently, previous lessons have been wasted on Washington which has had to pay more than once for its military ventures. The US anti-Libyan actions are not something singular. What a multitude of fantastic stories have American politicians

spawned about the USSR and Cuba to justify the escalation of the military venture against Nicaragua!

The US Administration has hugged to its breast the Afghan dushmans, bandits from UNITA in Angola, and the South African racists. And of all things this is done to affirm the ideals of peace and freedom. I am sure that if there were no American interference in the internal affairs of other states, regional conflicts would be on the wane, and would be far easier to settle and in a more just way.

It is extremely important that there is a growing awareness of the intimate relationship between the problems of strengthening international security and ensuring the reliable, confident and independent development of the newly-free countries.

Question. The world economic crisis has spared nobody, and least of all the Third World countries. The decline in oil prices, the continuing drop in prices for other raw materials, and the shortage of food in the world are all problems that threaten to increase the dependence of Third World countries, which are burdened with great external debts. The USSR, too, has been affected by some aspects of this crisis. What role can the Soviet Union play in the search for ways to overcome it?

Answer. I agree with you. The position of the developing countries is disturbing and, in some cases, even tragic.

What do we see happening? Imperialism is denying equality to the developing states and making them bear the consequences of its economic troubles. Hence the lowest raw materials prices in half a century, the falling oil prices, and the shortage of food. By exploiting the newly-free countries, imperialism is lining its pockets and enriching itself. It is largely at their expense that it finances the arms race. The result is that, on the one hand, there is the trillion-dollar debt of the developing countries and, on the other, there are the super-profits of the transnational corporations and banks.

This imperialist policy is well known in Asian, African and Latin American countries, as, indeed, all over the world. The developing countries spend more than 100 billion dollars a year only to pay interest on their foreign debts. They pay more than they receive in new credits. Or take another glaring fact: the American transnational corporations pocket two and a half dollars profit for each dollar invested in Latin America.

This is a brutal way of doing business, but imperialism knows no other.

The Soviet Union is far from indifferent to such a state of things. For our part, through our foreign trade, we exercise a stabilising influence on the markets of many commodities, including those exported by developing countries. The USSR's economic and technical assistance to those countries, which helps them form a national base of science and industry and modernise agriculture, is also working in the same direction. Our credits are repaid with growing exports from the newly-free countries, so there is no drama of indebtedness.

Understandably, developments on world markets affect us to a certain extent, too. Crises in the West reduce the demand for our exports. Inflation adds to import costs.

How to remedy the state of the world economy? Together with the developing states, we are for restructuring international economic relations to make them just and democratic. Such a restructuring could be started by implementing the major provisions of the programme for a new international economic order. Our concept of the economic security of states is fully consonant with it. It provides for the exclusion from international practice of all forms of discrimination, for a just settlement of the debt problem, and for the pooling of efforts by all countries to resolve the global problems, including, of course, the problem of development.

Let me say once more: peace and development are inseparable, and in their attainment the vital interests of the socialist and developing countries coincide.

Question. Our countries have a lot in common in their approach to the struggle for the liberation of peoples and for peace. Relations between our two countries were established long ago and it is time to sum them up and make an objective assessment of their significance and chart real paths for their further development. What is in store for us in this field?

Answer. This was precisely the subject of the meaningful and fruitful talks which I had with Chadli Bendjedid, President of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria. I am sure that in those few days the USSR and Algeria have shown once again how useful and effective cooperation can be if it is based

on the principles of equality and strict respect for each other's sovereignty.

What is in store? Under the Long-Term Programme of Economic, Trade, Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the USSR and Algeria, Soviet-Algerian economic ties will get a new boost. The power industry, ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, the oil and gas industry, geology, the metal-working industry and machine-building, agriculture, the water economy, forestry, and fishery—such is a far from complete list of branches in which interesting joint projects have been planned.

We are convinced that our cooperation in training national personnel is highly promising. Knowledge, culture and experience are all vital at present and, even more so, for the future.

The Soviet-Algerian negotiations have shown once again that in the drive to safeguard peace our countries are not fellow travellers but real partners. To the same extent this applies to affirming a new and just international economic order, to overcoming conflict situations on the basis of strict respect for the right of every nation to determine its own path in the future.

In brief, we are fully satisfied with the results of the talks and believe that the understandings reached will benefit the interests of the peoples of our countries, the interests of peace and social progress.

* * *

Mikhail Gorbachev. How do you do, I'm glad to meet you. It's a special pleasure for me that we meet today right after the visit of the President of your Republic, Comrade Chadli Bendjedid, to the Soviet Union. This was a big event in our relations and, I believe, internationally. It was a major event of a truly global scale.

It seems to me that we parted equally convinced that this visit of the President to our country will give fresh impetus to our relations, which are already of a high level.

You have evidently already read my answers to your questions.

Although I have very little time, I deemed it my duty to respond to your request considering the friendly relations between our countries and the fact that your magazine has a large readership at home, in Africa, and in Europe for that matter.

Zoubir M. Souissi. Quite true, our magazine is also read in Europe.

Mikhail Gorbachev. If you want to ask me something in addition to the questions you have submitted in writing, I'm at your service.

Zoubir M. Souissi. Indeed, I'd like to ask you two questions which are prompted by your Saturday speech on Soviet television.

Here's the first question.

After the USA turned down the Soviet-proposed unilateral moratorium, the Americans are now also rejecting your proposal for a meeting in a European capital on the grounds that you have ostensibly refused to come to the United States as you promised. How do matters really stand and will the meeting take place in the USA or elsewhere?

Mikhail Gorbachev. In my speech two days ago I really did call upon President Reagan to meet in a European capital in the near future, without delay, with the express purpose of immediately discussing the one issue of stopping nuclear tests. This meeting is not supposed to replace our meeting in the United States, on which we had agreed in Geneva, and which I didn't even mention this time.

The whole world, not only the Soviet Union but all nations, including the Americans, are alarmed by the fact that there is practically no positive progress in such a major aspect of the war-and-peace issue as the arms race and cuts in nuclear weapons. The talks are going on, but they have produced no results so far.

The Soviet leaders believe that some big step is needed to lead the talks on nuclear arms reductions out of the dead end and thus begin to move towards a goal which, as it seemed to us, both we and the Americans accept, namely, phased reduction of nuclear weapons with a view to their complete elimination after some time.

When we announced our concrete programme for liquidating nuclear weapons in the Statement of January 15, which you know, the President of the United States welcomed what he called a further step by us in this process and recalled his similar statements of 1983 and later. In Geneva we also agreed that a nuclear war is unthinkable and unwinnable.

So it appears that in essence we are saying one and the same thing. Still, we cannot get off the ground at the Geneva negotiations and begin to make real progress to this goal, proclaimed by both the Soviet and the American side.

We think that cessation of nuclear explosions and talks to sign an agreement on their prohibition in all media could be the first step in this direction.

Our idea is simple: all the time we are looking for ways and means of beginning nuclear arms cuts together with the Americans and other nuclear powers, but first of all with the American Administration.

Conclusion of a Soviet-American treaty to halt nuclear explosions would have tremendous importance because it would put up a barrier to the sophistication of nuclear weapons and the development of new types thereof. Moreover, such a step would also have enormous political and moral relevance as an example of joint action by the two great powers which bear a special responsibility.

Although we at once heard a negative statement in response to my new appeal to the President—in effect the Administration has repeated what it was saying earlier—we hope that the President, his immediate entourage and Congress will still think over our proposal.

As for my visit to the United States, this question remains within the field of vision of both the Soviet and the American side.

This, I would say, is my reply to your first question.

Zoubir M. Soussi. Allow me to proceed to the second question. Is a dialogue still possible between the Soviet Union, which stands for peace, and the American Administration, which is revanchist-minded and unyielding?

Mikhail Gorbachev. The question you ask is not easy. But we have now made it a rule and a principle—both in our domestic and in our foreign policy—not to evade difficult questions and any problems. I will therefore answer your question.

I would put the emphasis on the fact that a dialogue between the leadership of the Soviet Union and the US Administration is necessary. It is difficult to expect an improvement in the international situation without the normalisation of Soviet-American relations, without joint efforts by the Soviet Union and the

US to end the arms race and to abolish nuclear weapons, without the normalisation of international relations—political, economic, trade and cultural. We have always stressed this. And that testifies to the seriousness of our approach.

For all the significance and role of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, it is essential to reckon with the fact that hundreds of states and nations live in the world and want to live better, and build their plans for the future. This must be taken into account both by the Soviet leadership and the American Administration.

I think that what we said at the 27th Party Congress about our attitude to international affairs and to international cooperation is a convincing argument showing our respect for all peoples, our understanding of the responsibility for the safeguarding and consolidation of peace, for the normalisation of international relations not only to our own people, but also to other nations. So, for all the importance of Soviet-American relations, we cannot fail to take this into account.

Still for objective reasons, the role and consequently the responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United States for the state of world affairs is great. I repeat, we strive to live up to this responsibility. But things in the world will move more quickly and more surely along the path of normalisation if the same understanding and the same responsibility are displayed by the American Administration. And we invite the President and the US government and Congress to show political will and search for ways leading to the normalisation and development of Soviet-American relations, for ways of improving the situation as a whole.

Our assessment is as follows: there is now an uneasy period in these relations. We do not look at them with despondency, however, and are trying to do all in our power by agreeing to certain practical steps to create an appropriate atmosphere for improving relations and political dialogue.

Zoubir M. Souissi. I thank you for the high honour accorded to our magazine, for the opportunity to convey through it your message of peace to the Algerian people, to all freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples. Peace is now the most important thing.

Mikhail Gorbachev. We are sure of that. Those who followed

the work of our Congress, who have read its documents, know that this was precisely what we wanted to bring home to the whole world—a message of peace from the Soviet people to the entire world. But peace has to be worked for. If you would have peace, work for it.

Please convey through your magazine my best wishes to the friendly people of Algeria and to all readers of your magazine.

Pravda, April 3, 1986

Policy of Peace Versus Policy Leading to War

From the Speech at a Meeting
with the Working People
of the City of Togliatti

April 8, 1986

Now, comrades, a few words about international affairs. The other day I had a meeting with American congressmen and promised them that I would tell you precisely what I said to them. We do not have two policies. We have one policy which expresses the interests of the Soviet people and takes account of the interests of all other peoples.

The 27th Congress of the CPSU produced a comprehensive analysis of the contradictions and interrelationships in today's world. What is absolutely necessary to resolve its problems is a new way of thinking, an innovative approach, and an awareness of the fact that the arms race and the development of military technology have approached the critical line. This is what we proceed from. In so doing, we understand that we exist side by side in world politics with an opposite system in class terms and that from the point of view of safeguarding peace we are confronted by such a serious reality as the United States. At the same time, the leadership of that country cannot drop past habits and, to all appearances, refuses to reckon with the reality of the Soviet Union.

This fact, however, does not stop us from seeking a way out of the confrontation. For there is no other way. The alternative is a race towards nuclear catastrophe. Our conduct and policy are prompted not only by our principles and morality, but also by our understanding of the fact that any other approach is unrealistic. This is why, by decision of the CPSU Central Committee, I went to Paris and to Geneva. This is why the Soviet Union has put forward a large number of major initiatives. This

is why immediately after Geneva we set out to translate the accords achieved there and the Joint Statement into practical actions:

— We extended our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions twice and offered to begin talks without delay on ending nuclear tests altogether;

— at the Vienna and Stockholm conferences we put forward compromise proposals meeting the West halfway;

— another major initiative was our Statement of January 15, which contains a concrete and clear plan for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and for the reduction of other weapons to limits adequate for defensive purposes;

— we took into account the anxiety of Europeans about medium-range missiles and tactical nuclear weapons and came up with a compromise option for the European zone;

— we suggested the mutual withdrawal of the Soviet and US navies from the Mediterranean;

— the 27th Congress of the CPSU not only approved this concrete and constructive approach, but also formulated the basic principles for establishing an all-embracing international security system.

But what about those in the West on whom it also directly depends whether the arms race is stopped and the international climate is made sounder? How did they behave after Geneva? What is their policy? To begin with, we have not received a satisfactory reply to the Statement of January 15. What they have sent us evades the heart of the matter and attempts to make do with half-measures and to mislead the world public with vague promises.

As for a reply on the substance of the Statement, it is being provided by the actions of the United States and by the real policy of NATO. In Geneva both sides agreed that there could be no winners in the nuclear arms race any more than in a nuclear war. But when we put forward a simple and clear phased plan for the reduction and final elimination of nuclear arsenals, we were told: "No!"

Or another example: over the years they kept harping that the Russians cannot be trusted because they will not permit on-site inspections. We have agreed to such inspections. In response, President Reagan offers us to "verify" not a ban on nuclear

explosions but the procedure for improving nuclear weapons. As an American newspaper aptly remarked the other day, this is the same as asking a man advocating abolition of capital punishment to witness an execution.

We, naturally, have not accepted and will not accept such an offer. We put the matter differently: let us discuss our proposal on ending explosions and the American proposal on verification. The only thing that the US Administration seems to have retained from Geneva is the talk about a new meeting between the US President and the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. To make the matter absolutely clear, I shall say once again: We are in favour of such a meeting. We set no preliminary conditions for it. But we want it to take place in accordance with what the President and I agreed upon, namely, that it should be a step forward, that is, yield practical results as regards ending the arms race.

And one more thing. Our meeting can take place if the atmosphere of Geneva is preserved, or, as it would now be more correct to say, revived. Look at what is taking place. Soon after Geneva, an anti-Soviet campaign full of every type of fabrication and of insults to our country, was renewed with fresh force in the United States.

Subsequently, more serious matters arose, namely, the demand that the Soviet Union reduce the number of its diplomats in New York by 40 per cent. An American naval squadron appeared off the shores of the Crimea—nor did they bother to conceal the fact that the action was sanctioned by the top authorities. An attack was made on Libya to show America's might and to demonstrate that it could do whatever it wished. A high-yield nuclear explosion was carried out in Nevada with an obviously provocative purpose just before our moratorium expired. And when we proposed a meeting without delay concerning just one but truly urgent question, that of nuclear explosions, it took less than a day to answer: "No!"

Do the people in Washington think that they are dealing with faint-hearted people? Do they think that today it is possible to behave like reckless gamblers? Is this how the USA understands the spirit of Geneva? Do they think we do not see how the Soviet-American dialogue that has just been started is being used to cover up the fulfilment of military programmes?

All this makes us wonder what content and what meaning Washington is imparting to a new Soviet-American meeting.

And what about Western Europe? In reply to our proposals, which also meet the wishes of the European public and many governments, they are now saying: the American missiles cannot be removed from Europe because the Soviet Union has a greater amount of conventional weapons. But our January Statement unambiguously offers reductions in conventional weapons and armed forces as well.

They also say this: the USA will remove its missiles across the ocean, while Moscow will merely ship them to Siberia, whence they can be easily and promptly brought back. In saying this, they pretend not to know that the USSR offers to eliminate the missiles, not ship them anywhere. In sum, they stand for peace in words, but for missiles in deeds. Evidently neither Britain nor France has a serious approach in this respect.

Or take the attitude to the Strategic Defence Initiative. The West European governments and big business are using all sorts of pretexts for getting increasingly involved in that disastrous plan, and are thus becoming participants in a new, even more dangerous round of the arms race.

A final, and perhaps the most essential, point. The USA is putting its Star Wars programme into full gear. The President claims that it is a defensive and non-nuclear programme. But the general who heads the project describes in public how space weapons will hit the enemy on earth, while the US Secretary of Defence says that they also include nuclear components.

Let me be frank: If, contrary to common sense, the USA persists in this policy, we shall find a convincing response, and not necessarily in outer space. We know the potentialities of contemporary science, our own potentialities. There is nothing the USA can do that we cannot do as well. We can do everything, depending on the situation. Yet we are against such an option, we are against the absurd American armaments logic. To us, banning space strike weapons is not a problem of fearing a lag, but that of responsibility.

I wish to say the following in this connection: it is high time to give up trying to build relations with the USSR on erroneous concepts, on illusions. One of the most dangerous illusions is to consider the Soviet Union's peaceful intentions and proposals a

sign of weakness. And so: the arms race will not wear us out, we will not be taken from outer space or outdone in technology. Nothing good will come of these attempts.

As can be seen from the numerous letters pouring into the Central Committee, not a few Soviet people are apprehensive that under cover of peace talks and fruitless negotiations the West might make a spurt in the arms race to which we shall not have enough time to react. I can assure you, comrades, that this is not going to happen. The Soviet leadership can clearly see the difference between words and deeds. The Soviet Union builds its policy with due regard for the totality of real factors. We shall not be taken by surprise. The Soviet Union has proved repeatedly that it is able to meet any challenge. If need be, it will give a fitting answer this time, too. As the 27th Congress stressed, we do not lay claim to more security, but will not agree to less.

Certainly, nobody expected our programme of advance towards a world without wars and weapons to proceed smoothly, like a Zhiguli car on a well-paved road. We have a long and tough struggle ahead of us. Not only detente, but even a thaw in Soviet-American relations does not suit certain circles. They are trying to find any pretext to frustrate an improvement of the international situation, which began to manifest itself after Geneva. And the whole world knows who these circles are. They are the circles associated with the arms business, those associated with the military-industrial complex which sends its representatives to the upper echelons of power and takes them back after they have loyally served its aims there. They are those who earn billions on the arms race and confrontation.

At our Congress we outlined the main directions in the struggle against nuclear war. And we shall act consistently and perseveringly. Our potential is considerable.

Our true friends—the socialist countries—support us in this great effort. We have a special responsibility towards them, that is, our common responsibility for the destiny of socialism. It is very important that we are pursuing the policy of peace jointly, coordinating our strategy for the future and each important step towards peace.

The majority of countries in the world supports preserving peace, including the governments and peoples of the non-aligned

countries, of the Third World, and the working people of the capitalist countries.

We want to preserve the impulses of Paris and Geneva. We shall not let ourselves be provoked, nor shall we pour fuel on the bonfire of the cold war which is currently being rekindled. One should not play politics in this nuclear age.

We shall count on the common sense of the working people of all countries, the common sense of ordinary people, the growing sense of self-preservation, the awareness of new realities by political figures and parties, including those in the NATO countries.

As for us, we must always remember: carrying out the tasks of perfecting socialist society is the main front on which the success of the struggle for peace is ensured. The state of our national economy, the development of science and engineering, a qualitative restructuring of the economy and the building up of the spiritual, intellectual and moral potential of the Soviet state, are of decisive significance. In the final count, everything depends on the work put in by everyone of us. In a word, a strong, healthy economy ensures the success of the policy of peace. That is where foreign policy and home policy link up.

Message to Muammar Gaddafi, Leader of the Libyan Revolution

April 15, 1986

Dear Comrade Muammar Gaddafi,

During these days of trial for the Libyan Jamahiriya I want to express on behalf of the Soviet leadership and all Soviet people to you personally and to the friendly Libyan people our feelings of solidarity in the face of US imperialism's brigand atrocity. Also, please accept our sincere condolences on the tragic death of Libyans who fell victim to the barbarous US air raid.

Our position of principle on this latest armed aggression of the United States is outlined with the utmost clarity in the just published Statement of the Soviet Government. I deem it necessary to add the following.

The USSR took numerous steps to prevent the perilous course of events around Libya. Along with our moral, political, diplomatic and military support to friendly Libya and other measures in this direction that you are aware of, we have issued repeated serious warnings to the US Administration about the dangerous consequences that its continued anti-Libyan policy will entail for the situation in the Mediterranean and, indeed, the world situation as a whole. We also declare that such a course of events is bound to negatively affect Soviet-American relations as well.

Washington did not heed our calls prompted by a desire to avoid a new deterioration of the political climate in the world. The United States is again the chief culprit of the escalation of international tension who irresponsibly plays with the lives of millions of people for the sake of its imperial ambi-

tions. While declaring that they are combatting "international terrorism", the US leaders in fact only confirmed once again their adherence to the policy of state terrorism and the aggressive doctrine of neoglobalism.

The American armed attack on Libya has failed to achieve its aims. On the contrary, the aggression has only rallied the Libyan people still more closely round its revolutionary leadership and has only further fortified their resolve to continue upholding the progressive gains of the September 1 Revolution and to pursue an independent anti-imperialist course in the international arena. Washington's hopes of breaking the freedom-loving Jamahiriya and forcing it to its knees have been dashed, while the United States has suffered one more moral and political defeat.

The brigand raids of the US air force on peaceful Libyan cities have aroused the anger and indignation of the Soviet people. They are demanding an end to the aggressive designs of the United States against that sovereign Arab state.

We are taking vigorous steps in the international arena as well. We have lodged a firm protest with the US Administration and have again demanded that it should stop its adventurist anti-Libyan policy at once. An appropriate representation has been made by us to the government of the United Kingdom which permitted the use of the American bases located on its territory for the raids against Libya. In addition, we have called on the leading Arab and non-aligned countries to give the Libyan Jamahiriya active support.

It goes without saying that we coordinate all our actions in this direction with the fraternal socialist states.

Reaffirming our effective solidarity to you, Comrade Gaddafi, and to the entire Libyan nation, I would like to assure you that the Soviet Union firmly intends to continue fulfilling its commitments of further strengthening Libya's defence capability. This, as we see it, is of special importance for your country in the present situation.

With sincere respect,

Mikhail GORBACHEV

From the Speech at the 11th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany

April 18, 1986

Comrades,

Problems of war and peace figure prominently at your Congress, and with good reason. The international situation remains tense and acute. And Communists consider it their paramount duty to do everything possible to stop the world's slide towards nuclear catastrophe.

It was precisely the wish to achieve this goal that also prompted our trip to Geneva, the moratorium on nuclear explosions, and the concrete programme for fully eliminating nuclear arms, which was set forth in January. These major initiatives correspond to the interests of all nations and were energetically supported by the allied socialist countries, by many countries of the world. People began to hope for an improvement in the political atmosphere.

But, alas, today this hope is being subjected to serious trials. The military-industrial complex that rules in the United States is clearly opposed to a normalisation of the international situation. The arms merchants shudder at the mere thought that the Soviet Union and the United States might reach agreement on disarmament. Contrary to the vital interests and aspirations of all peoples, including its own, Washington has chosen to actually undermine the Geneva understandings, and has taken actions that only further complicate the already tense situation in the world arena.

I refer, first of all, to the two sinister nuclear explosions in Nevada, which destroyed a unique chance to give the process of disarmament a real start. I also refer to the brazen US action

against Libya, an action that is fraught with the danger of seriously worsening the situation in the world.

Washington, in its usual manner, has evidently decided to teach a lesson to the Arab countries, to force them to give up their struggle for a just settlement of the conflict in the Middle East. But this is also evidence of the bankruptcy of the American policy in the region—a policy of manoeuvres and separate deals in favour of Israel, a policy profoundly hostile to the interests of the Arab peoples.

No references to terrorism give the American Administration the right to play the role of an “international judge” and self-appointed chastiser, to substitute jungle law for the principles of international communication. The more so since the matter does not at all concern acts of terrorism, which are firmly condemned by the entire international community.

For many years now, the US imperialists have been keeping up the pressure on Libya and on other Arab countries that uphold their sovereign rights and defend the just cause of the Arab people of Palestine.

The USSR and other socialist countries have been demonstrating their solidarity with Libya in words and in deeds. They have warned about the grave responsibility the United States is taking by engaging in armed aggression against an independent country which is a UN member.

In a broad international context, the crime against Libya, the stubborn continuation of nuclear testing and the escalation of threats against Nicaragua cannot be seen in isolation from each other. They are all manifestations of Washington's general policy whose militarist, aggressive nature is most clearly revealed these days.

I would like to stress that they should realise in Washington and in the European capitals that such actions also do direct harm to the dialogue between the USSR and the United States and between East and West in general. No one should pretend that the US Administration is unaware of the fact that Soviet-US relations cannot develop irrespectively of how the United States behaves on the international scene and what kind of situation takes shape as a result.

By now every sensible person must know who is really working for peace and who is pushing nations towards the nuclear

abyss. One can imagine what would be left of the human race and its civilisation if the Soviet Union behaved on the world scene like the United States.

But such short-sighted, egoistic and adventurist policy is in principle alien to socialism.

At this critical moment no one should evade his duty to the present and future generations. The destiny of peace must not be left to the tender mercies of the US militarists.

As for the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, they have acted and will continue to act with full awareness of their responsibility.

Today we emphatically declare: our proposals for eliminating nuclear weapons and curbing the arms race remain in force. If the governments of Western countries are really concerned about the fate of peace, it is high time they began suiting their actions to their words.

So far this has not happened. Take Europe. It may be recalled that the Soviet Union made a big concession by proposing that all Soviet and American medium-range nuclear missiles be removed from the entire territory of Europe on condition that the other NATO countries, Britain and France, would not build up their missile potentials. But now the very same governments that only recently regarded the Soviet SS-20 missiles as the main threat to Western Europe declare that this is not enough, that the road to the further build-up of British and French missiles and nuclear warheads should not be blocked.

Where's the logic here, I ask you, and the principle of equality and equal security? There is no trace of them.

There is also no logic in the policy of the FRG. Its government keeps talking about its commitment to peace and its desire to develop cooperation with socialist countries. It says war will never begin from its territory. But what are the facts? It is on the territory of the FRG that Pershing and cruise missiles are poised against the East.

No other West European government, it seems, has given such wholehearted support to the militarist American SDI programme. More, Bonn has backed it with a European Star Wars plan. All this is all the more alarming because the ruling class of the FRG continues to claim that "the German question is open", and has not given up its revanchist plans.

The Soviet Union attaches much importance to its relations with the FRG as a major European state. Indeed, we are prepared to keep developing these relations on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. But this requires that Bonn's policy should first of all really meet the interests of peace and security.

We want to stress in this connection that we unconditionally support the legitimate demand of the GDR that its relations with the FRG should fully conform with the generally accepted norms of international law.

Speaking of the situation in Europe, we see another major problem in that powerful conventional armed forces stand face to face there.

Two army groups confront each other in Europe, each three million strong and equipped with the most advanced tanks, missiles and planes, not to speak of small arms of all types. More, the so-called conventional weapons are constantly being improved and made more sophisticated and powerful, their effect increasingly approaching that of weapons of mass destruction.

And there is one more aspect to this problem. We are told that Western Europe cannot give up nuclear weapons, including American ones, because it would then feel less secure in face of the armed forces and conventional armaments of the Warsaw Treaty countries. And the rightist press is backing this false argument and frightening people with fantastic scenarios of a Soviet tank armada invading the West.

What do we deem it necessary to say in this connection?

To begin with, the elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe would create a new situation not only for the West but also for ourselves. We have not forgotten that invasions of our territory in the pre-nuclear age were mounted from the west, and more than once.

And one more thing. I would like to appeal to all the people in Western Europe from here, from the capital of the socialist GDR: do not believe any allegations about the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union. Our country will never, under any circumstances, begin military operations against Western Europe unless we or our allies become targets of a NATO attack! I repeat, never!

We would like to back this position with a new initiative,

which this time concerns conventional armaments and armed forces. The USSR proposes that an agreement be reached on substantial reductions of all the components of the land forces and tactical air forces of the European states and the corresponding forces of the USA and Canada deployed in Europe. The formations and units to be reduced should be disbanded and their weaponry either destroyed or stored on national territories. Geographically, the reductions should obviously cover the entire territory of Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Tactical nuclear weapons would be reduced simultaneously with conventional weapons.

There is the question of reliable verification at every stage of this process. Both national technical means and international forms of verification, including, if necessary, on-site inspection, are possible.

In short, this is a subject for serious negotiations. We believe that consideration of the question in a broader context will make it possible to untie the knot which has been drawing tighter at the Vienna talks for so many years now.

We attach no less importance to eliminating chemical weapons. In a bid to expedite the conclusion of a pertinent international convention, the Soviet Union will put forward at the Disarmament Conference within the next few days a number of new proposals making it possible to iron out the remaining differences.

We consider all constructive initiatives, such as the idea of establishing a chemical weapons-free zone in Europe, advanced jointly by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Social Democratic Party of Germany, valuable and are prepared to study them.

There are no traps in our policy. We offer our hand, not fist, to the West. I want to stress that we seek mutual understanding and limitation of the arms race not out of weakness. We need peace, but so does everyone else. Our policy is prompted by our concern for the survival of mankind, perhaps the only civilisation in the starry expanses of our Galaxy.

Comrades,

The strength of the Communists lies in their ideological conviction and readiness to work with dedication for the ideals of peace and justice and for the happiness of the working people.

Your Congress, like the congresses of the other ruling communist parties, reaffirms our common resolve tirelessly to perfect socialist society and to enhance the appeal of the new social system by force of example.

We wish you, dear comrades, Communists and all the working people of the GDR, every success in carrying out the tasks which will be set by the 11th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

May the unbreakable fraternal friendship between the CPSU and the SUPG, between the peoples of the USSR and the GDR go from strength to strength!

Long live socialism!

Long live peace!

To the Participants in the World Peace Council Session

April 25, 1986

My heartiest greetings to the participants in the Session of the World Peace Council representing millions of men and women who have devoted themselves to the loftiest and greatest cause of today, that of safeguarding peace and life on Earth.

We are living in a very difficult time, in a fragile world. For the first time, all people are faced with the harsh, plain problem of survival. It is no longer enough, therefore, to want peace, no longer enough to censure the building up of military capabilities, no longer enough to simply see where the threat to peace originates. Nowadays, it is essential to act insistently and purposefully. Everybody must act—the public at large as well as the governments.

The mass movement for peace has immense, not as yet fully tapped, possibilities to assert the new anti-war and anti-nuclear thinking in world politics that reposes not on the “enemy image” stimulating confrontation, but on the need for joint efforts to build an all-embracing system of international security. The work that is being done by the World Peace Council along with many other movements and organisations, is helping this, is facilitating the consolidation of the powerful potential of peace, reason and self-preservation that has shaped in recent years. Overcoming obstacles, dissociation and prejudice within its own ranks, the massive stream of the struggle for peace will augment this potential and exercise an ever greater influence on international politics.

The state of affairs remains exceedingly grave. The current year, declared International Year of Peace by the UN, warns

us all against complacency. The most warlike elements representing the egoistic interests of imperialism's military-industrial complex have wrecked the unique chance of halting nuclear explosions and beginning to reduce nuclear armaments. Their armed aggression against the people of Libya has steeply increased the level of international tension. Preparations are under way to turn outer space into a source of unprecedented danger to the survival of civilisation. The rights and freedoms of people, above all their right to life, are being cynically spurned.

The Soviet Union is deeply conscious of its share of responsibility for the future of humankind. We have put forward a programme for eliminating nuclear weapons before the end of the century; we are prepared at any moment to negotiate an end to all nuclear weapon tests; we have come out with concrete initiatives aimed at the earliest banning and destruction of chemical weapons; we have proposed that nuclear weapons in Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals should be destroyed and conventional arms reduced. Also, the USSR has taken a number of substantial unilateral steps of goodwill.

The Soviet foreign policy programme has absorbed no few ideas and initiatives put forward by the peace movement. Their enactment depends in many ways on the public movements, currents and organisations, on the ability of people of different ideological views to conduct a dialogue and achieve mutual understanding on the key issues of war and peace, on their cooperation and their concrete joint actions. I trust that in future as well, the World Peace Council will continue making its tangible contribution to this process.

Friends, let me wish you success and fruitful work.

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Reply to a Message of the Leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Tanzania, Sweden and Greece

To Mr. Raúl ALFONSÍN, President of Argentina

Mr. Rajiv GANDHI, Prime Minister of India

Mr. Miguel de la MADRID, President of Mexico

Mr. Julius NYERERE, Tanzania

Mr. Ingvar CARLSSON, Prime Minister of Sweden

Mr. Andreas PAPANDREOU, Prime Minister of Greece

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your message of April 8, 1986, and for your support for our efforts to end nuclear testing.

I share your concern over the dangerous development of events in the world, and also your ideas regarding specific steps and actions which could be taken, primarily by the USSR and the USA, to eliminate the nuclear threat to mankind. I think you are quite right in stressing the importance of ending nuclear tests as a measure which would prevent the further improvement of nuclear armaments and help to lessen the nuclear threat.

The message was received at a time when the United States, contrary to the demands of the world public and ignoring the appeals of statesmen from countries on different continents of the Earth, carried out nuclear tests on April 10 and 22, 1986. Naturally, you understand that this inflammatory act has substantially altered the situation.

We have repeatedly warned, both publicly and in our correspondence with President Reagan, that the Soviet Union cannot keep prolonging its unilateral moratorium indefinitely. By not carrying out either test or peaceful explosions over a long period, our country has run a definite risk. In the period of our moratorium the USA carried on with its large-scale military programmes, including those in the framework of the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative. The nuclear explosions on the Nevada proving range are part of these programmes.

Such being the case, we were compelled to discard the freely taken unilateral commitment not to carry out any nuclear explo-

sions, because we cannot jeopardise our own security and that of our allies and friends. I repeat that it was the actions of the USA that compelled us to take such a decision.

However, even in this new situation the Soviet Union is firmly resolved to work perseveringly and consistently for a complete nuclear test ban which is an acute problem that brooks no delay. And we continue to count on your valuable support in this endeavour.

I would like to stress that the Soviet Union is doing all it can for a bilateral Soviet-American moratorium to become a reality. We are ready at any moment to return to the question of a mutual moratorium if the USA does not carry out any more nuclear tests. We supported your earlier idea that the USSR and the USA should abstain from nuclear testing till a new summit. Even now, after an eight-months break in nuclear tests in the USSR, we are in no hurry to resume them. However, Washington's reaction to all this has remained negative.

I can add that we cannot describe Washington's widely advertised "reply" to our calls for an end to nuclear explosions—namely, its invitation to our experts to attend the explosions in Nevada—other than as a mockery of common sense. In this way they want to put us in the untrue position of "collaborating" in the arms race, rather than of seeking its termination.

The prohibition of nuclear weapons tests in international law remains the key task. It can be attained by negotiations. To get the process off the ground we must try all available possibilities. As you know, we have proposed to the USA that bilateral talks should be started on ending nuclear tests. The USSR has also declared for resuming the tripartite negotiations on this issue and has again posed this question to Mrs. Thatcher. There are good possibilities for multilateral negotiations at the Disarmament Conference. Lastly, we are also prepared to reach agreement on extending the Moscow Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water to underground nuclear tests.

The Soviet Union reaffirms its readiness to consider and use such control measures, including those suggested by you, which would ensure firm confidence that the agreement on ending nuclear tests that has to be reached is rigidly observed by all.

In your message you correctly link the question of a Soviet-

American summit meeting with progress in arms limitation and the solution of the question of nuclear tests. At the Geneva meeting we agreed with the President of the USA to continue our dialogue, which, we hold, must bring about practical results, primarily on security matters. On the other hand, the present-day actions of the United States run counter to the task of looking for ways of improving international relations and intensifying the positive trends which resulted from the Geneva meeting. Let me say frankly that this has also done direct damage to the dialogue between the USSR and the USA.

However, considering the urgency of the question of ending nuclear tests, we have suggested holding a meeting in the nearest time in Europe specially on this question. This meeting would not substitute for the one we agreed upon in Geneva. At the meeting in Europe we could agree in principle on ending nuclear tests. Then there could follow relevant talks to draft the text of an agreement on this question. Our proposals to this effect still hold good.

The Soviet Union regards the termination and prohibition of nuclear tests as a major component of the movement towards a nuclear-free world. You may rest assured that in our striving to achieve it we are prepared to take the boldest steps provided the principle of equal security is observed. We hope that you, too, will continue to promote by common effort the constructive businesslike cooperation of all the peace-loving states in their efforts to ensure international security in the conditions of a nuclear-free world. The main thing today is to stop humankind's slide towards the nuclear abyss. This is the cause of all and everyone.

Respectfully,

Mikhail GORBACHEV

Pravda, May 3, 1986

**Speech at a Kremlin Dinner
for José Eduardo dos Santos,
Chairman of the MPLA-Party of Labour
and President of the People's Republic
of Angola**

May 6, 1986

Dear Comrade dos Santos, dear Angolan friends, comrades.

We are pleased to see our friend, President dos Santos, party leader and top statesman of People's Angola, in Moscow again. Greetings to all the Angolan friends accompanying Comrade dos Santos on this visit. You are always our welcome guests. Our effective solidarity with the struggle of the Angolan people under the leadership of the MPLA-Party of Labour is irreversible.

Your visit, Comrade President, coincides with a special and, let me add, exceedingly responsible and acute moment in international affairs. The Soviet leadership does not dramatise the situation. But we cannot help seeing that humanity has come to a frontier where its future, the future of our planet, of the house that all of us are living in, hangs in the balance. The stockpiling of mass destruction weapons has reached critical dimensions. Yet the arms race continues, and spreads to ever more spheres. Imperialism is trying to use practically all scientific discoveries first of all for the development of new deadly weapons. The confrontation, too, is continuing and making the arms race doubly dangerous.

We have just lived through one more acute crisis caused by the US attack on Libya, a sovereign state and full-fledged member of the international community. And once again the US Administration stood before the world in the repulsive posture of a strangler of the freedom and independence of nations.

In Libya the aggressor has suffered a politico-moral defeat. Nearly the entire international community has in one way or another censured the actions of the United States. But the men in the White House won't desist. New threats resound from

there, and now not only against Libya, but also against Syria and Iran. This means that a new crisis is liable to erupt at any moment, spurred by a drive for hegemony.

No references to "international terrorism", which the Soviet Union has always firmly opposed and now opposes in any shape or form, can exonerate the actions of the United States. These actions, indeed, are in themselves the worst possible act of terrorism—of state terrorism, with a mighty power seeing fit to administer lynch law upon countries that aren't to its taste.

All this must stop. We are deeply convinced that the arms race conveyer has got to be halted without further delay, that all concerned must renounce confrontation. And this has got to be done jointly, by everybody. Nothing but collective security can ensure the survival of civilisation on the Earth. It is also increasingly clear that security must encompass all areas—the military, political, economic, and humanitarian.

This is exactly what we acted on when we advanced the programme of an all-embracing system of international security at our Party's 27th Congress. In substance, this is a qualitatively new approach to this problem, the aim being to eliminate the material capability of waging war. It is quite evident that this prospect does not suit the military-industrial complex of the United States. That is why the battle for a world without wars and weapons will be long and hard. But the effort is worth it. For the very survival of humanity is at stake.

The peoples of the newly-free countries play an important part in this battle. And that is no accident. The current confrontation, the arms race, weigh most heavily on their shoulders. The imperialists are trying to meet their truly monstrous military expenditures at the cost of the developing states. They are like parasites on the body of the nations, sucking them dry while shedding crocodile tears over the economic difficulties of their victims.

Part of the refined system of neocolonial enslavement is the mechanism of indebtedness whereby the imperialists want to run the states and nations that have fallen into debt. They expect to strip the young states of their hard-won political independence in exchange for new loans and credits.

Many African countries have found themselves in most difficult straits in recent years. The situation there spells tragedy for

millions of people. It is leading to a further aggravation of the already most acute problems of backwardness, poverty, hunger, disease, and appalling child mortality. On imperialism's part this, too, is a kind of terrorism, an economic terrorism.

As we see it, it is a vital imperative to halt the neocolonialist plunder. A special session of the UN General Assembly is being called at the end of May to look into the critical economic situation in Africa. The Soviet Union is in favour of its working out an effective comprehensive programme for resolving the continent's economic problems. The crisis gripping the African countries cannot be overcome by fresh injections of financial aid. That will not cure the affliction. Radical measures are in order to root out its rockbottom causes inherited from colonialist days and nurtured by neocolonialism. These measures have got to be closely associated with a solution of the disarmament problem. For every step along the road of disarmament would provide for the greater security of all and, indeed, release funds for combating backwardness, and this, of course, also in the African countries. Our slogan is Disarmament for Development. I trust you agree with this approach.

Comrades, for ten years now Angola has been racist South Africa's target of interference and aggression with the backing and, lately, the immediate participation, of the United States. Washington and Pretoria do not wish to recognise the right of the people of Angola to run their country independently. The US Administration's decision to openly grant military aid to the puppet UNITA gangs, who leave a trail of blood in their wake on Angolan soil, was rightly assessed everywhere as a new escalation of that criminal policy.

The Soviet Union is in solidarity with the dedicated struggle of the Angolan people defending their sovereignty and progressive social system. We are standing by our commitments under the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with the People's Republic of Angola, and will abide by them firmly and constantly. Let there be no doubt on that score.

It is very important that the entire international community should come out still more actively in support of Angola for a resolute stop to the aggressive impingements on its independence and territorial integrity. Our readiness to invigorate collective efforts in the bid to settle conflict situations in various regions of

the world, as set forth at the 27th Congress of the CPSU, applies equally to the region of the South of Africa. There is a sensible and tangible alternative to the bloodshed, tension and confrontation in Southern Africa. It envisages stopping the aggression against Angola and the other newly-free countries, granting independence to Namibia without further delay—but a genuine independence, not the spurious kind wanted by the USA and RSA—and, finally, abolishing the inhuman system of apartheid.

It is high time to realise that any further support of the racist regime in the RSA and any further “constructive engagement” is an absolutely hopeless policy. It works against the legitimate rights and interests of the African nations, including the white population of South Africa, and can yield nothing but a new mass of victims and new suffering.

We regard the recent steps of People’s Angola—and that, Comrade President, includes your message to the Secretary-General of the UN—as one more token of your country’s goodwill and readiness to take an active part in settling Southern Africa’s problems by political means. The Soviet Union supports these important initiatives, and will continue to act in common with our Angolan friends in the interests of freedom, peace and stability in the South of the African continent.

Comrades, friends, we have enough grounds to be gratified over the fruitful and ascendant development of Soviet-Angolan relations in all areas—government, party, and so on. Much positive experience has accumulated in our friendly cooperation. To be sure, we are also aware of the as yet untapped potentialities. We are both firmly determined to improve the forms and methods of such cooperation, especially in the fields of economy, trade, education, health, and personnel training. We will work hand in hand to make this cooperation still closer and still more effective. In short, Soviet-Angolan relations have a splendid future.

My best wishes to you, dear Comrade dos Santos, to all the party and government leaders of People’s Angola, to the working people of Angola, in fulfilling the big tasks set by the Second Congress of the MPLA-Party of Labour to further the construction of a new society, to further peace and progress.

Speech on Soviet Television

May 14, 1986

Good evening, comrades,

As you all know, a misfortune has befallen us—there has been an accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station. It has painfully affected Soviet people and worries the international public. This is the first time we have had to deal with a force as powerful as nuclear energy that has gone out of control.

Considering the extraordinary and dangerous nature of what has happened at Chernobyl, the Political Bureau has taken into its hands the entire organisation of the speediest elimination of the accident and minimising its consequences. A government commission was formed and immediately left for the scene of the accident, while at the Political Bureau a group was formed under Nikolai Ivanovich Ryzhkov to tackle the urgent problems.

All work is actually proceeding round the clock. The scientific, technical, and economic potentials of the entire country have been set in motion. Operating in the area of the accident are organisations of many Union ministries and agencies that are under the guidance of ministers, as well as prominent scientists and specialists, units of the Soviet Army and the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

A huge share of the work and responsibility has been assumed by the Party, government, and economic bodies of the Ukraine and Byelorussia. The operational staff of the Chernobyl nuclear power station are working selflessly and courageously.

But what has happened?

According to specialists, the reactor's capacity suddenly increased during a scheduled shut-down of the fourth unit. The considerable emission of steam and the subsequent reaction led

to the formation of hydrogen, to its explosion, to damage to the reactor, and the resulting radioactive discharge.

It is still too early to pass final judgement on the causes of the accident. All aspects of the problem—design, construction, technical, and operational—are under the close scrutiny of the government commission. It goes without saying that once the investigation of the causes of the accident is completed, all necessary conclusions will be drawn and measures taken to rule out a repetition of anything of the sort.

As I have said already, this is the first time that we have encountered such an emergency, when it was necessary quickly to curb the dangerous force of the atom which had gone out of control, and to keep the scale of the accident to the minimum.

The seriousness of the situation was obvious. It was necessary to evaluate it quickly and competently. And as soon as we received reliable initial information, it was made available to Soviet people and sent through diplomatic channels to the governments of other countries.

On the basis of this information practical work was begun to clean up the breakdown and minimise its grave consequences.

In the resulting situation we considered it our foremost duty, a duty of special importance, to ensure the safety of the population and to provide effective assistance to the victims of the accident. The inhabitants of the settlement near the station were evacuated within a matter of hours and then, when it became clear that there was a potential threat to the health of people in the adjoining zone, they, too, were moved to safe areas. All this complex work required the utmost speed, good organisation, and precision.

Nevertheless, the measures taken failed to avert harm to quite a few people: two died at the moment of the accident—Vladimir Nikolayevich Shashenok, an adjuster of automatic systems, and Valery Ivanovich Khodemchuk, an operator of the nuclear power station; 299 people have been hospitalised, diagnosed as having the radiation sickness of varying degrees of gravity; seven of them have died while the rest are receiving every possible form of treatment. The best scientific and medical specialists of the country, specialised clinics in Moscow and other cities, have been enlisted. They have the most modern means of medicine at their disposal.

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet government, I express our profound condolences to the families and relatives of the deceased, to the work collectives, to all who have suffered from this misfortune, who have suffered bereavement. The Soviet government will take care of the families of those who died and of all victims of the accident.

The inhabitants of the areas that so warmly received the evacuees deserve the highest praise. They responded to the misfortune of their neighbours as if it were their own and, in the best traditions of our people, showed consideration, responsiveness, and attention.

The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet government are receiving thousands upon thousands of letters and telegrams from Soviet people and also from people abroad expressing sympathy and support for the victims. Many Soviet families are prepared to take children into their homes for the summer and are offering material help. There are numerous requests from people asking to be sent to work in the area of the accident.

These demonstrations of humaneness, genuine humanism, and high moral standards cannot but move everyone of us.

I repeat, assistance to people remains our prime task.

At the same time, intensive work is under way at the station itself and in the adjacent territory to minimise the scale of the accident. Under the most difficult conditions the fire was extinguished and prevented from spreading to the other power units. The staff of the station shut down the other three reactors and assured their safety. They are under constant observation.

A stern test was and is being passed by all—firemen, transport and building workers, medical workers and special chemical protection units, helicopter crews, and other detachments of the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

In these difficult conditions much depended on a correct, scientific evaluation of what was happening, because without such an evaluation it would have been impossible to work out and apply effective measures for coping with the accident and its consequences. Our prominent specialists from the Academy of Sciences, leading specialists from Union ministries and agencies as well as in the Ukraine and Byelorussia, are dealing with this task successfully.

I must say that people have acted and are continuing to

act heroically, selflessly. I believe we shall still have an opportunity to name these courageous people and to pay tribute to their exploit.

I have every reason to say that despite all the gravity of what has happened, the damage turned out to be limited. To a decisive degree this is due to the courage and skill of our people, their loyalty to their duty, the good team-work of everybody taking part in eliminating the consequences of the accident.

The task, comrades, is being carried out not only in the area of the nuclear power station itself, but also in research institutes, and at many of the enterprises in our country that are supplying everything necessary to those who are directly engaged in the difficult and dangerous business of handling the accident.

Thanks to the effective measures taken, it is possible to say today that the worst is over. The most serious consequences have been averted. Of course, it is too early to write finis to the event. We cannot relax. Extensive and long work still lies ahead. The level of radiation in the station's zone and in the directly adjoining territory still remains dangerous to human health.

As of today, therefore, the priority is to eliminate the consequences of the accident. A large-scale programme for the decontamination of the territory of the electric power station and the settlement, of buildings and structures, has been drawn up and is being implemented. The necessary manpower and material and technical resources have been concentrated for that purpose. In order to prevent any radioactive contamination of the ground waters and rivers in the vicinity, measures are being taken at the site of the station and in the adjacent territory.

Organisations of the meteorological service are constantly monitoring the radiation levels on the ground, in the water and atmosphere. They have the necessary technical facilities at their disposal and are using specially equipped planes, helicopters, and land-based monitoring stations.

It is absolutely clear—all this work will take much time and no small effort. It should be carried out meticulously, in a planned and organised manner. The area must be restored to a condition that is absolutely safe for the health and normal life of people.

I cannot fail to mention one more aspect of the case: the reaction abroad to what has happened at Chernobyl. In the world

as a whole, and this should be emphasised, the misfortune that befell us and our actions in that complicated situation were treated with understanding.

We are profoundly grateful to our friends in socialist countries who have shown solidarity with the Soviet people at a difficult moment. We are grateful to the political and public figures in other states for their sincere sympathy and support.

We express our kind feelings to those foreign scientists and specialists who showed readiness to assist us in overcoming the consequences of the accident. I would like to note the participation of the American doctors Robert Gale and Paul Tarasaki in treating afflicted people, and to express gratitude to the business circles of those countries, that promptly reacted to our request for purchasing certain equipment, materials, and medicines.

We are duly grateful for the objective attitude to the events at the Chernobyl nuclear power station that was shown by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and its Director-General Hans Blix.

In other words, we highly appreciate the sympathy of all those who responded to our misfortune and our problems with an open heart.

But it is impossible to ignore the way the event at Chernobyl was treated by the governments, political figures, and the mass media in certain NATO countries, especially the USA, and this calls for a political assessment. A wanton anti-Soviet campaign was launched by them. It is difficult to imagine what was said and written these days—"thousands of casualties", "mass graves of the dead", "Kiev deserted" and "the entire land of the Ukraine contaminated", and so on and so forth.

Generally speaking, we faced a veritable mountain of lies—most brazen and malicious lies. It is unpleasant to recall all this, but it must be done. The international public should know what we had to face. It must be done to find the answer to the question: what, in fact, was behind this highly immoral campaign? Its organisers, to be sure, were not interested in true information about the accident or the fate of the people at Chernobyl, in the Ukraine, in Byelorussia, in any other place or country. They were looking for a pretext they could use to try to defame the Soviet Union and its foreign policy, to lessen the im-

fact of Soviet proposals on the termination of nuclear tests and on the elimination of nuclear weapons, and, at the same time, to dampen the growing criticism of US behaviour on the international scene and of its militaristic course.

Bluntly speaking, certain Western politicians were after quite definite aims—to wreck the possibilities for balancing out international relations, to sow new seeds of mistrust and suspicion towards the socialist countries.

All this was made completely clear during the meeting of the leaders of "the Seven" held in Tokyo not so long ago. What did they tell the world, what dangers did they warn mankind of? Of Libya, groundlessly accused of terrorism, and of the Soviet Union, which, of all things, failed to provide them with "full" information about the accident at Chernobyl. But not a word about the most important issue—how to stop the arms race, how to rid the world of the nuclear threat. Not a word in reply to the Soviet initiatives, to our specific proposals on stopping nuclear tests, on ridding mankind of nuclear and chemical weapons, on reducing conventional arms.

How should all this be interpreted? One cannot help getting the impression that the leaders of the capitalist powers gathered in Tokyo wanted to use Chernobyl as a pretext for diverting the attention of the world public from problems that make them uncomfortable, but are so real and important for the whole world.

The accident at the Chernobyl station and the reaction to it have become a kind of test of political morality. Once again two different approaches, two different lines of conduct, were revealed for everyone to see.

The ruling circles of the USA and their most zealous allies—and among the latter I would single out the FRG—regarded the mishap only as another chance to put up additional obstacles to the development and deepening of the current East-West dialogue, progressing slowly as it is, and to justify the nuclear arms race. What is more, an attempt has been made to prove to the world that talks and, particularly, agreements with the USSR are impossible, and thereby to give the green light to further military preparations.

Our attitude to the tragedy is absolutely different. We realise that it is another sound of the tocsin, another grim warning that

the nuclear era calls for new political thinking and a new policy.

This has strengthened our conviction still more that the foreign policy worked out by the 27th Congress of the CPSU is correct and that our proposals for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the ending of nuclear explosions, and the creation of an all-embracing system of international security, meet those inexorably stringent demands that the nuclear age makes on the political leadership of all countries.

The "shortage" of information, around which a special campaign with a political content and nature has been launched, is in this case a wholly trumped-up charge. The following facts confirm this. It is well known that it took the US authorities ten days to inform their own Congress and months to inform the world community about the tragedy that took place at the Three Mile Island atomic power station in 1979.

I have already said how we acted.

This enables us to judge how those concerned go about informing their own people and foreign countries.

But that is not the substance of the case. We hold that the accident at Chernobyl, just as the accidents at US, British and other atomic power stations, poses to all states very serious problems, which require a responsible attitude.

There are now over 370 atomic reactors in different countries. This is a reality. The future of the world economy is virtually unimaginable without the development of atomic power. Altogether 40 reactors with an aggregate capacity of over 28 million kilowatts now operate in our country. As is known, mankind derives a considerable benefit from the peaceful atom.

But it stands to reason that we are all obliged to act with even greater circumspection, and to concentrate the efforts of science and technology on ensuring the safe harnessing of the great and formidable powers contained in the atomic nucleus.

To us, the indisputable lesson of Chernobyl is that in the course of the further development of the scientific and technical revolution the question of equipment reliability and safety, the question of discipline, order and organisation, are acquiring priority importance. The most stringent demands are needed, everywhere and in everything.

Further, we deem it necessary to support a serious deepening

of cooperation in the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). What steps could be considered?

First, creating an international system for the safe development of nuclear power engineering based on the close cooperation of all nations dealing with the matter. Prompt warning and information in the event of accidents or faults at nuclear power stations, specifically when this is accompanied by radioactive emissions, should be arranged for within this system. Likewise, it is necessary to organise an international mechanism, both on a bilateral and a multilateral basis, for the speediest rendering of mutual assistance when dangerous situations emerge.

Second, to discuss all this range of matters it would be desirable to convene a highly authoritative specialised international conference in Vienna under IAEA auspices.

Third, in view of the fact that the IAEA was founded back in 1957 and that its resources and staff are not in keeping with the level of the development of present-day nuclear power engineering, it would be expedient to enhance the role and capabilities of that unique international organisation. The Soviet Union is ready for this.

Fourth, we believe that the United Nations Organisation and its specialised agencies, such as the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), should be more actively involved in the effort to ensure safe development of peaceful nuclear activity.

For all this, it should not be forgotten that in our world, where everything is interrelated, war atom problems exist alongside those of the peaceful atom. This is the main thing today. The accident at Chernobyl showed again what an abyss will open if nuclear war befalls mankind. The stockpiled nuclear arsenals are fraught with thousands upon thousands of disasters far more horrible than the one at Chernobyl.

At a time of increased attention to nuclear matters, and after having considered all circumstances connected with the security of its people and all humanity, the Soviet government has decided to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests till August 6 of this year, the date on which more than 40 years ago the first atomic bomb was dropped on the Japanese city of Hiroshima, resulting in the death of hundreds of thousands of people.

We again urge the United States to consider most responsibly the measure of the danger facing mankind, and to heed the opinion of the world community. Let the leaders of the United States show their concern for the life and health of people by their deeds.

I reiterate my proposal to President Reagan to meet without delay in the capital of any European state that is prepared to receive us or, say, in Hiroshima, in order to agree on prohibiting nuclear testing.

The nuclear age forcefully demands a new approach to international relations, the pooling of efforts of states with different social systems in order to put an end to the disastrous arms race and to radically improve the world political climate. Broad horizons will then be cleared for the fruitful cooperation of all countries and peoples. This will benefit all people on Earth!

On the Five-Year Plan of the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and the Tasks of Party Organisations in Carrying It Out

From the Report at the CC CPSU Plenary Meeting

June 16, 1986

Comrades,

Today we will discuss the progress made in carrying out the general line determined by the Congress, sum up the preliminary results, draw the lessons of our post-Congress work, and define the immediate tasks of the Party.

True, little time has passed since the Congress. However, the responsibility of the moment and the scale of the tasks facing society today are so great that we must constantly check the pulse of the changes and compare our intentions and plans to the way things are actually going. In other words, we will discuss the most important problems of the present moment, how the energy of our plans is being converted into energy of action, what problems and difficulties have arisen and what we are to do next.

The 27th Congress of the CPSU set in motion all spheres of Soviet society—the political, economic and spiritual. Social development was given a strong dynamic impetus which stimulated the political awareness of the masses. The atmosphere of exactingness and truthfulness which prevailed at the Congress is exerting a mobilising influence on all practical work. Soviet people keenly respond and support innovations and demand that the reconstruction should be universal and meaningful. All this shows that the ideas of the Congress are firmly implanted in people's minds and are an objective guarantee that the ongoing change is irreversible.

Today we are even more convinced that the decisions adopted at the Congress are correct and in keeping with the crucial nature of the times. They have a special part to play in the destiny of this country and of socialism in general, and this will of course have far-reaching consequences for the whole world. We now have a fuller, more concrete idea both of the scale and the depth of the change initiated by the Party, and of the various difficulties we must still overcome. We are also more clearly aware of our possibilities—those of today and the potential possibilities.

The interest abroad in the Congress does not abate. It is especially keen in the socialist countries. The Congress' decisions gave powerful impetus to the struggle for peace and social progress. The approval and support of our friends are convincing us that we are following the right course. They also remind us that we bear a great responsibility for following it consistently and purposefully.

Sober-minded people in the non-socialist part of the world could see once again that our extensive plans of social and economic development are indissolubly linked with a foreign policy aimed at peaceful construction and all-round international co-operation.

Our plans evoked a different response from the militarist and aggressive forces led by the reactionary circles in the United States. They are now showing especial hostility in their fight against the Soviet initiatives aimed at improving the international situation and shaping international relations suiting the nuclear and space age.

In short, comrades, we must consider the key aspects of the five-year plan in the light of our domestic tasks and the state of world affairs. The plan is the basis for our work in the immediate future and in the long term.

We have come to a phase in our post-Congress work when we must show our ability of changing things and building, of finding new forms and methods, without ever letting success go to our heads. The chief performance criteria now are dynamic rates of economic growth, high efficiency indicators and palpable positive changes in the social sphere. We will be judged not only by our plans, but above all by the visible changes in our society, by the practical results.

I. THE FIRST LESSONS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION

Comrades, we must assess the performance of all Party committees, government and economic agencies, public organisations and work collectives by their work and results.

This approach will enable us to find our bearings not only in the current situation, but also to see how we must proceed further. We must do this also because, as experience shows, we are dealing not only with positive trends, which, of course, are dominant in society, but also with factors which hinder the reconstruction process. Some of these factors are objective, but most of them are due to inertia, sluggish habits, and an ossified psychology.

People who are showing their mettle today are those who strongly support the stand of the 27th Congress and have become actively involved in the common work, who spare neither time nor energy and who seek and find a worthy place for themselves in the reconstruction. However, there are quite a few comrades who realise the political need to work in a new way, but simply do not know how to do so. We must help them in every way possible. Neither must we overlook those who have not understood the essence of the ongoing changes, who are waiting to see what happens or simply do not believe that the economic and political turnaround planned by the Party can be successful.

The Congress directive on encouraging the creative activity of the masses as the basis of accelerated growth is having a profound influence on society. It is closely related to the drive for social justice, greater democracy and complete openness, and for ridding society of all signs of the petty-bourgeois psychology. Soviet people are showing a growing interest in politics and economics, culture and morality, in public life in general. And this is having a visible effect on people's labour and political activity, and on discipline and order in the country.

The good organisation and patriotism of the Soviet people in emergencies were forcefully demonstrated at Chernobyl. The breakdown at the atomic power station was a severe trial, with workers, firemen, engineers, physicians, scientists and soldiers displaying great fortitude, self-sacrifice, and courage.

The country has risen as one to combat the consequences of the accident. The CPSU Central Committee and local Party and government organisations are flooded with letters from people who want to be sent to Chernobyl. An extensive fund-raising campaign has been launched to aid the families affected by the accident. Many work collectives have pledged to work several shifts with the pay going to the aid fund.

Allow me on behalf of our Plenary Meeting to convey our deep condolences to the bereaved families, and to cordially thank all those who, risking their lives, did everything they could to contain the accident and who are working selflessly today to eliminate its consequences.

Comrades, we are faced with difficult tasks in all areas of social and economic development. Of course, it would be naive to expect us to overcome the lag and shortcomings that have accumulated over a number of years in only a few months. But a tendency towards higher rates of economic growth is apparent. We attribute this mostly to the hard work of the people and the positive processes taking place in society.

In the first five months of this year industrial production rose by 5.7 per cent compared to the same period last year. There are also changes in industries which have been lagging behind for many years—coal mining, iron-and-steel, railway transport. The timber, wood-working, and pulp and paper industries have begun to improve their performance. The oil industry has not yet overcome its difficulties, but promising tendencies are evident there too. A number of branches of mechanical engineering are developing rapidly. Intensive work is also under way in the agrarian sector.

In many regions and territories of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, and Byelorussia, and in the Baltic Republics and elsewhere, the active work carried out by Party, government and economic organisations and work collectives shows what we can do if we encourage initiative and foster a creative and business-like climate at workplaces.

The main thing now is to consolidate the rates of growth already achieved and to continue raising them. This is feasible, but will require major efforts, doubly so because we are still at the very start of the restructuring and not everything has been done organisationally and the economic levers and incentives

crucial for further economic change to the better are not yet functioning in full gear.

The analysis of the economic changes would be far from complete if, along with the obvious successes, we fail to note the weak points, the things which impede our advance. I would say the reconstruction is still taking place too slowly. Many enterprises still rely on crash tactics and abide by the old slogan of fulfilling the plan no matter what. The turn to quality, efficiency and new management methods is difficult and painful. It should be absolutely clear, however, that the Central Committee will firmly support all that is sound and conforms with the decisions of the Congress, all that promotes reconstruction and progress. We will be just as firm in combating all that hinders this process.

The new that was initiated by the April (1985) Plenary Meeting and was further elaborated in the decisions of the 27th Congress, calls for a profound restructuring not only of the economic sphere, but of society as a whole. This is no simple process. It requires effort and serious change in the mentality of our cadres, of all working people. We have succeeded in overcoming passive attitudes to some extent, increasing responsibility, improving organisation and giving greater scope to initiative. At the same time, the restructuring process is still running into snags at enterprises, in the administrative field, in research institutions, artistic collectives, and in the work of Party and government bodies. Old ways of doing things and inertia are slowing progress.

Sometimes words are substituted for deeds, no action is taken in response to criticism, and self-criticism takes the form of self-flagellation. Some managers are lavish in issuing declarations of openness and publicity, and speak quite correctly about the important role of the work collective, and about promoting democratic principles. Regrettably that is where it all stops. Restructuring becomes a mere illusion: everything is all right in words, but there is no real change. The restructuring process merely marks time.

The post-Congress period has shown that the complicated structure and inefficient performance of our administrative apparatus considerably hamper our progress and the introduction of new management methods. The redistribution of rights and

responsibilities between the central economic bodies and ministries, on the one hand, and enterprises, production associations and work collectives, on the other, is proving to be a painful process.

Even though the functions of management bodies have changed, some managers try to hold on to their right of command at all costs, while the simple truth that no ministry, no central department, however efficient, can, given today's large-scale economy, solve every problem and replace the creative search of work collectives, should by now be clear and obvious to everybody.

Blind faith in the omnipotence of the apparatus is reflected in the fact that the centre is still receiving requests to set up more and more management bodies and allocate additional staff. Some republics try, quite unjustifiably, to copy the structure of management at the centre and have asked the USSR Council of Ministers for permission to set up new ministries and departments, though they already have fifty or more ministries, central departments, and other management bodies.

The past few months have clearly shown that it is impossible to carry out any social restructuring without changing the style and methods of Party work at every level. These matters merit more detailed scrutiny, and I shall return to them later.

Now, I should like to stress the tremendously important role of the leaders of Party bodies in asserting the new style. How consistent and vigorous the reconstruction of Party work will be, depends on the position they take, on their manner of acting and behaviour.

In this connection I have to call special attention to the part played by the first secretaries of the central committees of the communist parties of the Union republics, of territorial and regional Party committees and, of course, of city and district Party committees. They must set the tone, show political insight and a profound understanding of the tasks at hand, have organisational abilities and a high sense of responsibility, be able to assess their own and the work of others critically, and show their commitment to the Party cause in the loftiest sense. Only then can we count on good results, and an atmosphere of constructive search and endeavour in the districts, towns, regions and republics.

Comrades, what are the main conclusions to be drawn from our work in the first few months after the Congress?

The main thing is that the Party and the people actively support the political line of the Congress. The Party reorganises itself as it organises and rallies the working people. The past few months have again demonstrated that the restructuring is everybody's concern, from rank-and-file Communist to Central Committee secretary, from shopfloor worker to minister, from engineer to academician. We can accomplish it only if it truly becomes a universal concern. And everything that stands in its way must be rooted out.

And one more important conclusion. The people's creative initiative cannot be replaced with instructions, even the best of them. The restructuring presupposes all-round encouragement of the initiative and self-reliance of work collectives and every cadre. Today it is inadmissible—and practically impossible—to solve all questions at the centre. Everybody has to realise that. Work collectives at enterprises and associations have to shoulder most of the responsibility for the day-to-day decision-making. As to creating the necessary economic, legal and social conditions for fruitful work, for progress in science and technology, that is the immediate duty of central management bodies.

And lastly, the time that has elapsed since the Congress and the latest developments have clearly confirmed the vital importance of the lesson of truth referred to at the Congress. In all situations, we should remember Lenin's warning: "Illusions and self-deceptions are terrible, the fear of truth is pernicious."¹ The Party and the people need the whole truth, in big things and small. Only the truth instills in people a keen sense of civic duty. Lies and half-truths corrupt the mind, deform the personality, and prevent one from making realistic conclusions and evaluations—and without this an active Party policy is inconceivable.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 44, 5th Russ. ed., p. 487.

II. DECISIVE STAGE IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARTY'S ECONOMIC STRATEGY

Comrades, we are here to examine the new five-year plan and the tasks which the Party and all working people must carry out to fulfil it.

The Twelfth Five-Year Plan has a special role to play. The rates of our socio-economic development and the people's standard of living will depend on the foundations we will lay in the next five years for radical reforms in the national economy and the acceleration of scientific and technological progress.

As you know, the drafting of the new five-year plan has not been easy. Our studies showed that the old methods of management and planning from attained levels were only leading our economy into a dead-end. For a whole year we persistently searched for new approaches which would create the conditions for deepening the intensification of production and accelerating the introduction of the achievements of science and technology in production. Guidelines meeting the requirements of the present-day economic and social policy of the Party, were submitted to the 27th Congress of the CPSU.

When drafting the new five-year plan we were able to reach the highest level in terms of most of the quantitative and, more importantly, the qualitative targets of the Guidelines for the country's economic and social development. The draft plan has been thoroughly discussed in the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, has been approved and is now being submitted for discussion to this Plenary Meeting.

Which particular aspects of the plan should be given attention?

First of all, I would like to say that on the whole the plan corresponds to the directives of the 27th Party Congress. It provides for the concentration of efforts and resources in the key areas of economic development and for changes in the structural and investment policies in the interests of the intensification of social production. The plan is aimed at raising the efficiency of the economy, saving resources, increasing the effect of economic levers and incentives, employing long-term standards, and introducing new methods of economic management.

One gets the most exhaustive picture of the changes in the economy by looking at the absolute increment figures envisaged in the plan. The principal ones are 50 per cent higher than in the previous five-year period. For example, the national income will grow by 124,000 million roubles compared to 79,000 million in the eleventh five-year-plan period. Industrial output growth will add up to 200,000 million roubles compared to 133,000 million, and the average annual increment in the gross agricultural output will be 29,000 million roubles compared to 10,000 million in the preceding five-year period. It should be noted, too, that growth rates are to go up from the very first years of the five-year period.

The high targets envisaged in the plan called for a new approach to defining the sources of economic growth. The decisive factor here is a radical heightening of production efficiency through more rapid scientific and technological progress. This is the basis, comrades, on which the whole plan is built.

In the new five-year period the share of the accumulation fund in the national income is to be increased to 27.6 per cent. This will create realistic conditions for boosting the absolute increase in capital investments. In terms of the national economy as a whole, the rates of their growth will rise from 15.4 per cent in 1981-1985 to 23.6 per cent. The plan envisages the technical modernisation and reconstruction of many of the now operating enterprises. The allocations for these purposes will go up by 70 per cent, while their share in total productive capital investments will exceed 50 per cent by the end of the current five-year period.

The next five years will see large-scale mechanisation and automation of production and the introduction of new technologies. All this will lay the ground for improving working conditions and relieving more than five million people of manual jobs by 1990, or more than twice as many as in the previous five years. Large-scale measures have been taken to save material and energy resources.

On the whole, comrades, the set of measures in the plan aimed at introducing new achievements of science and technology in production and at improving economic management methods, will make it possible to increase the average annual rate of na-

tional income growth to 4.1 per cent, or nearly by a third compared to the previous five-year period.

There are also plans for carrying out a broad social programme on the basis of accelerated economic development. The real incomes of the population will grow; the supply of foodstuffs and other consumer goods will be improved; the services industry will be extended and work will continue to upgrade the health service and public education.

Special attention is being devoted to resolving the housing problem. We are to build 595 million square metres of new housing, which will be of better quality and more comfortable. House-building in rural areas will proceed at priority rates. All these are important measures, but they should not lull us into complacency. The search for new ways of improving the Soviet people's living conditions must be continued with the use of all available means and possibilities. Cooperative and individual house-building should be actively promoted.

About four-fifths of the national income is to be spent on improving the people's well-being. The country's defence capability, too, will be maintained at the requisite level.

In a word, the Twelfth Five-Year Plan is a major step in carrying out the economic and social policy worked out by the 27th Congress of the CPSU. Essentially, it is a programme of action for each branch, each republic, the entire economic complex and the society as a whole. The Politbureau believes that there is every ground for the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee to endorse this plan and to instruct the Council of Ministers to submit it for consideration to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Nikolai Ryzhkov will report to the deputies on this plan at its next session.

A) PAST MISTAKES MUST NOT BE REPEATED

Looking at the submitted plan objectively, it will be only fair to say that it will take hard work to fulfil it. It is essential that we attain the goals set, and carry through the reconstruction of the economy so as to create conditions for the further growth of its efficiency. All this, comrades, must be accomplished in the next five years.

Of late, performance has improved somewhat. But this has been achieved primarily by drawing on reserves that were readily available. To ensure long-term and stable success we must work out more cardinal measures. Past experience in building socialism has taught us that at turning points in the development of society we must boldly venture on drastic changes and not shrink from far-reaching transformation.

We all know what Russia's economy was like before the Great October Revolution. Its industrial production was only 12.5 per cent that of the United States. For Lenin and the Bolshevik Party it was absolutely clear that socialism would be able to win only by embarking on a basic reconstruction of the economy and by achieving the highest possible labour productivity. From the first Soviet years, the Party worked for a major renovation of the economy, using all available resources for this end.

Acting on Lenin's plan for the building of socialism our people soon created a material-technical base for industry, with its core consisting of factories equipped with machinery that was advanced for its time. Industries guaranteeing rapid technical progress were set up, and large-scale modernisation of production was vigorously undertaken. All-out advancement in science and education, and the training of qualified research and engineering personnel became the top economic priority.

It was precisely in this way that the rapid pace of economic and social development was achieved. In a historically short time, the formerly backward peasant country became one of the world's leading industrial states. By the fifties, despite the enormous war losses, the volume of our industrial production had reached 30 per cent, and by 1970 as much as 75 per cent, of the US level. The national income of the Soviet Union was two-thirds that of the United States.

But in the seventies and eighties we lost some of our previous dynamism. The economy did not succeed in switching over in time from extensive to intensive development. Economic planning was conducted by inertia, reposing on the previously achieved level. Departmental interests acted as a brake on the transference of capital investments and resources into the more promising industries. The precedence of the gross production indicator in assessing the economy distorted the real state of affairs and gave false information about its condition.

The structure of our production remained unchanged and did not meet the requirements of scientific and technological progress. The Soviet Union produces considerably more iron ore and steel than the USA, while its engineering output is significantly lower. It produces much more timber, but fewer timber products. Under these circumstances, each unit of increment in the national income or in industrial and agricultural output requires us to spend more resources.

To rectify the situation, we must dig down to the causes of the lag. They amount primarily to serious errors in our capital investments policy. For no good reason, the accretion of inputs into the investment complex was reduced in five-year plan after five-year plan. As a result, such basic engineering industries, as machine-tool construction, instrument-making, and computer technology, and also modern structural materials, did not get the due impetus. Furthermore, capital construction was conducted ineffectively, the building time increased, and so did the stores of uninstalled equipment.

We consider the rapid growth and accumulation of fixed production assets in the country a great achievement, and, by and large, this is correct. But at the same time, comrades, we cannot fail to see that negative tendencies had appeared over a number of years in the reproduction of these assets. The planning agencies and many ministries showed an unjustified addiction to building new plants, and neglected the needs of the existing ones. The bulk of the machinery and equipment went to the new plants, while the obsolete equipment of the existing factories was not replaced in time. The renewal of assets was too slow and their age structure deteriorated.

Among the negative effects of the extensive reproduction of fixed assets is an excessive growth of the sphere of repairs. In industry alone, equipment repairs cost 10,000 million roubles, and of this sum over 3,000 million goes to repairing equipment whose standard operational life is over.

It should also be mentioned that such an approach is slowing down the turnover of the country's metal stock. Rather than consigning obsolete machinery for recycling at the appropriate time, the metal is tied up in inefficient equipment that is repeatedly subjected to expensive repairs. To produce new machinery, we are compelled to increase the production of pig iron,

steel and rolled metal, as well as the extraction of iron ore, coal and other mineral resources.

And, finally, the extensive forms of building up fixed production assets have led to an artificial shortage of labour. There are those who still resort to this excuse when explaining low growth rates, failures to make contract deliveries or to fulfil the plan. Naturally, we are aware of the demographic situation in the country. But we are entitled to ask: if there is a labour shortage, why continue to build new enterprises, and on the basis of obsolete equipment at that, and not infrequently turning out outdated products?

This is precisely the way things stand. At present, in industry alone there are about 700,000 job vacancies. And this with the equipment operating mostly for only one shift. If the shift ratio were raised to 1.7, the number of job vacancies in industry would exceed 4 million. Thousands of millions of roubles were spent on creating these vacancies. That's how it happens that old machines function in the existing enterprises, and the new ones have no workers to man them. The money has been spent, but there are no proper returns.

Comrades, today at the Plenary Meeting I consider it necessary to draw special attention to the fact that the faults of the investment policy have had the most adverse effect on the development and the technical level of the engineering industries.

The share of machine-building in the total volume of investments was kept down unjustifiably. Both the planning bodies and the ministries had a hand in this. The prestige of creativity in engineering was undermined, and the once world-famous schools of technology designers have disappeared. A pernicious philosophy of imitation and mediocrity has taken shape. As a result, some products do not measure up to the present-day level of science and technology.

What is the trouble, comrades? What are the causes of the situation that has arisen with the technological standards of our machines? They may, in substance, first of all be traced to the fact that until now we have made no systems analysis of the latest world achievements. Attainment of top quality and reliability was not, in effect, envisaged in the designing of new technology. True, we have recently begun to evaluate technology on the basis of analogues. But not the very latest foreign models are

used as standards. This is a sad example of outmoded thinking and eye-wash on the part of those who are responsible for the development of essential technology. Who are they deceiving? It turns out that they are deceiving their own people.

The existing orientation on an average or even low technological quality of products was to a certain extent legalised by the operating standards. The system of standards did not encourage designers to search for new ideas. Neither did it raise barriers to producing outdated machines and equipment. Apparently, a kind of inferiority syndrome that surfaced at some research institutes and design offices had also played its part. They explained away their poor results by claiming it was impossible to work better. Nor was everything as it should be in the matter of stimulating the work of scientists, designers, and engineers.

For many years no proper attention was given to acquiring the requisite facilities for research and experiments, and no due investments and resources were channeled into this field. Naturally all this was bound to affect the technological level of machine-building and the rates of scientific and technological progress.

Such was the situation prior to the April (1985) Plenary Meeting. It was comprehensively analysed by the Central Committee. Measures that were worked out have been unanimously approved by the Plenary Meeting and the Party Congress. I want to repeat to those who are trying to pull us back: we cannot and will not put up with this attitude and must stem all attempts to perpetuate the former approaches and errors, first of all in the sphere of scientific and technological progress.

I am sure that the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee will adopt a principled line in the fundamental question of our home policy and will support all the necessary measures of the Politbureau and the government designed to revolutionise the development of our economy and bring it abreast of the vanguard positions of scientific and technological progress. I have already spoken about the responsibility borne for this by members of the Central Committee elected at the 27th Congress of the CPSU. We, comrades, have no right to shun this historic responsibility.

What is to be done first of all in order to optimally fulfil the

rigorous Twelfth Five-Year Plan and create the necessary premises for a further acceleration of scientific and technological progress?

B) TO ACCELERATE MODERNISATION AND ENERGETICALLY DEVELOP MACHINE-BUILDING

In our efforts to carry out the Party's economic strategy we will rely heavily on the reorientation of the investment and structural policy: increasing the share of capital investments that will go into the modernisation and retooling of industrial enterprises now in operation, accelerating the development of machine-building, and shortening the investment cycle.

We have recently taken some far-reaching measures with respect to the cardinal issues of economic growth. I am referring to the resolutions calling for a fundamental reorganisation of metal production, a further chemicalisation of the economy, modernisation of engineering, more rapid computerisation, installation of flexible manufacturing systems, rotor lines, automated design systems, industrialisation of capital construction, and upgrading designing and the drawing up of estimates. Guidelines have been laid for resource saving. Work of tremendous importance is under way to upgrade the quality of output in every sector of the national economy. Finally, a solid groundwork has been laid for introducing new methods in management.

The decisions taken are oriented on intensive economic growth through more timely application of advances in science and technology. The whole of this work, comrades, must be carried out in decidedly all areas of our economy. Naturally, we must now act within the framework of the five-year plan. Within this framework, we have vast opportunities for further intensifying the national economy and enhancing its efficiency.

Speaking of untapped potentialities, I would like to begin with the better utilisation of fixed production assets and optimisation of their renewal. This, comrades, is the key component of the wealth of our socialist society, the material base of our economic potential. And we must set things right as far as the use of fixed production assets is concerned, and ensure a genuinely proprietary, rational attitude towards them and their effective renewal.

We can bring about a substantial qualitative improvement in our economic performance, above all, higher productivity and increased returns on capital, if we accelerate the renewal of fixed production assets, discard their outdated part more rapidly, and use the technically up-to-date machinery and equipment more intensively by, among other things, raising the shift coefficient. By cardinally renewing production assets and reducing the scale of new construction, we can release substantial capital investment funds for speedier social development, above all, for building more housing.

These, comrades, are potentialities of vast proportions which lie in the mainstream of the Party's present economic policy. They are not a figment of the imagination divorced from life, but a reality confirmed, notably, by the initiative of the Leningrad Party organisation.

While working out the ways for continued intensification of industrial production, the Leningrad regional Party committee has analysed the draft economic plans of industrial enterprises for the twelfth five-year-plan period. It turned out that the overwhelming majority of ministries are still committed to extensive development in the enterprises under their jurisdiction in the Leningrad region. Close to 40 per cent of the capital investments were earmarked for new construction and for the expansion of operating capacities. At the same time, the scope of the technological updating of production was clearly insufficient.

Following a thorough study of the state of affairs, the regional Party committee arrived at the correct conclusion: new and advanced components of the production assets must be used in two or three shifts, and thereby carry out the assignments of the Twelfth Five-Year-Plan. In the meantime, outdated equipment must be phased out and the space thus released used for the installation of the latest plant. This means, as our Leningrad comrades estimate, about three million square metres of space. As a result of retooling the proportion of advanced types of machinery in the machine-tool inventories of the city and region will double by the end of the five-year-plan period. The quality indicators in industry will rise.

Considerable cuts in new building will allow the Leningraders to decrease capital investments. Some of the resources thus saved will be used for the technical modernisation of operating enter-

prises, but primarily to expand housing construction and to improve towns and villages. In this way, major technological, economic and social problems will be settled comprehensively.

As you know, the Politbureau of the Central Committee has considered and approved the proposals of the Leningrad regional Party committee and found that they offer a highly promising approach for accelerating the development of social production. The Leningrad initiative is of countrywide importance, being an effective means for the industries of other regions to follow.

We see the change-over to two-shift operation today as an important initiative. This work schedule has long been standing practice in many countries. Enterprises crucial to scientific and technological progress work there in two and even three shifts. This reflects a determination to make the best possible use of advanced equipment and replace it more swiftly with even more effective equipment. Workers on evening and night shifts receive additional incentives. Our central authorities must address themselves to the matter without delay and advance proposals for greater moral and material incentives for workers on evening and night shifts. We expect the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions to make an active and constructive contribution to this matter of national importance.

Even in the early stages, as the initiative of the Leningraders was being first discussed, someone suggested that it would not be so simple to get engineering factories to operate in two or three shifts. And it is, indeed, no simple thing. But we may legitimately ask: why is it that people can work three shifts at continuous production plants, such as metallurgy or chemistry, as well as in the food or textile industries, where, incidentally, female labour predominates? Why then is there only one-shift work, as a rule, in the engineering and metal-working industries where working conditions are certainly no worse?

The Politbureau believes that all ministries and departments in conjunction with local Party, government, trade-union and Komsomol bodies must immediately get down to the actual job of intensifying production, taking into account the Leningrad initiative. In this context, it is important to remodel the operation of the transport services, the educational institutions, kindergartens and infant nurseries, and all the social services, in order to create proper conditions for effective work.

In switching to a multi-shift schedule, it is obviously worthwhile to allow the regions, territories and republics to retain the overall capital investments allocated to them under the five-year plan, leaving them free to use the resources they release by reducing the amount of new industrial construction for updating their production plant and advancing their social and cultural development. And they, for their part, must guarantee fulfilment of their five-year-plan assignments. Such proposals have, incidentally, already come from some Party and local governmental officials. I think they should be supported.

One of the most urgent issues of the new five-year plan is to speed up the technological updating of operating production plant. The plan envisages a substantial increase in capital investments for these purposes. But there are many additional levers and possibilities here as well. . . .

Many enterprises in the machine-tool manufacturing industry are going over to the production of advanced machine tools and equipment capable of increasing productivity many times over and ensuring high quality of products. . . .

The instrument-making and electronics industries are doing their best to speed up the development of computers and micro-processors. They have now created tangible premises for quickly organising the production of high-performance computers and ensuring large-scale production of electronic appliances for the engineering industry and other sectors of the economy. The Twelfth Five-Year Plan envisages a 140 per cent increase in the production of computers, as compared with the previous five-year period, including the manufacture of 1.1 million desk-top and portable computers.

The practices of the Byelorussian railway workers are gaining ever wider recognition. Ten railways have already adopted new methods of organising and stimulating work. The implementation of this project of national importance will ensure the more efficient functioning of the railway lines and, at the same time, make it possible to increase labour productivity and release nearly 100,000 workers. Such innovative attitudes deserve high praise and active support. Generally speaking, creative search is taking place in all sectors of the economy and in all regions of the country.

Comrades, retooling and modernisation of production call for

new attitudes. You are aware of how many major plants were reconstructed in the past. Thousands of millions of roubles were spent on replacing obsolete equipment. But all too often the efforts failed to yield the desired result. One of the chief reasons for this was poor quality of detail design, often based on low-efficiency technology and antiquated labour organisation. All too often the new equipment differed from the old only in date of manufacture.

How are ministries dealing with the problem of modernisation now, in this time of change? What projects are they planning to tackle in the new five-year period?

A sample analysis of plant modernisation projects of some industrial ministries has been made at the request of the Central Committee. What are its results? Not all projects by far could be accepted as matching modern standards. Many of them require thorough revision. Some of them, moreover, have become so outdated that it was recommended to scrap them. . . .

I'd like to ask where these wretched designers and ministerial officials who endorsed these projects want to take the country? Clearly, such projects can only discredit the idea of accelerating scientific and technological progress, and involve the economy in enormous expenditures.

So, comrades, we must draw the due lessons from all this. We must review promptly, in the shortest possible time, all retooling and reconstruction projects slated for implementation in the twelfth five-year period. Those which fail to live up to the task of speeding up scientific and technological progress should be discarded without hesitation; their implementation should be prohibited, while the funds thus released should be channeled into the manufacture of advanced technology.

Responsibility for the quality of retooling and reconstruction projects should lie, above all, with the ministries which are called upon to be the technical headquarters of the various industries. They above all should be held accountable. The attention of the ministers was drawn to these questions at a conference held in June of last year. They were directly instructed then to review the retooling and reconstruction projects.

The approach has to be changed drastically, comrades. We cannot allow thousands of millions to be invested in obsolete projects based on technically unsound solutions. If we do so, we

will not rise to the latest world standards of production. And we cannot, I would even say must not, accept this.

Everyone is aware of the urgency of supplying the people with consumer goods. Some specialists propose building new enterprises for this purpose. Far be it from us to rule out this path of development, particularly as it concerns the output of modern materials and goods. But basically the task of expanding the production of commodities can only be carried out through the retooling and reconstruction of light industry enterprises. The main thing is to find the correct solutions to this problem.

Estimates reveal the following. If the most advanced equipment and technologies are used in the reconstruction of enterprises, we will be able to increase their effectiveness by 30 to 40 per cent. Evidently, we must proceed in the following manner: wherever such equipment is available reconstruction should be conducted vigorously, and where it is not, reconstruction should be put off for two or three years until the production of efficient equipment is started up, whereupon, it will be possible to make up for the delay on the basis of new production technology. In sum, the ministries and central departments must approach the matter with the utmost care, and stop clinging to the old. Otherwise, they will let down the whole country.

Comrades, you well realise that the plans for updating the national economy on the basis of the latest scientific and technological achievements depend, in the final analysis, on the machine-building industry. It is here that all of today's burning economic questions are focused. We will not be able to cope with the tasks the Congress has set before us unless we quickly modernise machine-building and re-orient it to producing new machine systems and sophisticated equipment for all branches of the national economy.

This matter was recently discussed at a conference of the top-ranking officials in the various branches of engineering at the CPSU Central Committee. We had a serious talk with the ministers. The discussion showed that we cannot afford to confine ourselves to the measures charted in the well-known resolution on developing machine-building. Additional and equally extensive efforts are needed in order to thoroughly update the machine-building complex. Proposals have been elaborated on Cent-

ral Committee instructions for additional measures to accelerate progress in machine-building.

First of all, guidelines have been established for a considerable improvement in the technological standards of machines, instruments and other equipment, for an increase in the production of items fitted out with automatic control devices, for a dramatic rise in the output of special-purpose technology to be used at producer enterprises, and for a substantial expansion of the capacities of stock preparation shops. Measures have been worked out to further step up science and production integration, and consolidate the experimental facilities of research institutes and design bureaus.

When implemented, these measures will ensure that 80 to 95 per cent of the total output of the basic goods will correspond to world standards by 1990, with the figure for newly developed products reaching practically 100 per cent. It is planned to switch production entirely to top-quality articles between 1991 and 1993.

The share of microprocessing equipment will grow sharply, as will the automation of research and development. The demand of the instrument-making industry for the latest electronic equipment will be met in full.

Machine-building enterprises will be retooled much more quickly, with 38 to 40 per cent of Soviet-manufactured technology to be assigned for this purpose. In 1990, the production of special technologies for use at producer enterprises will reach 4,000-4,200 million roubles, as compared with the initially planned 2,500 million.

Capital investments in the machine-building complex are fully ensured by contract allocations and properly distributed for each of the five years. In order to concentrate investments in the crucial lines of scientific and technological progress, and observe the specified time limits in construction, it is planned to freeze more than a hundred outdated-design engineering projects now under construction.

Major steps are envisaged to improve the economic mechanism in machine-building. Beginning next year, the number of confirmed assignments will be drastically cut by means of increasing the role of such general indicators as profit, labour efficiency growth and reduction of relative consumption of basic

materials and resources. The planning of machinery and equipment production in tons is ruled out. Solutions to most of the criteria determining the interaction of industries within the machine-building complex have been found, and other possibilities for the further enhancement of the technical level of production have been determined. The machine-building ministries have been directed to complete in 1986 the formulation of plans for the retooling of each enterprise and of the industries as a whole through broad use of scientific and technological achievements. The solution of the problem of providing the machine-builders with high-quality progressive materials will require an additional increase of the component suppliers' capacities. This, too, will have to be done.

The Politbureau has examined and expressed its support for all these proposals. Now it is submitting them to the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee for approval.

As you see, comrades, the realisation of so very crucial and complex a programme will call for tremendous effort and for strenuous and competent work. It must be carried out—we have no other choice. Any other approach means relinquishing positions and falling behind. This the CPSU Central Committee cannot accept.

We hope that the heads of the machine-building ministries and the work collectives will deal with this important national task with full understanding and due responsibility. Recalling the lessons of the past, we must warn all those who are responsible for fulfilling the programme of modernising the engineering industry: there must be no retreats from what has been outlined, and no excuses citing objective or subjective reasons will be accepted.

Comrades, speaking of the radical retooling and reconstruction of the economy, we cannot bypass the problems of capital construction. Its volume in the new five-year plan is enormous. Almost 1,000,000 million roubles is being allocated for this purpose. More than 500,000 million roubles worth of building and assembly work alone will be carried out. This is 20 per cent more than in the Eleventh Five-Year Plan.

Yet, the situation in the building industry remains unsatisfactory and the process of reconstruction is being dragged out. Nearly half the construction trusts chronically fail to fulfil their

plans and are wrecking the schedule for commissioning plant and projects. The management of construction work has serious structural defects. The establishment of design and building associations and firms for the industrialised mass construction of standard turnkey projects has not yet gone beyond the stage of good intentions.

Generally speaking, comrades, a thorough streamlining of the entire construction industry will have to be undertaken and advanced experience more widely utilised. . . .

We obviously face the need for cardinal change in capital construction. The time has come to demand action from all those who are responsible for utilising advanced experience in this industry. It is necessary to change the planning and organisation of construction and, of course, to update its material base.

THRIFTY MANAGEMENT AND SKILFUL ADMINISTRATION

Comrades, there are many other untapped potentialities within the framework of the five-year plan, which can provide additional momentum to our advance. When we speak of the need for a fundamental restructuring of the economy, we see a substantial improvement in the quality of products as one of its most important results. The Party Congress posed the problem of quality as a nation-wide task. The CPSU Central Committee addressed a special letter to all working people. We can now definitely say that most Soviet people realise the need for an urgent solution to this most important problem. Many work collectives have tackled the job with a will. . . .

It is highly important that the Party committees should actively support the work of production collectives and state control and approval bodies in order to radically rectify the situation as quickly as possible. That this is possible is evidenced by the experience of those enterprises where the system of outside control was introduced as an experiment last year.

Radical changes are also needed in the utilisation of material resources. Recently, the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of the USSR passed a resolution that poses challenging tasks in saving energy and resources. The saving of resources is an important source for meeting the growing de-

mand for materials, fuel and electric power. We expect to receive over one quarter of the increment of the national income in the current five-year period from saving resources.

This is an important task, though not all managers appreciate this to the full and remain captives of outmoded conceptions. The Ministry of the Automobile Industry, the Ministry of Heavy Machine-Building, the Ministry of the Coal Industry, the Ministry of Power and Electrification, and the Ministry of Light Industry systematically fail to reach the targets in economising on a number of various resources. No few enterprises are still guilty of direct losses of valuable raw materials and products. Thirteen thousand million cubic metres of casing-head gas is burnt needlessly in flares every year. Millions of tons of coal are lost in transport by rail. The loss of agricultural produce is high, amounting overall to nearly 20 per cent. And how much electric power, heat and water is still being consumed needlessly? The utilisation of recyclable resources is still poorly organised.

Putting it bluntly, we have reached a point beyond which such mismanagement is intolerable; we simply cannot afford it. Our scientific and technological policy, planning, and economic and administrative levers should be focused on eliminating these pervasive faults. We must launch an all-out war on wasteful practices and exercise the strictest thrift. Steps should be taken to make the saving of resources and the degree of their utilisation one of the main criteria for assessing the performance of every enterprise and collective.

The saving of primary and other materials should be more actively encouraged. Can we consider it normal that payments for the saving of resources amount to mere kopecks? This simply won't do. Thriftiness should also become a habit, the second nature of every worker. Thriftiness should be constantly fostered in the rising generation, both in the family and at school.

Comrades, special attention in the five-year plan is devoted to the development of the agro-industrial complex. The planned targets are in line with the policy formulated by the May 1982 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. On the whole, the volume of capital investment, the output of farm produce and the amount of material and technical facilities for the agro-industrial complex have been planned in keeping with the targets of the Food Programme. Enterprises that process and store

farm produce, and plants making agricultural machinery will be developing at priority rates.

In general, favourable conditions are being created for a build-up of the potential of the agrarian sector. This is undoubtedly justified. At the same time we must realise that the immense resources channeled into that sector are not as yet yielding sufficient returns. On the whole, the eleventh five-year period was completed with low indicators. This affected the supply of foodstuffs to the population and the rate of the country's economic development.

It is only fair to say that positive changes are shaping in the agrarian sector of late. However, they have not spread to all branches of the agro-industrial complex, and not to all regions, territories and republics. We are now faced with the urgent task of ensuring stable output of crops, primarily grain and fodder. This is the main problem, and the stable development of livestock farming, the incomes of collective and state farms, and the economic performance of the processing enterprises depend largely on its successful solution.

Work in the agrarian sector must be improved in order to change the situation decisively for the better. We have vast reserves for that. They are to be found above all in the already created huge potential. We have experience in running an efficient agriculture in practically all zones. Thanks to the measures taken to improve administration and the system of management, the economic and organisational premises have been created for enhancing the labour of agricultural workers.

Without going into details, I want to emphasise the main thing once again: intensive technologies have got to be used on a large scale if we want to achieve high productivity in animal and crop farming. This is both the most realistic and the most efficient way of achieving better results in crop growing and in livestock production.

We should continue our policy of concentrating efforts and means in the decisive branches of the agro-industrial complex. This is a reliable way of getting tangible returns on investments in the countryside. The experience of our country and of other states shows that one should concentrate resources on those farms and in those regions where they promise the best results in terms of volume and economic efficiency. . . .

If we are to make great achievements in our agro-industrial complex, we must not merely follow traditional paths. It is only by concentrating resources and providing for the priority development of key sectors, and skilfully using the advantages inherent in the new economic mechanism and the structure of management that we will be able to work efficiently, increase output quickly and successfully carry out the tasks set in the Food Programme of the USSR.

Finally, comrades, our successes in the twelfth five-year period will depend on how we will further perfect management and the entire economic mechanism. The principles of this work have been defined. On the one hand, we must continue to improve centralised management of the national economy, enhance the role of the State Planning Committee and other economic agencies, and specify the functions of ministries, and, on the other hand, increase in every way the rights and economic independence of enterprises and amalgamations, and also their responsibility for the results of their activity.

I believe everybody agrees with this now. But the practical realisation of democratic centralism in management is not proceeding in the way that is required in the present situation. We have carried out experiments and obtained promising results, but we often shrink back when it comes to applying them on a large scale. Many of the elements in the system of economic management have already been tested, and the new should be introduced more boldly in practice—all down the line, so to say. To this end, the central economic bodies should, on the basis of the guidelines laid down by the 27th Congress, more quickly draft and adopt documents necessary for the introduction of the new principles of management.

The numerous instructions, regulations and methodological guidelines that we have been accumulating for decades should be reviewed in accordance with the decisions of the Congress and the resolutions adopted after the Congress, and those which contradict the change in approach should be resolutely discarded. We will not be able to advance without this, comrades. Genuine centralism in management has nothing in common with bureaucratic regulation of the multifaceted life of production, research and design collectives. The system that took shape over many years, under which these collectives were hamstrung with far-

fetched instructions and methods, deprived managers and development engineers of the possibility to promptly solve the arising economic and technical problems. This results in forfeited advantages amounting to many billions of roubles on the scale of the country. We encounter such phenomena at every step. . . .

Order must be installed in this matter; we must see to it that the rights of work collectives are really expanded. Hence, the drafting of the law on the socialist enterprise (production amalgamation) should be quickly completed. This document should be based on the new concept of economic management; it should sum up the recent experience, and consolidate all the best elements of the course towards greater economic independence, towards increasing the role and responsibility of enterprises and production amalgamations.

Thereby we will lay the foundation for the optimal distribution of rights and duties among ministries and enterprises, and for legislatively protecting work collectives from petty tutelage and arbitrary administration, from unjustified interference in their day-to-day economic activity. This, comrades, will mean a serious step forward in democratising the management of our economy and developing the initiative of the working people.

As you know, the 27th Congress set the task of really mastering economic principles of management. In this connection we will have to ensure first of all the formulation of advanced standards and quotas. The State Planning Committee should head this crucial work and enlist the participation in it of ministries and agencies, scientists, specialists of amalgamations and enterprises on a broad scale. Moreover, the job should not be dragged out. Without creating substantiated economic standards, we will not rid ourselves of the yoke of all sorts of instructions fettering enterprises, and it will be difficult to move from administrative to economic methods of management. This will slow down the application of the principles of unsubsidised self-financing, which we intend to introduce ever more widely.

Finally, mention should be made of the key importance of price-setting for economic management. Many unanswered questions have accumulated here. The price of machinery and equipment, and estimates of construction costs, are being raised under the pretext of modernisation. Changes in the range of products

and pursuit of gross output indicators often bring about unjustified increases in the price of consumer goods as well.

Regrettably, state and economic bodies often look the other way, so to speak, and quite often themselves turn out to be interested in increasing output volumes by means of this play of prices. Following last year's audits alone more than 100 million roubles received by enterprises in unlawful profits through violations of price-setting regulations were confiscated and directed into the budget.

I would like to warn you, comrades, that this is an extremely dangerous tendency. Artificial price-raising does not cure economic ailments but only corrupts officials and puts a brake on technical progress. Exaggerated prices based on the input approach conceal shortcomings in technology and in the organisation of production, and cause neglect of the search for economic methods of management.

Price increases are justified only if they are due to a substantial improvement in the quality of consumer commodities and the higher effectiveness of products. We must introduce order in price-setting. The State Committee for Prices must take a more clear-cut and principled stand. It is also high time to improve crediting, and banking in general. As we switch to new methods of management we must enhance the role of the bank as a key organ of economic control.

I would particularly like to single out a problem, which, if not solved, will make the task of introducing resource-saving technologies and overcoming the input-oriented nature of the economy impossible to carry out. I am referring to the notorious gross output indicators. Various forms of assignments in terms of such indicators play a major role in assessing the performance of industries, regions and enterprises. Since this is so, costly materials are often used just to increase the gross output indicator; the weight of machines is increased, ton-kilometres are chalked up, intra-enterprise turnover is inflated, etc. We are fighting for efficiency, but look at the really ridiculous situation in which managers find themselves: they manufacture a product at lower cost and get a dressing down for failing to meet the target in terms of roubles; they introduce a novelty, save resources and again it turns out that they have put their enterprise and sometimes even the whole industry at a disadvantage.

Take the following example. An economic experiment at motor transport enterprises of a number of ministries was started two and a half years ago. The participants in the experiment began planning their work in such a way as to interest people not in ton-kilometres but in the timely delivery of all ordered freight with the least expenditure. The causes that prompt managers to pad their accounts with non-existent tons and kilometres have been removed.

And here are the results: fulfilment of contracts, that key indicator, rose to 100 per cent. At the same time, the demand for motor vehicles and drivers declined, and fuel consumption dropped by 18 per cent. The introduction of such terms of work nationwide would free thousands of motor vehicles and drivers and save more than five million tons of motor fuel.

It would seem that the planning bodies should seize upon this new method of work. Far from it. Certain high-ranking officials of the state planning committees of the USSR and the Russian Federation defended the outmoded planning systems with might and main, as the saying goes. The previously planned "gross output", that is, the volume of transportation, turned out to be exaggerated. Yet the planners did not want to admit that these estimates were no good. This is a fine example of how the new is turned down, of reluctance to deal with the restructuring of the economic mechanism and to renounce outdated methods of work.

Gross output indicators still dominate in many sectors. More efforts are being made to revive gross output as the main evaluating indicator in, for example, construction, and not without the approval of the USSR State Planning Committee and the Ministry of Finance of the USSR. This is happening despite the fact that the experience of the leading building organisations testifies to the contrary, namely, that their work should be evaluated and incentives issued on the basis of finished products, the commissioning of projects, and not on the basis of the volume of construction and assembly work. I believe, comrades, that the time has come to cut this gross output knot, for otherwise we will not be able to move ahead and successfully tackle the input mechanism.

Speaking of management, I cannot help mentioning the responsibility of the USSR State Planning Committee for the solu-

tion of economic problems advanced by life itself. Conceived at its founding as the think tank for managing the economy, the State Planning Committee continues to perform a traffic controller's functions in many respects. Not infrequently, it deals with matters which top industry executives, and perhaps even directors of enterprises, could well sort out by themselves. At the same time it does not perform the main function of the country's strategic planning body.

Routine business hinders planners to seek ways of resolving the main socio-economic tasks, to choose proportions and priorities in the development of the national economy, to define structural policy, to locate productive forces and to balance the economy. This is why we have overlooked many things. Generally speaking, a serious reorganisation of planning is in order.

Comrades, discussing the long-term development of the country and drawing up measures for the future, we must not lose sight of the tasks of the current moment. The successful fulfilment of the plans for this year, and hence for the entire five-year period, depends on whether these tasks are carried out correctly. Workers in the countryside have special responsibilities these days. The results of the current year in the agrarian sector are of exceptional importance for us. As you know, fairly good results have been achieved in livestock production in the past five months. It is important that they be consolidated.

However, the main task is to grow and harvest without loss grain, fruit and vegetables, and the fodder and industrial crops. This is a task of nation-wide importance, and should be approached as such in everyday work. And what is especially important in the many regions where present weather conditions are unfavourable is to take in and preserve the whole harvest, and prevent losses.

A crucial period is beginning in the operation of industry, capital construction and transport. There must be no slackening the results of work: efforts should be made to increase the rate of production growth and to fulfil all the plans without fail. It is important to get ready in time for work in winter. We must draw lessons from the past. With this in mind, the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of the USSR passed a resolution recently, outlining specific measures to prepare the national economy for the coming autumn and winter seasons.

The attention of the Party, state and economic bodies should be even now riveted on fulfilling it. The entire life-sustaining facilities of cities and villages should be put in proper order, ensuring the reliable operation of electric power and heat supply systems, maintenance of energy-generating units and the planned commissioning of new capacities, the timely build-up of stocks of fuel at enterprises and in the utilities. In short, they must see to it that the population does not experience any discomfort in everyday life under any circumstances, that the work collectives operate normally, and the economy develops at a stable pace, gaining momentum.

Comrades, those are our ideas on the fundamental and current problems of economic policy. And fulfilment of the large-scale programme of economic reconstruction within the twelfth five-year period depends to a decisive degree on our solving these problems. The fulfilment of the assignments of the five-year plan will provide new evidence of the dynamism and vitality of the socialist system, and will be a major step forward in carrying out the policy charted by the 27th Congress of the CPSU.

III. ACTIVE RESTRUCTURING OF PARTY WORK

Comrades, when the country's destiny was at stake, or when it was a matter of solving questions of vital importance for its present and future, Lenin emphasised: "The Party is responsible."¹

Ours is the ruling party. It has in its hands powerful levers for influencing social processes. The theory and policy, the ideas and strength of organisation, millions of Communists in production and management, in science, technology and culture—such is the mighty potential of the Party.

The activity of the millions of working people, and the scope and depth of the people's creative endeavour, which is the decisive factor of acceleration, depend in many respects on how Party organisations operate. Only by placing the human being at

¹ V. I. Lenin, "To the Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.)", *Collected Works*, Vol. 44, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 48.

the centre of Party work will we be able to carry out the tasks set by the Congress. The essence of the radical restructuring of Party work lies precisely in turning to people, to real work.

What has been shown by the months since the Congress? The ideas of restructuring were received with understanding by the majority of Party cadres and are beginning to turn into practical work. New relationships have shaped between local and central Party, government and economic bodies. Many practical matters are dealt with faster and with greater understanding. We have risen another step higher as regards frankness and sharpness in the way problems are put and in the level of criticism and self-criticism. . . .

Important steps are being taken by all Party organisations. The quest for new forms and methods of work suiting the present time is itself proceeding with difficulties. One encounters the idea that the guidelines set at the Congress apply to the sphere of big-time politics, while the day-to-day work should proceed as usual, keeping to the beaten track. It can be said that such sentiments still exist within Party circles. . . .

Since the Congress, Soviet people have shown a growing interest in the Party's affairs and in the processes taking place in society. They want to find their place in the countrywide drive asserting the ideas advanced at the Congress and to make their contribution to the restructuring. This is borne out by the numerous letters to the Central Committee and the editorial offices of newspapers. Some of these letters are in your hands. It would seem that the task of the Party committees is utterly clear: to support the public activity and labour effort of people in every way. But in many places everything remains as before, and initiatives run into a wall of indifference, if not out-and-out resistance. . . .

The Congress oriented the Party committees on mastering political methods of leadership. But the striving of Party bodies to assume managerial functions continues unabated. Just listen to what some Party leaders say. They speak readily and with expertise of the current economic campaign, of milk yields and weight gains, tons, etc., but are quite often at a loss when the conversation turns to a political analysis of social phenomena, to the socio-economic tasks, the scientific and technical problems, and to the resources inherent in the human factor.

Frankly speaking, we need to change things, and get rid of elements of administration by fiat at all levels—from primary organisations to the apparatus of the Central Committee. Only all-round political, organisational and ideological efforts at all levels of Party leadership will ensure accomplishment of the tasks set by the Congress.

Raising the capacity for action of primary Party organisations is therefore gaining particular importance. We have more than once become convinced of their inexhaustible resources. I would say that we should begin the restructuring precisely by stimulating the independence, enterprise and vigour of the primary organisations, the initiative and activity of Communists. That is the crux of the matter, something that should be tackled in real earnest.

This must be done by the Party's district and city committees, which are the closest to the work collectives, and know the resources and potentials of their primary Party organisations. We have quite a number of Party committees at district and city level that have risen to the new situation and are giving greater scope to the initiative of the cadres and are shifting the centre of gravity to control of their work from below, and also, by the public and the press.

At the same time, there is still a gravitation towards traditional methods of leadership, or rather administration. All this, comrades, was practised at one time out of necessity, in compensation, as it were, for deficiencies in the economic machinery. At present, such practice is not only unnecessary but also harmful. The functions of dispatcher should be discarded more boldly. The work collectives and people are the main sphere of activity for the secretary and members of a district Party committee.

Recently, I have had many meetings and conversations with directors of enterprises, workers, engineers and secretaries of Party committees, and they all agree that opportunities for showing initiative at work are broadening too slowly. Red tape, that twin-brother of administration by fiat and arch opponent of any broad participation of the masses in managerial affairs, is making itself felt.

Take the bodies of management, for example. When one gets directly acquainted with their activities, one can see that some ministers and heads of departments and enterprises have alto-

gether lost the habit of speaking to one another, of establishing direct business contacts, and that everything is done by correspondence. Are the comrades unable to speak to one another over the telephone, to get together and settle problems, or is this an attempt to shield oneself from responsibility by means of papers?...

Far from being a technical question, unnecessary paperwork is a political issue. Just see what an inspection boils down to: a study of references, tables, minutes and plans of activities, and to finding out whether the matter had been discussed before and whether an appropriate decision was taken. In short, there is a habit of working with papers and not with people, and of looking at people through papers. As for how people work, live, what they think, what their problems are and what their state of mind—all that is left outside the scope of vision. Yet that, after all, is what Party work is all about.

There will be no change until an atmosphere of intolerance to drawbacks, to stagnancy in work, to showy pretense and idle talk is established in the Party and its organisations. This is why we must enhance critical discussions in the spirit of the Congress. What we need is principled criticism, naming those whom it concerns, showing the causes of shortcomings and omissions, and the ways of removing them—criticism that sustains the spirit of concern, of a healthy lack of self-satisfaction with what has been achieved.

Comrades, the concept of acceleration is inseparably connected with vigorous personnel policy. The plans for the next five years envision fundamental measures in personnel training and the establishment of a system of continuous education. All of them are directed to providing professionally competent workers for every area of material production and cultural and intellectual life. This task is being tackled not only in educational establishments where we have initiated serious reforms. It is a need of the times that everyone should continuously update one's knowledge, improve one's skills and broaden one's ideological, political, scientific, technological and economic horizons. Otherwise one cannot efficiently use the latest technology, be a knowledgeable manager or skilful administrator.

Special importance is attached today to work with ranking executives who are called upon to organise the restructuring in

the areas entrusted to them. The April Plenary Meeting, as you know, faced quite a few unresolved personnel issues. This drew criticism from both Communists and non-Party people. The Central Committee made the proper conclusions. Many well-trained and mature Communists, who had proved themselves in practical grass-root work and who understood the current situation well, were promoted in the course of the election campaign. There should be continued improvement in the placement of cadres.

Speaking in Togliatti, I noted that now that work is getting under way to accelerate scientific and technological progress, people with an innovative spirit should be particularly valued. All the more so because we are urging everyone to act rather than wait. One cannot help seeing that a man with initiative often comes into conflict with outdated regulations that are at loggerheads with the new tasks. Everything possible should be done to ensure that searching, creative people are not driven into a corner and suffer defeat. . . .

At our Plenary Meeting we should bluntly state in the most principled manner that Party committees are called upon to protect the honour of the Party, and not the honour of rank. Everything is important in Party work, and not least of all the way a person is received at the Party committee, the way he is talked to, the way the questions that trouble him are settled and, finally, the solicitude shown him.

Yet it still happens that when a Communist comes to a city or district Party committee to share his doubts or express his personal opinion, he is given no answer on the substance of the matter, and is told, "Don't forget where you are." But, indeed, where is he? The Party committee is like home to him. Where else should he take his cares and problems if not to his Party committee? And because Party comradeship is a Bolshevik standard of relations among Communists regardless of rank or title, he has every right to expect to be treated with understanding and attention rather than high-handedly.

The spirit of comradeship should pervade our entire Party life. Making stricter demands on the performance of one's duties, it is always necessary to draw a clear distinction between Party criticism and a dressing down that hurts human dignity. Deviations from this rule—and we know of such cases—crush the human

spirit, sow uncertainty in the work collective and depress public interest and activity. We cannot tolerate that sort of thing.

We should persevere tirelessly in the effort to further a sound climate in our society, to have it take deep root. I would say that, in this context, the war on drunkenness and alcoholism remains one of the most urgent tasks. We should be guided in this war by the opinion of our people rather than those who have become addicted to alcohol. We have pledged to our entire people to resolutely combat drunkenness, and it is our Party duty to fulfil this mandate.

We should also fulfil the mandate to step up the war on unearned incomes. The recent major resolutions on this score were welcomed by the public. They should root out this phenomenon, which is alien to socialism, and at the same time help to improve the living conditions of the working people.

To sum it all up, comrades, we should strictly respect our main socialist principle: to support and encourage honest and conscientious work in every way and wage an uncompromising struggle against all parasitic elements, against those who would like to live at the expense of others, at the expense of society.

We should proceed from the fact that as the tasks in the social, economic, cultural and intellectual fields grow more complex, the demands on ideological work will also increase. I would like to note today the great contribution that is being made by the press, television, radio and the other mass media to the process of restructuring. They are doing a great deal to broaden publicity, to translate the democratic principles of our society into practice, and to raise serious, socially meaningful problems. Today it is especially important for our press to sensitively spot the emergence of everything new and advanced that is generated by the restructuring in all areas of life, and to help put it within the reach of all society. The objectivity, high exactingness and responsibility of the mass media are inviolable principles of the Party press which, indeed, guarantee them high prestige.

The newspaper is the face of the Party committee. It reflects the style and methods of its work, its standards of leadership and its attitude to every topical problem. If the Party committee adopts new approaches, the press follows suit. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the degree of publicity and effectiveness in many local newspapers is still far below that of

the centrally-published press. As an analysis of this matter shows, this directly depends on the position of the Party committees. Hence the need, both in Party committees and editorial offices, to draw the correct conclusions in a self-critical way. I am certain that they will be made.

In short, we count on a further vitalisation of the ideological sphere and on the rallying power of truthful ideas which bring together millions for a common cause.

IV. ON THE RESULTS OF THE BUDAPEST CONFERENCE OF THE POLITICAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Comrades, let me now move on to the second item on the Plenary Meeting's agenda.

The documents of the recent regular conference of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) of the Warsaw Treaty countries have been published. What would I like to say about the importance of the PCC conference? First of all, it should be pointed out that the conference took place immediately after several fraternal parties had held their congresses, and naturally the foreign-policy principles endorsed at the highest party forums were in the focus of collective discussion. Because of that, the conference acquired a greater dimension with the emphasis on matters of strategic, global nature.

It was particularly stressed that the course of accelerated socio-economic development adopted by our Party and by other fraternal parties had engendered a broad international response and will, in step with its progress, have an increasing effect on the entire course of world social development. It was pointed out that this was what worried our class adversary most of all.

There was an exchange of views on the course of events in Europe and in the international arena in the period since the Sofia PCC conference and the Soviet-US summit meeting in Geneva. All comrades agreed that the situation is still complicated and that there are no grounds so far for speaking of a relaxation of tension.

You know about the steps we have taken to make sure that the positive trend that originated in Geneva would not disappear

or dissolve in the whirlpool of international affairs. They include a concrete plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of this century, a moratorium on nuclear explosions, and proposals on the destruction of chemical weapons. Our initiatives did help and continue to help improve the international climate.

But it is precisely the prospect of a relaxation of tension that is regarded in the West and, first of all, by the ruling reactionary upper crust in the United States, as a threat to their interests. Recent months and weeks have seen a series of rejections of Soviet proposals on cardinal present-day issues: the refusal to end nuclear tests; the renunciation of existing agreements on strategic arms; and the refusal to keep outer space free of weapons. In addition, there is the reluctance to conduct negotiations in good faith in Geneva and Vienna.

Washington's actions in Berne showed a haughty disregard for the interests of all countries of Europe, and not only Europe, and as a result no important accords on human rights were achieved. Only total non-acceptance of present-day realities can explain why the US leaders are counting on brute force, on the nuclear fist, on terrorist piracy zealously sustained by ideological intolerance and hatred. They continue to assess the present world situation in terms of Star Wars and nuclear warheads, the arms race and militarist blackmail, thus increasingly undermining the security of the entire world and of their own country.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the real threat to US security does not come from outside. The threat, and a substantial one at that, is being posed by that country's military-political elite, its adventuristic behaviour in the world arena.

The 27th CPSU Congress proposed sensible ways for resolving the problems facing humanity. Our objectives are absolutely clear. They are: acceleration of the country's social and economic development; broad international cooperation that benefits all; disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons, and peace for humanity. Hence our political course both inside the country and in the international arena. And as more people on earth come to know the truth about the Soviet Union's policy, there are more and more supporters of this course.

This, in fact, is what worries the ruling circles of imperialism. They regard the Soviet initiatives as a formidable obstacle to their imperial designs aimed at world supremacy and social re-

venge. Unable to offer the peoples a peaceful historical alternative meeting the interests of all, they are whipping up militarist psychosis which they think can put a brake on historical progress and help them preserve economic and political power. More, they are pinning hopes on the possibility, however illusory, to hinder the implementation of our plans, impede the development of the socialist countries, push us off the course of the 27th CPSU Congress and keep us embroiled in the arms race.

It stands to reason, comrades, that the main aim of our foreign policy should be to frustrate these dangerous plans. The Soviet Union will persevere in carrying forward its initiatives, which accord with the cherished hopes of our people, of all peoples in the world. But we will never allow the United States to achieve superiority in nuclear missiles. And here our Leninist foreign policy and our defensive power rest on the reliable basis of the strategy of accelerating socio-economic development worked out by the Party and reflected in specific terms in the draft Twelfth Five-Year Plan which we are discussing.

The future of peace must not be abandoned to imperialism; imperialist reaction must not be allowed to deepen the military-political confrontation. That would mean only one thing—sliding towards nuclear war. This was the conclusion expressed in the speeches of all the participants in the Political Consultative Committee conference.

We have discussed with our friends the situation that prevails in our talks with the United States at Geneva. The following question has now arisen: should we continue treading at the Geneva talks, bickering with the Americans, something that suits them down to the ground, or search for new approaches that will help to clear the path to a reduction of nuclear arms? Having decided to firmly adhere to the course of searching for a mutually acceptable agreement at Geneva, we offered the Americans the following interim variant:

a) to agree on non-withdrawal from the ABM Treaty for at least 15 years and confine work on the SDI to the level of laboratory research, i.e., to the threshold the United States has already actually approached;

b) to limit strategic offensive arms (ICBMs, SLBMs and heavy bombers) to equal ceilings. In this case the question of medium-range weapons, including long-range land-based cruise mis-

siles capable of reaching the territory of the other side, will be solved separately.

This variant again demonstrates the Soviet Union's desire for a mutually acceptable accord. Although, of course, we would prefer to agree at once on a drastic 50 per cent reduction in strategic offensive arms capable of reaching each other's territory.

We have also submitted a draft agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe. We agreed that in the event of a zero ratio between the Soviet Union and the United States in this type of arms, as many British and French nuclear missiles should remain in the European zone as there are now. We have also stated that we will not increase the number of medium-range missiles in Asia.

In other words, the Soviet Union has taken new steps facilitating the search for mutually acceptable accords at the Geneva talks. Time will show how the United States responds to this. In any case, it should be clear: if the American side again ignores our initiatives, it will be obvious that the present US Administration is conducting an unseemly game in a most serious matter on which the future of humanity depends.

The problem of ending nuclear tests is now especially acute. To a certain extent this is also a result of the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power plant. The accident showed that even a small emission of radioactive substances brings misfortune and alarm to thousands of people.

All honest people, those who expressed their sincere sympathy and offered disinterested help, see a far more serious danger behind this accident. They ask themselves and others: what will happen if the military atom gets out of control, accidentally or by evil design? The explosion of just one nuclear bomb would be a far more terrible tragedy for the peoples of many countries. This is what people on Earth are thinking about more and more.

The United States is assuming a grave responsibility before humanity by refusing to end nuclear testing and to accede to the Soviet moratorium. The world is alarmed by Washington's behaviour. But the serious situation also calls for doubling and trebling the efforts for ending all nuclear tests and eliminating nuclear weapons.

The misfortune of Chernobyl is our misfortune. We'll manage to overcome it. We thank one and all for their sympathy and

assistance in connection with the accident. We thank them sincerely, from the bottom of our hearts. But let Chernobyl, and other cases when atomic energy went out of control, serve as a stern warning to those who have yet to fully realise the nuclear menace threatening the world, and who still regard nuclear weapons as an instrument of policy.

I would like to say a few words about a new Soviet-American summit meeting. We are in favour of dialogue with Washington. We are not slamming the door: a new meeting with the US President is possible. But, clearly, it requires an atmosphere that would hold out the prospect of concluding tangible agreements. We have said this to President Reagan and to the entire world. And our attitude is being met with understanding among friends.

But what is the behaviour of the US Administration? It is sabotaging the disarmament talks and has declared its intention not to comply with the SALT-2 Treaty, saying it is "dead"! The actions that it is taking all over the world are only complicating the international situation still more.

A legitimate question arises: Does Washington really want a new meeting, or is all the talk around it merely an attempt to mislead the world public?

The significance of the Political Consultative Committee conferences is known to be largely determined by the new initiatives they advance. Central to the Budapest conference was the jointly-elaborated, detailed proposal for reducing conventional armaments and armed forces throughout Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals. Its content is known to you. It concerns a 25 per cent reduction of the armed forces of both sides within the next few years. This should put an end to the speculation that nuclear disarmament in Europe, given that the conventional armed forces retain their current level, would be to the disadvantage of the West European states. It is noteworthy that the West has not found it possible to dismiss this proposal out of hand.

Several other important initiatives were agreed upon in Budapest. The conference approved the idea of pooling the efforts of all countries in the peaceful use of outer space and of creating a special international organisation for this purpose. This idea, which was put forward shortly before the conference in the speech in Csepel, has already found expression in a proposal sent

to the UN Secretary-General. We also discussed questions pertaining to the further advancement of the concept of an all-embracing system of international security.

Special mention should be made of the lively, constructive atmosphere at the Budapest conference. All comrades—and this is a sign of the times—viewed concrete issues in the light of the common foreign-policy strategy of the allied socialist states. In short, Budapest displayed the unity, the creative cooperation, which enriches socialism's international policy and lends still greater weight to its actions in the world arena.

All participants in the conference noted with satisfaction that the work of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation's supreme body has become more dynamic and more prompt of late. The decisions adopted in Budapest are a major contribution of the socialist countries to the efforts of improving the international situation.

To sum it up, comrades, we have always made the maximum effort to preserve and consolidate peace, and will continue to do so. And in this noble undertaking, we are conscious of the active support of our friends, of all peace-loving forces on earth.

Comrades! Such are the main lessons and conclusions of our post-Congress development, which we must assimilate in full measure to advance successfully. Such are the domestic and international conditions in which we have begun implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

The political objective of the five-year plan is to restructure our economy and create a modern material and technical base so as to ensure the speedier development of Soviet society, resolve the major social tasks, and make sure that the country's defences can be depended upon. Time will not wait. Everything we have planned must be done in time, for what is at stake is the power and prosperity of our country, socialism's positions in the international arena and the consolidation of peace throughout the world.

A memorable date is approaching—the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Our common patriotic and internationalist duty is to meet that remarkable holiday with rapid economic and socio-political advances, with achievements and successes worthy of the land of the October Revolution.

I think that it is necessary, on behalf of the Plenary Meeting, to call on all working people to promote the nation-wide social-

ist emulation movement in order to successfully attain the targets set in the Twelfth Five-Year Plan, and to appeal to them to transform our bold plans into the energy of practical actions. The Central Committee calls on all Soviet working people to take part in the emulation movement, to be active in the labour drive of the five-year-plan period, and to make a tangible personal contribution to the common cause at his or her workplace.

The attention of the Party committees, of all Party organisations, should be focused on how to tackle the tasks set by the Congress and how to conduct political, economic, organisational and educational work to attain and exceed the targets of the five-year plan. That, indeed, is the order of the day. Therefore, there must be more analysis, more action, a more practical approach, less vague talk and fewer excuses for objective reasons.

From every leader and from every Communist the Party expects concrete deeds to lead us forward along the projected road, not vows and assurances. The Central Committee will support the initiative and innovatory quest of Party organisations, work collectives, ministries and departments, aimed at achieving better results. To act persistently and energetically, with initiative and a high sense of responsibility, is what life today requires of each and every one of us. I am confident that the appeal of the Plenary Meeting will be appreciated and will elicit a response among the working class, among farm workers and the intelligentsia, and will be embodied in the heroism of the routine everyday work of millions of people. And that, comrades, is what counts!

Speech at the 10th Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party

June 30, 1986

Esteemed Comrade Chairman,

Dear Comrades Delegates and Guests of the Congress,

On behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union I heartily greet the 10th Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party.

Addressing you, I want to, first of all, express the sincere respect and friendly feelings that Soviet Communists have for their Polish confederates and comrades-in-arms.

From this rostrum I convey warm greetings to the entire fraternal people of Poland. Soviet-Polish friendship, our brotherhood are great gains that many generations of Poles and Soviet people have sealed in joint struggle and labour.

We are deeply touched by the expressions of comradeship, trust and affection for our Party and people, and the kind words spoken in this hall about the Soviet Union. Heartfelt thanks to all of you!

Comrades, Poland's friends and foes are aware that your Congress has gathered at a responsible stage in your country's history, that it is summing up the results of the acute ideological and political confrontation, the hard and highly strenuous struggle to normalise the situation, and that it is showing the way to the future.

Not always by far, and not everybody has understood the class content of the ongoing events. But that does not change their essence. In the final count, it was a struggle for the survival of socialism in Poland. And socialist Poland has stood its ground, has safeguarded its revolutionary gains. That, indeed, is the

main result you have brought to the Congress, and one that we can legitimately congratulate you on today.

History will no doubt pay due tribute to the PUWP leadership, the thousands upon thousands of Communists, all Polish patriots, all people inside and outside the Party, for taking the country out of a dramatic situation, for repulsing the assault of socialism's enemies, and for doing it on their own, with the solidarity of their friends and allies.

It is appropriate to say here, I think, that socialist Poland owes a lot to its outstanding leader, Comrade Wojciech Jaruzelski, his energy and political insight, his breadth of approach, and his finding solutions to exceedingly complicated problems and firmly defending his people's interests, the socialist cause. And I say this not out of politeness, comrades, but because I know it to be true.

All of us listened most attentively to the Report of the PUWP Central Committee delivered yesterday by Comrade Jaruzelski, and have acquainted ourselves with the draft Party Programme, the first in the history of the PUWP. Both documents contain an assessment of the past and a profound analysis of the current realities in Poland. They also define the tasks of the next stage in the building of socialism.

The Soviet Communists look with understanding and approval at your plans for the future, and, as brothers, wish you success in carrying them out.

Your Congress is fresh evidence that the Polish United Workers' Party is a vanguard force capable of uniting Polish society and leading the country to economic, social, and cultural progress.

We have a comradely interest in the success of your plans and undertakings, in seeing a strong, independent and socialist Poland, an active and dependable member of our community. This is in the vital interest of the Polish people, and works for our common cause.

Close cooperation and alliance between Poland and the Soviet Union, the two largest European socialist states, is essential for the successful advancement of the two countries, and for stability and peace in Europe.

That is why throughout the postwar years, including the time of acute crisis when imperialist quarters showered an avalanche

of lies on Poland and hit out with economic "sanctions", the Soviet people have stood by your side, supported your country, helped it as best they could.

I want to reassure the Congress, the entire Polish nation, that we will always be your friends in any weather!

Comrades, the 10th Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party is, for understandable reasons, attracting the special attention of all Communists, of broad political circles all over the world. The Polish crisis of the end of the 1970s and early 1980s reflected the contradictions of your society. But it also absorbed the complexity of the current contention of the two systems and brought out in sharp form the problems that socialism encounters at this highly complicated stage, this turning point, in its development. That is why the lessons of the Polish crisis are important for all Communists, not only the Polish.

The first of these lessons, and probably the most substantial, as we see it, is that those events have, despite their complexity and ambiguity, shown clearly that socialism has sunk deep roots and that the working people in our countries cannot conceive living without it. And this means the socialist gains are irreversible. As Comrade Jaruzelski put it so aptly in his report, Marxist-Leninist ideas have become part of the "national bloodstream" and socialist values and standards are indissoluble components of the social mentality.

It showed, too, that now socialism is an international reality, an alliance of states brought close together by common political, economic, cultural and defensive interests. To raise one's hand against the socialist system, to try subverting it from outside, to try prying away any country from the socialist community—all this encroaches on the will of the people, and, indeed, on the postwar arrangements, and, in the final analysis, on peace.

Another important conclusion we can draw refers to what may be described as the live nerve of socialist society—the place and role of the working class and of its Party, and the significance of the enduring organic link between them.

We know the basic points of the relevant theory. History has proved time and again that none but the working class can be the initiator, the inspirer, the main force in building socialism, that its Party alone, and no other, can organise and direct the energy of the mass of the people to building the new society.

Your country's working class, your Party, can be legitimately proud of the achievements of people's Poland. The four decades after the war, which is a relatively short period, have seen the deep-going social change and the gains that Polish patriots have aspired to for ages, namely, the country's guaranteed independence, and enduring just borders. Under the leadership of the PUWP, the workers, peasants and people's intelligentsia have raised Poland from the ashes, built an up-to-date industrial base, restored the historical monuments, and safeguarded and augmented the values of national culture. The allied parties are making a valuable contribution to this constructive effort.

As rightly noted at this Congress, the Polish crisis was not a worker's protest against socialism. It was above all a disavowal by the aggrieved working class of the distortions of socialism in practice. The opponents of socialist Poland at home and abroad managed to exploit this disaffection for their own ends. We know all too well what they are after in the West who call themselves friends of the Polish people. They could not care less for the fate of the Polish nation. What they want is to dismantle socialism, to liquidate the socialist gains. Indeed, the worse it is in Poland, the better they like it.

And that, too, is a lesson, a reminder that socialism is a historically new undertaking, a difficult cause that has to overcome the resistance of the anti-socialist forces, and to contend with imperialism's economic, political, propagandist, and military pressures.

Lastly, the experience of the past period again showed the danger of mistakes and subjective deviations from the principles that lie at the root of socialism's political system, of neglecting the standards of Party and government life, of miscalculations in social and economic policy.

The most dependable guarantee against such deviations is the creative development and application of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and close links between the Party and the working class, the broad mass of the working people. Those links are alive and indestructible, if the Party has a clear understanding of the people's needs, assesses the country's capabilities at each given stage in a realistic light, and blazes the trail to the future with bold confidence. Seen from the other angle, it means that every politically conscious worker, every citizen, must associate his expectations in life with the Party's policy, must conceive

himself not simply as the doer of its will, but also as an active participant in elaborating and carrying out the Party's decisions.

And one more conclusion that we can draw is of universal, international relevance: the socialist revolution provides scope for society's all-round progress. This does not go to say that such progress is henceforth automatically assured, that the relations of production and the productive forces have been harmonised once and for all. The swift growth of production, science, technology, and culture, the very advancement of the human personality—all this sets new demands on how society is organised. It is on the order of the day to continuously renovate socialism upon its own basis. Lacking this, stagnation, a clotting up of the social organism may complicate the economic and social problems to a danger point.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union said so clearly at its 27th Congress. The capacity for self-critical analysis, for sober assessment of its own activity and for drawing the due conclusions from past mistakes and miscalculations—that, too, is an important form of struggle for socialism, a fundamental principle making for the working-class party's success bequeathed to us by the great Lenin.

We have set our course resolutely on accelerating social and economic development, on renovating our life and clearing it of everything that hinders the full play of the socialist system's powerful political, economic, and spiritual potential.

In substance, all of us have one and the same aim, namely, learning as quickly as possible to fully utilise the immense potentialities of our system, and to find the optimum balance between the centre and the localities, the spheres belonging to the state and those belonging to society, between government and self-government. We must also learn to better stimulate the activity of people, to stimulate their labour and political involvement, their civic consciousness.

At present, pride of place goes of necessity to a deep-going and comprehensive improvement of the administrative mechanism. The main direction in this effort is clear to us. What we must do is resolve a dual problem: heighten the effectiveness of planning and organisation in determining the ways of our economic development, on the one hand, and afford the utmost scope to the initiative of work collectives, on the other.

As we know, the essence of socialism is expressed in the following formula: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." We are bent on confirming this formula by our everyday life, ruling out any wage levelling and seeing to it that conscientious and highly productive labour should be properly rewarded and social justice strictly abided by. For this we use economic levers, the power of persuasion, and the force of the law.

As you see, the reconstruction we have actively launched gathers into a tight knot a wide range of issues—from the functioning of the system, governmental and non-governmental institutions, down to the working and living conditions of people and the moral climate in our society.

The June 1986 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, which examined topical aspects of the Party's home and foreign policy elaborated by the 27th Congress of the CPSU, has been an important milestone along this road. The pith of the Plenary Meeting's decisions is to waste no time on getting off the mark, to increase the rate of advance, and to more resolutely jettison everything that still hinders innovation and initiative. Now that we have set our course on deep-going reconstruction in all spheres of society, the merits and prestige of managers and executives depend above all on their keen feel for the new, their competence and efficiency, and their taking the people's interests close to heart.

We follow Lenin's approach: "What we need is more factual knowledge and fewer debates on ostensible communist principles. . . . This calls for modesty and respect for the efficient 'specialists in science and technology', and a business-like and careful analysis of our numerous *practical* mistakes, and their gradual but steady correction."¹

Our Parties face the historically important task of combining the social justice inherent in socialism with the highest possible economic efficiency. We must, we are simply obliged to make socialism stronger, more dynamic in its development, more successful in competing against capitalist society in all parameters. And that requires above all that we make full and effective use

¹ V. I. Lenin, "Integrated Economic Plan", *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, 1977, p. 145.

of the truly inexhaustible possibilities of the scientific and technological revolution.

Here, understandably, it is best for us to act together, to pool our efforts. That is needed in the economic interests of our countries. That is needed, too, in face of the international political situation and, not least of all, in the interests of our economic security.

There is no denying that we were late in spotting the traps set along the trade routes to the West. You have mentioned here the damage sustained by Poland. And Poland is not the only one to sustain damage. The very idea that it is simpler buying in the capitalist market than producing at home, has been damaging. We are most decidedly shaking off such feelings in our country. Which does not mean, of course, that we are winding up economic contacts with the West. What we want is to use them rationally, to eliminate excesses, to prevent dependence.

Naturally, unconditional priority should go to cooperation in production with the fraternal countries, to speeding up the socialist economic integration. In this respect, key importance attaches to carrying out the Comprehensive Programme for Scientific and Technological Progress adopted in the CMEA framework.

The Soviet-Polish ties, which are making good headway, blend splendidly with this common strategy. Trade between our countries is to increase substantially in the current five years. Still, the new times require new, more effective forms of cooperation to be introduced on a bigger scale, such, for example, as joint enterprises, joint groups of scientists and other specialists, and direct ties between industrial enterprises and between research institutions.

Frankly, our delegation was gratified to learn at the Congress that the very first steps in that direction are already yielding good fruit. Let's tackle things boldly, on a wide scale, sparing no effort. It will pay off a hundredfold.

Comrades, three weeks ago at the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Treaty countries' Political Consultative Committee we jointly discussed international developments, and agreed on what all of us are to do further.

The United Nations, as you know, declared 1986 a Year of Peace. The socialist countries treat this seriously.

In January we came forward with a programme for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the century. In February, at the 27th Congress of the CPSU, we advanced the idea of an all-embracing system of international security. This was followed by concrete proposals facilitating agreement on the removal of medium-range missiles from Europe. Neither did we overlook possible search for special accords with the West European nuclear powers, namely, Britain and France. We also suggested measures concerning the abolition of the chemical threat.

In May, the Soviet Union extended its moratorium on nuclear tests for the third time, so that now it covers a whole year. Finally, in June, the Warsaw Treaty countries came out with a full-scale plan for reducing armed forces and conventional armaments on the entire European continent—from the Atlantic to the Urals.

What more can be done, one would think. But, alas, the business of disarmament has not budged a millimetre on account of the undisguised obstructionism of the US Administration. What is worse, Washington is scrapping the last few constraints that have been holding back the arms race—the SALT-2 Treaty and other Soviet-American agreements. This is contrary to the vital interests of the world community. Neither does it square with the spirit of the understandings reached in Geneva last year.

American leaders make fancy statements about wanting peace and disarmament, but do the very reverse. And justify their sabotage of that sacred cause with lies about our violating provisions of the treaties we have concluded with the USA. They also say that this is not their last word, that they might change their attitude if the Soviet Union behaves itself.

These pretensions of the US Administration to act the school-teacher and hand out marks for behaviour to sovereign states, could be treated as a joke. But it is no joking matter. The survival of the human race is at stake, and we believe that statesmen should deal with the problem most seriously.

This does not apply to Washington alone. I am sorry to say that the governments of other NATO countries who have in word dissociated themselves from the dangerous extremes of US policy, tend to yield to Washington's pressure in the long run,

and thereby assume their share of responsibility for the escalation of the arms race.

The ancient Greeks have a myth about the abduction of Europa. That fictional plot has quite unexpectedly acquired a modern-day message. As a geographical concept, of course, Europe remains where it is. But the impression we get is that the independent policy of certain West European states is being abducted across the ocean. The impression is that the national interests and, indeed, the fate of the 700 million Europeans, as well as the civilisation that has shaped here since times immemorial, are being sold down the river on the pretext of security.

Let there be no mistake: it is farthest from our thoughts to drive a wedge between the USA and its NATO allies. When we negotiate, we proceed from Europe's political and military realities.

There was a time when the socialist countries welcomed the participation of the United States in the European process. At that time it was a question of all its participants promoting security and cooperation in Europe. Now, on the other hand, the US Administration has apparently set out in the diametrically opposite direction, that of escalating the arms race and the confrontation. Who stands to gain from that? Can the European nations benefit from it?

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are, naturally, drawing their own conclusions from Washington's challengingly militarist behaviour.

We will most resolutely repulse all adventurist and destructive actions of the United States. US imperialism must not be allowed to dispose of the fate of the world at will.

Our policy will be a responsible one, a policy of patiently laying the groundwork for smoothing out Soviet-American relations.

We are in favour of dialogue. But it must be a dialogue in which both sides want to reach tangible results. Negotiations must not be used as a smokescreen for the arms race. We shall not go along with Washington in deceiving the world public.

Peace can be safeguarded only by the common effort of all states and all peoples. It is essential that everyone in the West should know: any nuclear missile launch is, in substance, not only an act of murder, but also of suicide.

The Chernobyl accident has been one more reminder of the

awesome powers enclosed in the atom. I want to thank you, comrades, for your solidarity with us in this misfortune that has befallen us. We know that it has also obliquely affected your country. So your support is doubly dear to us.

We must not forget that only a negligible fraction of the destructive powers of the nuclear weapons stockpiled in the world went out of control in Chernobyl. We are determined advocates of destroying nuclear weapons, and sincerely hope that the alarmed voices—ours and those of their own public—will at last reach the responsible political quarters of Western Europe.

But as long as a tangible threat of imperialist aggression persists, the socialist states will be compelled to see to their security. That is the purpose of the Warsaw Treaty, under which our armed forces, along with their comrades-in-arms, stand guard over peace, and this also on the territory of some of the allied states.

The socialist countries will let no one regard them as prey for alien appetites and the lust of revenge. We say to the West: take our proposal for eliminating medium-range nuclear missiles seriously, take our proposal for scaling down conventional armaments seriously, and it will be possible to substantially reduce tensions in Europe. Our troops in other countries are not anchored there for good. But anchors must be raised simultaneously by all concerned.

The socialist countries consider it their duty to promote well-meaning, mutually beneficial cooperation among the European peoples, to build bridges and work together wherever possible—in sports and cultural exchanges, trade, scientific and technical collaboration, cooperation in production, and contacts between people. That is the only way we can buttress the elements that unite Europe irrespective of the different social systems.

Comrades, human civilisation has come to a forking of the roads not only in questions of war and peace. We have entered an age where the indissoluble link between the right to life and the right to development is felt ever more strongly.

Can we reconcile ourselves with the fact that colossal financial means are being spent on weapons while hundreds of millions of people across the world are starving and millions die of hunger every year? It is chiefly the peoples of developing countries who live in poverty. But the problem of poverty has not spared the

advanced imperialist states either, including the United States. A country that allocates more than 300 billion dollars yearly on armaments, is unable or, what is worse, reluctant to feed its own undernourished, teach its own illiterates, and provide a roof for its own homeless.

The growing gap between the economically advanced and the underdeveloped countries is a most acute problem. But here, too, the imperialists' behaviour amounts to plain usury or, putting it more bluntly, to out-and-out plunder. The imperialists are drawing the noose of financial and technological dependence ever more tightly round the necks of dozens of countries. Nor do they shrink from the old methods, namely resort to brute force.

Everybody knows our attitude to this. All peoples have the sovereign right to shape their own future. There can be no normal international relations in the absence of that principle. We have always worked for the restructuring of the international political and economic order along reasonable and just lines, and have always supported anti-imperialist movements and organisations regardless of their social orientation.

This is an unusually complicated time, with conflicting tendencies interweaving and contending against one another on a global scale. We are witnessing social revolutions and the bitter resistance of the forces going off the stage of history. We are witnessing a precipitous surge of scientific and technological progress, and also its other side imperilling the very survival of life on earth. We are witnessing extraordinary achievements in all areas of science and art, and, on the other hand, the degradations of the imperialist-inspired pop culture. We see wealth against a backdrop of poverty, and hunger amidst plenty. We see a powerful drive towards interdependence and closeness and, on the other hand, alienation and hostility among countries and groups of countries. In many people this breeds tergiversation and fear of the future.

Searching thought and its verification by social and political practice has become the motto for our parties at this responsible stage of history. We back everything that serves the true interests of the peoples, the cause of peace and social justice, and the progress of humankind. And we firmly reject anything that is contrary to these aims.

Our revolutionary doctrine is a powerful instrument of cognition. It enables us to assess as a package all the contradictions of our times, to reach down to what causes them, and to find the right answers to the most vital questions. But our doctrine, too, needs to be continuously advanced. Today, we can safely say that the Communists have learned a most important lesson, namely, that our theory must be boldly advanced, that we must go forward continuously.

Dear comrades, the Soviet Communists know that the socialist cause in fraternal Poland is in dependable hands. Let me most heartily wish success to the 10th Congress of the PUWP. We are sure that Soviet-Polish friendship and cooperation will grow, will go from strength to strength, for the good of our peoples and that of the entire socialist community.

Long live socialist Poland!

Long live peace and progress!

Statement on Soviet Television

August 18, 1986

Good evening, dear comrades.

At our meeting today I would like to make a statement on a key issue in international politics.

The Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing which the Soviet Union has strictly observed for one year expired several days ago, on August 6.

What was the basis for and what prompted this important, extremely responsible decision which, I would say, was a difficult one for us to make?

To put it briefly, it was based on the realities of the nuclear and space age.

What are they? How do we see them?

First. Mountains of nuclear and various other types of arms have been piled up, but the arms race, nonetheless, far from abating, is gaining speed. A threat has arisen of its spread to outer space. The militarisation of the United States and the entire NATO bloc is going on at high speed. It is important to stress that the pace of the development of military technology is so high that it leaves ever less time for peoples, states and politicians to realise the real danger, and is reducing mankind's ability to stop the slide towards the nuclear abyss. There is no time to lose, for otherwise the appearance of new sophisticated arms systems will make agreement on their control altogether impossible.

The situation is becoming ever more intolerable. Today, it is not enough to preserve the existing treaties. Major practical steps are needed to curb militarism and reverse the course of events for the better. The "balance of terror" is ceasing to be a deterrent. Not only because fear and reason do not go together and because fear might prompt actions with unpredictable consequences. This fear is a direct factor in the arms race: by increasing mistrust and suspicion, it creates a vicious circle of heightening tension. There are many examples.

It is now clear as clear can be that the old notions of war as a means of attaining political objectives have become outdated. In the nuclear age, these obsolete tenets feed a policy that may result in a worldwide conflagration.

Second. Our moratorium was based on the commitment of socialism as a social system to the cause of peace, and on the profound understanding of its responsibility for the fate of civilisation. The Soviet Union as a socialist state and nuclear power regards it as its supreme duty to do everything it can to safeguard the peaceful future of the planet.

Our efforts to direct international affairs towards detente accord with our philosophy, our socialist morality. Besides, in the nuclear age, saving the Earth from atomic annihilation is a universal task, a task for all peoples.

Third. The present-day world is complicated, diverse and controversial. At the same time, it is objectively becoming ever more interdependent and integral. This peculiarity of the human community at the end of the 20th century cannot be disregarded in foreign policy if it is to be realistic. Otherwise there will be no normal international relations, they will be doomed to instability and, ultimately, to catastrophic confrontation.

In substance, pre-nuclear thinking lost its significance on August 6, 1945. Today, it is impossible to ensure one's security without taking into account the security of other states and peoples. There can be no genuine security unless it is equal for all and all-embracing. To think differently is to live in a world of illusions, a world of self-deception.

The new thinking, required by the present-day world, is incompatible with the notion that the globe is someone's domain or with attempts to patronise others and instruct them on how to behave and what path to choose—socialist, capitalist or some other.

The Soviet Union believes that each people, each country, has the right to be master of its own destiny, its resources, and to independently determine its social development, uphold its security and participate in organising an all-embracing international security system.

Global problems, too, are becoming graver in today's world. Yet they cannot be resolved without pooling the efforts of all states and peoples. The exploration of outer space and the ocean

depths, ecology and epidemics, poverty and backwardness—these are all realities of the age which demand international attention, international responsibility and international cooperation. Many new world processes are thus tied into a tight knot. And disarmament could play an immense role here by releasing considerable funds, and intellectual and technical resources for constructive purposes.

Our foreign policy draws inspiration from the fact that all over the world people, political and public forces of diverse orientation and world outlook are coming to realise ever more firmly that the very survival of the human race is at stake, and that the time has come for resolute and responsible action. This calls for the utmost mobilisation of reason and common sense.

Two tragedies involving nuclear and space age technology have occurred recently: the loss of the Challenger crew and the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power plant. They have augmented our anxiety, and were a brutal reminder that people are only just beginning to master the fantastically powerful forces they have themselves called to life, and are only just learning to make them serve progress. These events have been an object lesson of what would happen if nuclear weapons are put to use.

Everyone, and statesmen above all, should draw the obvious concrete conclusions. And an important, probably the most important one, is that the weapons devised by man should never be used and that today it is simply suicidal to base interstate relations on the illusion that superiority can be attained through terrible means of destruction.

To eliminate all of them is the only way to ensure genuine peace. To do so is to pass the maturity test of history. This applies to all political leaders whose lot it is to undertake that lofty universal mission.

One must learn to face the facts with courage: experts estimate that the radioactivity of the smallest detonated nuclear warhead is equal to that of three Chernobyls. Most likely this is true. And since it is so, the explosion of even a small part of the existing nuclear stockpile will be a catastrophe, an irreparable disaster. And if someone still ventures on a nuclear first strike, he will doom himself to an agonising death—not even from a

retaliatory strike, but from the consequences of the explosion of his own warheads.

This is neither propaganda nor political improvisation, nor any buildup of "fear". It is a reality which it is simply irresponsible to reject and criminal to disregard.

Objective and honest analysis of all these realities prompts other approaches to world politics. They underlie the fundamental conclusions we have drawn of late, notably at the 27th Congress of the CPSU.

Soviet foreign policy, including questions of disarmament, is based on an understanding of the profound changes in the world.

We believe that the Soviet proposals of January 15, 1986 on eliminating nuclear weapons worldwide by the year 2000 fully meet the demands of the times.

We are ready to search compromise solutions to the problems that are causing controversy and suspicion.

The Soviet Union has submitted a package of constructive proposals at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

Jointly with our Warsaw Treaty allies, we have submitted a package of measures for reducing the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. In this sphere, too, we want progress—mutual and consistent—towards lower and less dangerous levels of military confrontation.

New proposals on chemical weapons have been made which, in our view, make it possible to sign before the end of this year or the next a convention on banning chemical weapons and destroying their stockpiles and the industrial plant for their production.

At the Stockholm Conference, cooperating constructively with the other participants, the socialist countries have done a great deal to find solutions to such key issues as non-use of force, notification of military exercises and troop movements, exchange of annual plans of military activity, invitation of observers, and verification.

We have advanced a broad platform for ensuring security and cooperation in Asia and the Pacific, and invite everybody to participate in this process.

We have taken the initiative in cooperating with all interested states on international safeguards in nuclear power engineering.

We recently submitted to the United Nations, as an alternative to the Star Wars programme, a programme of building a Star Peace, of establishing a world space organisation.

The 27th Congress of the CPSU formulated the basic principles of an all-embracing international security system which is the most concentrated expression of our new approaches to foreign policy. Recently, a group of socialist countries officially submitted the matter of establishing such a system for consideration at the next session of the UN General Assembly.

At the same time, we are aware that no matter how important and significant our proposals may be and however committed we are to them, we are not able to do everything on our own. The problem of international security is a common problem and, therefore, a common concern and a common responsibility.

When working out our proposals, we study and take into account the points of view and initiatives of other governments, and of mass and political movements. We are very careful about providing for the equal security of all at each stage in the implementation of the proposals. And, certainly, we do not regard them as final and not subject to discussion. The way out of the dead ends of confrontation is found through dialogues and contacts, discussions and talks. That is the only way to thaw the ice of mutual mistrust and achieve practical results.

This also determines our attitude to the problem of control when resolving all disarmament problems. For example, when we made our proposal for halting all nuclear blasts we said we had no objections to international control. Our consent to the installation of American monitoring devices in the area of Semipalatinsk is convincing proof of this. It would seem that the problem of control has ceased to be an obstacle to agreement. It is still being persistently exploited, however, with a view to concealing the truth—the unwillingness to disarm.

People of goodwill welcomed our moratorium on nuclear explosions. We heard words of approval and support from all parts of the world. Politicians and parliamentarians, public figures and mass organisations saw it as a model of the correct approach to present-day problems and as hope of deliverance from the fear of nuclear catastrophe. The Soviet moratorium was commended by the UN General Assembly, the world's most representative assembly of countries.

We were supported by outstanding scientists—physicists and physicians—who know the dangers lurking in the atom better than anyone else. I saw for myself at the recent meeting with scientists in Moscow that our moratorium has inspired members of the scientific community of various countries for vigorous action.

All these obvious and encouraging signs of the new thinking, however, are opposed, primarily in the United States, by a militarisation of the political thinking of Western ruling circles, already dangerously lagging behind the process of profound change in international affairs, with advances in science and technology strongly outpacing social and moral progress.

The rightist militaristic group in the USA representing the powerful military-industrial complex is simply out of its mind about the arms race. Its interest here seems to be three-fold: to prevent the flow of profits from arms manufacturing from ebbing, to secure US military superiority, to try and drain the Soviet Union economically and weaken it politically, and, in the long run, to win world leadership, to attain the long-sought-after imperial ambitions, and further pursue a policy of plunder with regard to developing countries.

Hence a foreign policy which for all its convolutions and verbal allurements is still based on the following dangerous delusions: underestimation of the Soviet Union, of the other socialist countries and the newly free states, on the one hand, and overestimation of its own potentialities that nourishes technological over-confidence and political permissiveness.

Some US politicians regard our participation in talks as a result of the growing US military power and the development of the Strategic Defence Initiative. Since its policy is based on such erroneous premises, the US Administration cannot take the road of honest agreements, of improving the international climate. And yet, it will still have to reckon with the realities. They cannot be avoided.

As to our proposals, I repeat that they stem from the realities of the world of today, that they are not prompted by any weakness, but by a sense of lofty responsibility for the future of humanity.

Such is the situation at the moment.

There is our moratorium, on the one hand, as well as our large-

scale compromise proposals on the negotiating table at various forums. The pressure of the peace forces has increased considerably. Greater attention is being devoted to the problems of international security by political quarters, including official, concerned over the seriousness of the situation.

On the other hand, there is the refusal to stop nuclear testing, the stubborn resistance to peace initiatives, the defiant disregard for the demands of the public and the opinion of many authoritative parties and organisations, and the contempt for the concern of their own allies and their own people.

This is the state of affairs that faces us, the Soviet leadership, at the hour when our moratorium expires.

What are we to do? What is our choice? What is the most correct decision to take, the best for the situation at hand? What decision will benefit the positive processes the most, and reduce the threat of military confrontation?

Our people resolutely support the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet Government. They insistently demand that the foreign policy of the 27th Party Congress be continued. At the same time, there is a justifiable note of alarm in letters and comments of Soviet people: is it wise to keep up the moratorium when nuclear explosions continue to reverberate in Nevada one after another? Is not the risk too great? Is not time working against the security of our country?

The United States has, indeed, held the record for the number of detonations made in the past 40 years. During the 12 months of the Soviet moratorium it set off another 18 nuclear devices. I repeat: 18, three of which were not announced. What is more, as a rule, they were set off demonstratively, the explosions being timed to coincide with Soviet statements extending the moratorium, or with some new Soviet initiative. We were even invited to Nevada to see how it all happens. It should be added that the present US Administration is implementing wide-ranging military programmes.

In short, the Soviet Union has quite enough reasons for resuming nuclear tests. And yet we are convinced even now that the ending of nuclear tests not only by the Soviet Union but also by the United States would be a real breakthrough in the drive to halt the nuclear arms race and speed up the elimination of nuclear arms. The logic here is simple: if there are no tests, the

nuclear weapons which both sides have already stockpiled in abundance will not be upgraded.

The same viewpoint is evident in the appeals to the United States and the Soviet Union of a considerable and authoritative part of the world community. It includes the Delhi Six, that permanent forum of top statesmen from countries on four continents—Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania. Recently in Iztapa they adopted their Mexican Declaration, which again calls for an end to all nuclear explosions. That is also the demand of the majority of non-aligned countries.

We have received messages from politicians and public figures, from individuals and organisations in many countries, including the United States and other NATO states. They, too, ask us not to resume nuclear testing, to give those who insist on nuclear explosions one more chance to come to their senses.

We are aware, of course, and I have spoken about it before, that forces which do not want disarmament at all are highly active in the USA. More, they are doing everything they can to involve us in ever new spirals of the arms race, to make us slam the door to negotiations.

But we would like to hope that realism and awareness of the necessity for joint search of ways to improve the international situation, to end the senseless arms race, to abolish nuclear weapons, will prevail in the US assessments and deeds.

Yet we know who we are dealing with. Therefore, our country's security is a sacred thing to us. That must be clear to everybody. It is a matter of principle.

That is what we act on when responding to any challenge from the United States, including the notorious SDI. Here, too, no one should expect to intimidate us or to prompt us to needless expenditure. If need be, we shall come up with a prompt response, and it will not be what the United States expects. But it will be an answer that will make the Star Wars programme worthless. I am saying that with a specific aim: let the US Administration again and again weigh the real value of the new military programmes and of the arms race as a whole in the light of US interests and security. In substance, after all, the main harm of the SDI is that it dims the prospects in negotiations and widens the zone of mistrust. That is the whole problem. It is no less political than military. Therefore, we again call for

advancing from a world that is armed to excess to a world without arms.

Thus, comrades, the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the Government of the Soviet Union have thoroughly and scrupulously weighed all the pros and cons, and, prompted by their sense of responsibility for the fate of the world, have decided *to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions till January 1, 1987.*

As we take this step, we trust that people in all countries, all political groups and the public at large will correctly appreciate the long silence on Soviet nuclear test ranges.

On behalf of the Soviet people, I appeal to the wisdom and dignity of the Americans not to again miss the historic chance on the road to ending the arms race.

I call on US President Ronald Reagan to again impartially gauge the prevailing situation, to discard all extraneous matter, and abandon the misconceptions about the Soviet Union and its foreign policy.

The Soviet Union is confident that agreements on ending nuclear tests can be reached speedily and signed *this year at a Soviet-American summit meeting.* That would, undoubtedly, be the *main real outcome of the meeting*, a considerable step closer to ending the arms race. It would be a kind of prologue to further progress at the talks on nuclear arms and their elimination, to a radical improvement of the world situation as a whole.

The Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions is an action and not just a proposal, and therefore proves the seriousness and sincerity of our nuclear disarmament programme, of our calls for a new policy of realism, peace and cooperation.

More than half of 1986, which the United Nations has declared a Year of Peace, has gone by. By extending its unilateral moratorium, the Soviet Union is making another palpable contribution to the common wish that this year should live up to its name.

This is the essence of the Soviet Union's new political initiative.

This is the message which our country addresses to the governments and peoples of all countries, above all to the government and people of the United States.

Thank you. Goodbye.

Statement on Soviet Television

October 22, 1986

Good evening, dear comrades.

I speak with you again, and the subject is again the same—Reykjavik. This is a very serious issue. The outcome of the meeting with the US President has stirred the entire world. A great deal of new data have come out over the past days demanding assessments which I would like to share with you today.

You will remember that I said at the press conference in Reykjavik that we shall return again and again to this meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the US.

I am convinced that we have not realised the full significance of what happened. But we will reach this realisation. If not today, then tomorrow. We will grasp the full significance of Reykjavik and will do justice to the accomplishments and gains, as well as to the missed opportunities and losses.

Dramatic as the course of the talks and their results were the Reykjavik meeting greatly facilitated, perhaps for the first time in many decades, our search for a way to achieve nuclear disarmament.

I believe that as a result of the meeting we have now reached a higher level, not only in analysing the situation, but also in determining the objectives and the framework of possible accords on nuclear disarmament.

Having found ourselves a few steps from an actual agreement on such a difficult and vitally important issue, we all grew to understand more fully the danger facing the world and the need for immediate solutions. And what is most impor-

tant, we now know that it is both realistic and possible to avert the nuclear threat.

I would like to point out here that the Soviet programme for eliminating nuclear arms by the year 2000 was until recently described by many "experts" in world politics as illusory and an unrealisable dream.

This is indeed the case when past experience is neither wealth nor counsel, but a burden that makes the search for solutions all the more difficult.

Reykjavik generated more than just hopes. Reykjavik also highlighted the difficulties encountered on the way to a nuclear-free world.

If this fact is not understood, it is impossible to assess correctly the results of the meeting in Iceland.

The forces opposed to disarmament are great. We felt that during the meeting and we feel this today. Reykjavik is being talked about a great deal.

Those who look realistically at the facts assess the meeting in Iceland as a major political event.

They welcome the fact that as a result of this meeting progress was made towards new qualitative levels in the fight against nuclear weapons. The results of Reykjavik, as they are viewed by the Soviet leadership, are encouraging to all who seek a change for the better.

Interesting assessments are being made in many countries at the state level, in public circles and in the scientific community. The opportunities that have been opened up are being characterised as corresponding to the aspirations of all mankind.

It is a common view that the meeting has raised both the Soviet-American dialogue and the East-West dialogue as a whole to a new level.

For the dialogue has been taken out of the plane of technical estimates and numerical comparisons and has been placed onto one with new parameters and dimensions.

From this height new prospects can be seen for the settlement of today's urgent issues. I am referring to security, nuclear disarmament, the prevention of new spirals in the arms race, and a new understanding of the opportunities that have opened up before mankind.

One could say that the debate over the results of the meet-

ing has only just begun. I believe, I am even confident, that this debate will grow. And, we believe, the joint efforts of the people, of political figures and of public organisations will grow as well in an endeavour to take advantage of the opportunities that opened up in Reykjavik.

A course was outlined there for settling vitally important issues on which the very fate of mankind depends.

In the time that has passed since Reykjavik, however, something else has become clear.

Those groups linked with militarism and making profits from the arms race are obviously scared. They are doing their utmost to cope with the new situation and, coordinating their actions, are trying in every way possible to mislead the people, to control the sentiment of broad sections of the world public, to suppress the people's quest for peace, and to impede governments from taking a clear-cut position at this decisive moment in history.

These groups have at their disposal political power, economic leverage, and the powerful mass media. Of course, one should not overestimate their strength, but one should not underestimate it either. All indications are that the battle will be a difficult one.

Forces are being regrouped in the camp of the enemies of detente and disarmament. Feverish efforts are being made to create obstacles in order to stem the process started in Reykjavik.

Under these circumstances, I consider it necessary to return to the urgent issues which arose in connection with the meeting in Iceland.

Our point of view, which I made public one hour after the meeting, has not changed. I consider it necessary to state this not only in order to reiterate the appraisals made earlier.

I am doing this to draw your attention to the juggling with words and dissonance which we are observing. This might be the result of confusion or perplexity, but this also might be a pre-planned campaign to fool the people.

The aims which were set before the meeting are explained differently. The initial negative reports of the Reykjavik meeting have quickly and concertedly become words of praise.

A hectic campaign has been started to misappropriate the other side's proposals.

The greatest efforts are being made to defend SDI, a project that was shown to be worthy of shame in Reykjavik. Generally speaking, Washington is now experiencing some hectic times.

But what is this? A pre-election game which needs to depict Reykjavik as a success? Or are we dealing with a policy that will be unpredictable for years to come?

This needs to be studied carefully.

It certainly did catch our attention as to how and where certain political groupings are trying to steer the discussion of the results of the meeting.

The key elements of this campaign are worth mentioning. Efforts are being made in a bid to whitewash the destructive position of the US Administration which came to the meeting unprepared. They came, I would say one more time, with the same old baggage. But when it was cornered and the situation demanded definite answers, the US side wrecked the chances for concluding the meeting with an accord.

A new situation has developed since Reykjavik, and meanwhile efforts are being made to force the USSR to return to the old approaches, to the unproductive numbers debates, and to walking in circles in a deadlock situation.

Evidently there is a great number of politicians in the West for whom the Geneva talks serve as a screen, and not as a forum for seeking accords.

What was once disguised thoroughly is now being disclosed: there are powerful forces in the ruling circles of the US and Western Europe which are seeking to frustrate the process of nuclear disarmament. Certain people are once again beginning to claim that nuclear weapons are even a good thing.

A half-truth is the most dangerous lie, as a saying goes. It is extremely disquieting that not only have the mass media, leaning towards the right, taken such a stand, but so have leading figures in the US Administration. And at times this stand is even one of downright deception.

I have already had the opportunity to report how things went in Reykjavik. We arrived at the meeting with constructive and the most radical arms reduction proposals in the entire history

of Soviet-US negotiations. These proposals take into account the interests of both sides.

Upon arrival in Iceland, I spoke about this on the eve of the meeting in a conversation with the leaders of that country. The proposals had already been handed over to the President of the United States by the middle of my first conversation with him.

Far-reaching and interconnected, these proposals form an *integrated package* and are based on the programme made public on January 15 for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

The *first* proposal is to reduce by half all strategic arms with no exceptions.

The *second* proposal is to eliminate completely Soviet and US medium-range missiles in Europe and to start talks immediately on missiles of this type in Asia, as well as on missiles with a range of less than one thousand kilometres. We suggested that the number of such missiles be frozen immediately.

The *third* proposal is to consolidate the regime of the ABM Treaty and to start full-scale talks on a total nuclear test ban.

The discussions in Reykjavik, which I described in detail in my previous speeches, opened with the Soviet proposals.

Tremendous efforts and intense arguments resulted in the positions of the two sides drawing reassuringly closer together in two of the three areas.

The talks enabled the two sides to establish specific periods for the elimination of strategic offensive arms. We came to the agreement with President Ronald Reagan that the arms of this type belonging to the USSR and the USA can and must be completely eliminated by the year 1996.

An accord was also reached on the complete elimination of US and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe and on a radical cut in missiles of this type in Asia.

We attach great importance to these accords between the USSR and the United States: they prove that nuclear disarmament is possible.

This is the first half of the truth about the Reykjavik meeting. But there is still the other half and this is, as I have already said, that the US side frustrated an agreement which, it seemed, was quite near at hand.

The US Administration is now trying in every way possible

to convince the people that the possibility of a major success in reaching definite agreements was not realised due to the Soviet Union's unyielding position on the issue of so-called Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI).

It is even being asserted that we allegedly lured the President into a trap by putting forward "breathtaking" proposals on the reduction of strategic offensive arms and medium-range missiles and that later we ostensibly demanded, in the form of an ultimatum, that SDI be renounced.

But the essence of our position and proposals is as follows: we stand for the reduction and the eventual complete elimination of nuclear weapons and are absolutely against a new stage in the arms race and against its transfer to outer space.

Hence we are against SDI and for the consolidation of the ABM Treaty.

It is clear to every sober-minded person that if we start the process of radically cutting and then completely eliminating nuclear weapons, it is essential to rule out any possibility of either the Soviet or US side gaining a unilateral military superiority.

It is precisely the extension of the arms race to a new sphere and the attempts to take offensive arms into outer space in order to achieve military superiority, that we perceive as the main danger of SDI.

SDI has become a barrier to ending the arms race, to getting rid of nuclear weapons, the main obstacle to a nuclear-free world.

When Mr. Shultz, US Secretary of State, tells the American people that SDI is a sort of "insurance policy" for America, this, to say the least, is an attempt to mislead the American people.

In fact, SDI does not strengthen America's security but, by opening up a new stage of the arms race, destabilises the military-political situation and thereby weakens both US and universal security.

The Americans should know this.

They should also know that the US stand on SDI announced in Reykjavik basically contradicts the ABM Treaty. Article XV of the Treaty does allow a party to withdraw from the Treaty, but only under certain circumstances, namely, "if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject

matter of this Treaty have jeopardized its (that party's) supreme interests". There have not been and are no such extraordinary events. It is clear that the elimination of nuclear weapons, if begun, would make the emergence of such extraordinary events even less likely. This is only logical.

Article XIII of the ABM Treaty, however, stipulates that the sides should "consider, as appropriate, possible proposals for further increasing the viability of this Treaty". The US, on the contrary, is seeking to depreciate the Treaty and deprive it of its meaning.

Each of these quotations is from the Treaty signed by the top representative of the United States.

Many stories have been invented to raise the prestige of SDI. One of them is that the Russians are terribly afraid of it. Another has it that SDI brought the Russians to the talks in Geneva and then to Reykjavik. A third is that only SDI will save America from the "Soviet threat". The fourth says that SDI will give the United States a great technological lead over the Soviet Union and other countries, and so on and so forth.

Understanding the problem, I can say now only one thing: continuing the SDI programme will push the world into a new stage of the arms race and destabilise the strategic situation.

Everything else ascribed to SDI is in many respects rather dubious and is done in order to sell this suspicious and dangerous commodity in an attractive wrapping.

In upholding his position that prevented an agreement being reached in Reykjavik, the President asks the rhetorical questions: "Why are the Soviets so adamant that America remain forever vulnerable to Soviet rocket attack? Why does the Soviet Union insist that we remain defenceless forever?"

I must say I'm surprised by such questions. They give the impression that the American President has opportunity of making his country invulnerable, of giving it secure protection against a nuclear strike.

As long as nuclear weapons exist and the arms race continues he has no such opportunity. Naturally, this also applies to ourselves.

If the President counts on SDI in this respect, it is futile. The system would be effective only if all missiles were eliminat-

ed. But then, one might ask, why an anti-missile defence at all? Why build it? I won't even mention the money wasted, the system's cost, which, according to some estimates, will run into several trillion dollars.

So far, we have been trying to persuade America to give up this dangerous undertaking. We urge the American Administration to look for invulnerability and protection elsewhere—by totally eliminating nuclear weapons and establishing a comprehensive system of international security that would preclude all wars, nuclear or conventional.

The SDI programme still remains an integral part of US military doctrine.

The Fiscal Year 1984-1988 Defense Guidance now in force, which the Pentagon produced at the beginning of Reagan's term in office, directly provides for the "development of space-based weapons systems", including weapons to destroy Soviet satellites and accelerate the development of the system of the anti-missile defence of US territory with the possible US pullout of the ABM Treaty.

The document says that the United States should develop weapons that "are difficult for the Soviets to counter, impose disproportionate costs, open up new areas of major military competition and obsolesce previous Soviet investment". Once again, as you can see, there is, as former President Nixon put it, a chase of the ghost; once again, there are plans to wear out the Soviet Union.

It is hard for the current administration to learn lessons.

Is this not the reason why its commitment to SDI is so stubborn? The plans for "star wars" have become the chief obstacle to an agreement on removing the nuclear threat. Washington's claim that we are now moving towards an agreement is of no use.

To eliminate nuclear weapons as a means of deterring American aggression, and, in return, be threatened from outer space can only be accepted by those who are politically naive. There are no such people in the Soviet leadership.

It is hard to reconcile oneself to the loss of the unique chance of saving mankind from the nuclear threat. With precisely this in mind, I said at the press conference in Reykjavik that we did not regard the dialogue as closed and hoped that President Rea-

gan, on returning home, would consult the US Congress and the American people, and adopt decisions logically necessitated by what had been achieved in Reykjavik.

Quite a different thing has happened. Aside from distorting the entire picture of the negotiations in Reykjavik—about which I will speak later—in recent days they have taken actions that, following such an important meeting between the two countries' top leaders, appear as simply wild to any normal point of view.

I am referring to the expulsion of another fifty-five Soviet Embassy and consular staff from the United States. We will, of course, take measures in response, very tough measures on an equal footing, so to speak. We are not going to put up with such outrageous practices. But now, I have this to say.

What kind of government is this, what can one expect from it in other affairs in the international arena? To what limits does the unpredictability of its actions go?

It turns out that it has no constructive proposals on key disarmament issues and that it does not even have a desire to maintain the kind of atmosphere essential for a normal continuation of the dialogue. It seems that Washington is not prepared for any of this.

The conclusion is obvious. It is confirmed by the considerable experience which has been accumulated. Every time a gleam of hope appears in the approaches to the major issues in Soviet-American relations and to a solution of questions involving the interests of the whole of mankind, a provocative action is immediately staged with the aim of frustrating the possibility of a positive outcome and poisoning the atmosphere.

Which is the real face of the US Administration then? Is it looking for answers and solutions or does it want to finally destroy everything that may serve as a basis for headway and deliberately rule out any normalisation?

Quite an unattractive portrait is emerging of the administration of that great country—an administration quick to take disruptive actions. Either the President is unable to cope with the entourage literally breathing hatred for the Soviet Union and for everything that may lead international affairs into calm waters or he himself is this way. In any event, there is no restraining the "hawks" in the White House, and this is very dangerous.

As for informing the American people about the meeting in Reykjavik, the following has taken place, which is entirely in the spirit of what I have already mentioned: facts have been concealed from them. They were told the half-truth of which I spoke earlier. Things were portrayed so as to show that the United States, acting from a position of strength, virtually wrested consent from the Soviet Union to reach agreement on US terms.

And the day is not far off when the United States will ostensibly attain its goal: it is essential, they say, not to slacken the pace of military preparations, to speed up the "Star Wars" programme and to increase pressure in all directions.

These days have witnessed the drowning of a great cause in petty politicking and the sacrificing of the vital interests of the American people, allies, and international security as a whole to the arms manufacturers.

A good deal has been said about the openness of American society, about the freedom of information, the pluralism of opinions, and the fact that everyone there can see and hear what he pleases.

In Reykjavik, when pointing out the differences between our two systems, the President told me, and I quote: "We recognise freedom of the press and the right to hear any point of view." But how do things stand in reality?

Here is the latest fact.

It has been brought to my attention that a public organisation of ours, the Novosti Press Agency, has published in English the text of my press conference in Reykjavik and of my speech on Soviet television and sent them out to many countries, including the United States.

Well, the fact is that the pamphlets with these texts have been detained at the US customhouse for several days now. They are being prevented from reaching the American reader. There's the "right to hear any point of view" for you!

Or take, for example, the cinema. As I told the President when we were discussing humanitarian affairs, great number of American films are shown on the Soviet screen. They give Soviet people an opportunity to become acquainted with both Americans' way of life and their way of thinking.

In "free America", on the other hand, Soviet films are prac-

tically not shown. The President avoided making any reply and, as usual in such cases, fell back on free enterprise which lets everyone do whatever he wants.

I also told him about the publication of American books in this country as compared to that of our books in the United States: the ratio is approximately twenty to one.

I put the question of radio information before the President as well. I said that in this field, too, we are on an unequal footing. You have surrounded the Soviet Union with a network of radio transmitters and broadcast round the clock everything you like in many languages of the Soviet Union from the territories of other countries. America, availing itself of the fact that we are not its close neighbour, has isolated itself from our radio information by using the medium wave band—receivers in America are only of that kind. The President had nothing to say to that either.

Then I suggested to him that we take the following approach: we stop jamming the Voice of America broadcast and you give us an opportunity to conduct radio broadcasts directed at the United States on your territory or somewhere nearby so that the broadcasts might reach the population of your country. The President promised to think about it.

It appears that the United States is becoming an increasingly closed society. People there are being isolated from objective information in a cunning and effective way. This is a dangerous process.

The American people should know the truth about what is going on in the Soviet Union, about the true content of Soviet foreign policy, about our real intentions, as well as the truth about the state of affairs in the world as a whole.

At the present stage, I would say, this is becoming extremely important.

Now a few words about how the outcome of the Reykjavik meetings is being portrayed in the United States. It took only several hours, or days at most, for everything discussed at Reykjavik to begin dispersing in the fog of inventions and fantasies. Attempts are being made to destroy the seedlings of trust before they take root.

The President stated recently, that the only object of agreement had been ballistic missiles, and his assistants said plainly

that bombers and all cruise missiles remained untouched.

The Secretary of State presented another version—that our accord dealt with all strategic arms. By the way, the latter was present during my talks with the President, as was our Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze.

Mr. Speakes, the White House spokesman, stated that possibly Mr. Reagan had been misunderstood and had actually never agreed to the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

Things got to the point of outright misrepresentation.

It is alleged, for example, that during the past meeting the US President did not agree to the Soviet proposal on a *complete* elimination of *all* strategic offensive arms of the USSR and the USA by 1996, and that a common point of view on our proposal was never reached.

With all the responsibility of a participant in the talks I state: the President did, albeit without particular enthusiasm, consent to the elimination of all—I emphasise—not just certain individual ones, but all strategic offensive arms. And these are to be eliminated precisely within ten years, in two stages.

The interpretations of the discussion of the nuclear testing issue are a far cry from the truth, too. The United States' unilateral approach to this issue is pictured in such a way as to lead one to believe that the Soviet Union has given it its full consent. This is not the case, nor could it be.

The issue of the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe is also being presented in a distorted fashion, to say nothing of the fact that it is being withdrawn from the package proposed by the Soviet side.

But our consent to freeze the number of missiles with a range of under 1,000 kilometres is also being portrayed as the Soviet Union's "recognition" of the United States' "right" to deploy American missiles of the same class in Western Europe.

With such interpretations I myself will soon be in doubt as to what we really spoke about at Reykjavik—about removing the nuclear threat, reducing and eliminating nuclear arms? Or about how to keep this threat growing, how to diversify the nuclear arsenals and turn not just this entire planet, but outer space, the universe, too, into an arena of military confrontation? For this, comrades, is what is happening.

The prospects of reaching a mutual understanding between

the Soviet and American sides so frightened certain people that they began erecting inconceivable obstacles ahead of time and inventing "preconditions".

An assistant to the President went so far as to say that before embarking on nuclear disarmament the USA must see some changes in the political climate in the Soviet Union.

All this is just not serious, not serious at all.

When similar claims were made 70 or 40 years ago it was still possible to regard them as an inability to think things through, or as historical blindness. Nowadays they can only be the demonstration of a complete lack of understanding of reality.

The issue of conventional arms is also mentioned as one of the "preconditions". In and of itself it is serious enough.

To this day there is a well-worn thesis in the West concerning the "superiority" of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty states in conventional arms. It is this that is allegedly compelling NATO to continue building up its nuclear potential.

There is in fact no disbalance whatsoever. After Reykjavik this fact was publicly recognised for the first time by Mr. Shultz and Mr. Regan. But the crux of the matter does not lie in the maintenance of parity. We do not want the arms race to move from the sphere of nuclear arms to the sphere of conventional ones.

Let me remind you that our January proposal on the elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the century included also the provisions on the elimination of chemical weapons and on radical reductions in conventional armaments.

We have returned to that issue more than once since January. The proposals of the Warsaw Treaty countries were presented in greatest detail last summer in Budapest. We sent them to the other side, that is, the NATO countries.

So far we have received no answer.

Every day that has passed since Reykjavik has made it more clear that the meeting in Iceland was that touchstone which determines the true value of the words and declarations of political figures.

So much has been said of the need to be free of the nuclear nightmare, of how we will be able to breathe more easily

in a nuclear-free world. Let the USSR and the USA get things in motion.

But no sooner had a ray of hope appeared than many of those who had just been cursing nuclear weapons and pledging their allegiance to the idea of a nuclear-free world went back on their word.

Certain quarters in Western Europe even voiced their feeling that it was difficult to part with American nuclear weapons, with American missiles.

Evidently, the point is that the policy-makers in the West are thinking of nuclear weapons not in the terms of defence at all. Otherwise it would be difficult to explain why pretexts are now being sought for keeping the missiles in place or why support for the SDI programme is being expressed at the government level.

Here is something for both us and the West European public to ponder.

In addition to direct attacks, subtle manoeuvres are being made. Wouldn't it be possible to take from the negotiating table what is most advantageous, while ignoring that which is not to one's taste for one reason or another?

They say that difficulties at Reykjavik arose because we, the Soviet side, put forward our cardinal proposals in a package. But the package contains a balance of interests and concessions, a balance of withdrawn concerns and the interdependence of security interests. Here everything is as if on scales; the two pans must be balanced.

That is why, evidently, those in the West want to shatter this logically substantiated and fair variant of an overall accord into pieces, doing nothing to restore the balance of compromises.

All the proposals we made at Reykjavik are objectively connected with central strategic weapons systems. Our concessions are also a part of the package. No package, no concessions.

This is a reality of our national security. But such an approach ensures the security of the USA and all other countries as well.

That is why we attach such significance to strengthening the ABM Treaty. We are not endangering it in any way. On the contrary, we are opposed to having it revised, supplemented, or

what not, and we are even more opposed to having it replaced with something else, as the President suggested at Reykjavik. Or maybe this was just a slip of the tongue.

Let me put it frankly: I was very much surprised when during the meeting he began persuading the Soviet side and me personally not to regard the ABM Treaty as gospel. What, then, should one's attitude to treaties be like? Should they be treated as mere slips of paper?

Without strict observance of the treaties, and especially such a fundamental one as this, it is impossible to ensure international order and basic stability. Otherwise, the world would be subject to arbitrary rule and chaos.

Let me say once again: when SDI is given preference over nuclear disarmament, only one conclusion can be made—with the help of that military programme efforts are being made to disprove the axiom of international relations of our epoch, an axiom laid out in simple, clear-cut words signed by the US President and myself last year. These words read: nuclear war must not be fought and cannot be won.

Let me say in conclusion that the Soviet Union has put the maximum of goodwill into its proposals. We are not withdrawing these proposals; they still stand! Everything that has been said by way of their substantiation and development remains in force.

Good night, comrades. All the best.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design, and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovskiy Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.



PROGRESS
Publishers