

Mikhail **GORBACHEV**

**Political Report
of the CPSU Central Committee
to the 27th Party Congress**





CHIS

**POLITICAL REPORT
OF THE CPSU
CENTRAL COMMITTEE
TO THE 27TH CONGRESS
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF THE SOVIET UNION**

**Delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev,
General Secretary of the CPSU
Central Committee**

February 25, 1986

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
Moscow 1986

CONTENTS

I.	THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD: ITS MAIN TENDENCIES AND CONTRADICTIONS	7
II.	THE STRATEGIC COURSE: ACCELERATION OF THE COUNTRY'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	26
	A. The Results of Socio-Economic Development and the Need for Its Acceleration	27
	B. Economic Policy Guidelines	30
	1. Modernisation of the National Economy on the Basis of Scientific and Technological Progress	30
	2. Solving the Food Problem: A Top-Priority Task	37
	3. Economic Management Must Measure Up to the New Demands	40
	4. Putting Reserves of Economic Growth into Action	50
	C. The Basic Guidelines of Social Policy	53
	1. Steady Improvement of the People's Standard of Living, Consistent Application of Social Justice	55
	2. Improvement of Social-Class Relations and Relations Among the Peoples of the USSR	61
III.	FURTHER DEMOCRATISATION OF SOCIETY AND PROMOTION OF THE PEOPLE'S SOCIALIST SELF-GOVERNMENT	67
IV.	BASIC AIMS AND DIRECTIONS OF THE PARTY'S FOREIGN POLICY STRATEGY	78
V.	THE PARTY	95
	1. To Work in a New Way, to Enhance the Role and Responsibility of Party Organisations	96
	2. For the Purity and Integrity of the Image of Party Member, for a Principled Personnel Policy	101
	3. To Reinforce Ideology's Link to Life and Enrich People's Intellectual World	104
VI.	THE RESULTS OF THE DISCUSSION OF THE NEW EDITION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME AND OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE PARTY RULES	113

0902010000

© Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 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 from 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". 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 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 and 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 dialectic 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".

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 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". He went on: "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."

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 science 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 combatting 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". Today, too, we are firmly convinced that promo-

ting 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 humanity 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 expenditures 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 vandalism. 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 important cross-roads 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 wellbeing 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 deepgoing 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 de-

velopment set in the CPSU Programme, and even the lower targets of the 9th and 10th five-year plans, were not attained. Neither did we manage 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." 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 transfor-

mations. 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 previous 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 reequipment 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 production, 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, of 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 creat-

ing the conditions for stable farming. 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 supplying 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 territorial 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 intersectoral 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 ensuring 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." 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.

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, inter-sectoral 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 coordination 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 multi-faceted 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 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 social 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 level of every member of the collective.

And, of course, a reliable barrier is needed against all attempts to extract unearned income from the social 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. As was noted, however, this will require a good deal of time, but 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 machine-building, 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, metalcutting 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 Shchokino method and the certification of work places 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 management 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.

Combatting 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 combatting 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 wellbeing 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 avocational 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 social 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 a 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 cooperative 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 unflinching 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 USSR 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' recommendations 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 are lacking in 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 militancy 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 **Leninist 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 governmental 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 two 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 developing 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 unfailingly, 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 sensitively 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 combatting 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 unflinching 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-neighbourly 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 perfectly 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 strategic 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 competition and 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 road-block 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 highjacking 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 world socialist 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 unbiased 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 weapons 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 and broader contact between peoples for the purpose of learning about one another; 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 build-up 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. 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 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: hack worker 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 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 underlies 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 judging 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 unflinchingly to political extinction."

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 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 well-being, 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 governmental 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 governmental 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 to 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..." 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 acceler-

ation 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 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 is no need to overestimate 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 must not forget that psychological warfare is a struggle for the minds of people, for shaping their outlook and their social and intellectual bearings in life. 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 nationwide 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."

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.

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. They have 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 nationa-

lities 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, honest-minded 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 daring, 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!

(Mikhail Gorbachev's report was heard with great attention and repeatedly punctuated with prolonged applause.)

М. С. ГОРБАЧЕВ

ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ДОКЛАД ЦЕНТРАЛЬНОГО КОМИТЕТА КПСС
XXVII СЪЕЗДУ КОММУНИСТИЧЕСКОЙ ПАРТИИ СОВЕТСКОГО СОЮЗА

на английском языке

Цена 30 коп.



