Wednesday June 17, 1987

SOVIET NEWS

Established in London in 1941

Mikhail Gorbachev opens conference at CPSU Central Committee

A CONFERENCE on questions of radically restructuring the management of the economy, which are to be submitted for discussion at the next plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, was held at the Central Committee on June 8 and 9.

Taking part in the conference were Mikhail Gorbachev. General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee Lev Zaikov, Yegor Ligachev and Nikolai Ryzhkov, and Alternate Members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee Boris Yeltsin, Nikolai Slyunkov and Nikolai Talyzin.

Restructuring

The conference was opened by Mikhail Gorbachev. A plenary meeting of the Party's Central Committee will be held at the end of this month, he said. On its agenda is the cardinal question of restructuring the management of the country's economy. It is the task of the plenum to adopt such decisions that will make it possible at the stage of intensification to adopt a new integral system of managing the country's economy. This is of decisive importance because we are dealing here with the basic, main questions of restructuring.

I would like to make a number of remarks and to hear your views on three questions.

The first question — how is the restructuring proceeding, not only in the sphere of the economy but also in society as a whole? For you represent various regions of the country and are directly connected with the activity of work collectives on a day-to-day basis. What are Party and soviet bodies, what are the ministries now doing? You have an opportunity to speak out from your own positions and to assess what is taking place at the stage of restructuring that began after the January plenary meeting of the Party's Central Committee.

The second question — what is your opinion of the draft law on the enterprise? You are familiar with it and some of you took part in the nation-wide discussion. expressed yourselves publicly while others studied it in their collectives and in Party organisations. I believe you also pondered this document comparing it, so to say with the realities in which a given enterprise, a given work collective operates. Quite naturally you have something to say to the Central Committee about the draft law. We must study it at the June plenum of the Party's Central Committee

IN THIS ISSUE

Mikhail Gorbachev opens conference at CPSU Central Committee ... p. 205
Mikhail Gorbachev's response to leaders of the Six ... p. 207
Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with Jambyn Batmunh ... p. 208
The restructuring effort and the public consciousness ... p. 209
Foreign Ministry spokesman on Pershing-1A missiles ... p. 211

and the regular session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, adopt and approve it now in the form of law. As we think about radically restructuring the management of our economy the question of the enterprise, this main link of the economy, of its position in the integrated system of management quite naturally becomes the cardinal issue.

If we are to speak of the past, perhaps the main shortcoming was exactly that we had begun at the top, although that would appear to be logical for a planned economy. But this time we decided to start everything from the main link because when we had tackled questions of planning and management on the level of the central bodies. after that nothing was left to the enterprise: the higher echelons grabbed everything. No cardinal measures were thus possible. The new provisions and recommendations reached the enterprises in a very truncated form and we never managed to get this process started in earnest and properly brought to its logical conclusion. That is why both in the 1960s and in the 1970s the reform and our efforts to improve economic management did not produce a full effect.

Law on the Enterprise

We have begun movement from the starting point — the enterprise, the amalgamation. First of all it is necessary to consider and find parameters that would enable the key link — the enterprise, the amalgamation — to reveal the potential of socialist economy, our economic system and the work collective. That is why it is very important that we know your viewpoint, your assessment of the document.

At the same time, raising the issue this way, we understand that if the law on the enterprise is divorced from other elements making up the integral system of our economic management, the enterprise would find itself in a difficult situation. It would not be able to realise all possibilities and turn to new methods of management — above all cost-accounting, self-financing and self-repayment.

That is why work on the law was carried out simultaneously with the drastic restructuring of the upper echelons of economic management. This applies to government bodies and economic agencies, the role of which is immense. One of the important issues of comprehending the new role of the centre was to ascertain what form the ministry, the headquarters of a given branch should acquire.

The Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee has considered practically all directions of perfecting central economic management bodies. That was not an easy thing to do, one should say. Debates are going on at all levels. This is quite normal for now we are to resolve major issues and, of course, it is better to resolve them with least losses.

So, the third question is: what in your view is the role of central management bodies?

These are the three problems on which we are to concentrate our attention.

Since the law on the enterprise is to enter into force from January next year, it is clear that the central bodies should also be transferred to new terms of work. The task, therefore, is to complete all preparations this year.

We discussed draft resolutions at the Politburo

of the CPSU Central Committee, but we neither adopted any decisions nor endorsed them finally — we issued instructions to amend them with due account for the results of discussion. These questions will be taken up at the plenary meeting of the Party Central Committee as well. After the final approval of the law by the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, it will be necessary to link together all the resolutions and endorse them.

This is our plan. Reform is serious and largescale work. It is something more than turning a page in a book or living one day. One should pass through stages in order to attain the objectives the basis of which we are building today. Much will depend on what ideas, what documents we will take along on entering this initial stage.

Socialist democracy

The questions that are being discussed today are of great political significance. The Party should say its word at this turning point. The people are looking for ways to improve the work of our economic mechanism, to develop further socialist democracy and the political system. Now, as never before, we need democratic discussion of all these problems, creative endeavour of the people.

Summing up the results of the conference, Mikhail Gorbachev said:

1 think that everything examined here will be reflected in the Politburo's report to the plenum of the Party's Central Committee.

I would like to say that this meeting was a kind of first test for the results of the work done by the Politburo of the Party's Central Committee and the Government to prepare the main documents that will form the basis for building an integral mechanism for running the national economy.

In this regard I am voicing not only my own opinion but also the opinion of all comrades in the leadership: we are satisfied with the meeting, first of all because it was an open and honest discussion which was perhaps sometimes polemical and showed different approaches and viewpoints on these or other issues.

In the main, the discussion verified what we were conjuring up and visualising as the future economic mechanism and the future system for managing the economy.

I believe that it verified the main, the fundamental points, first of all that without restructuring we cannot move forward.

I put that question before everything else: what are comrades thinking of restructuring, how has it been going, what do they think of its progress and how can it help speed the country's social and economic development?

I think that we can state as a result of the exchange of opinions that restructuring is no longer just a theoretically and politically motivated response to the challenge of the times, to what has matured in our society. It is the sole real alternative to the condition in which our society found itself, especially its social and economic spheres.

I didn't hear any other proposals from the participants in the meeting: everybody is for restructuring.

There are huge collectives standing behind

you managers of major enterprises, and in this way you already express a certain opinion of the working people. On the other hand, you serve on Party. local government and other agencies formed democratically, on the basis of well-known principles. Hence you express in a measure also the judgements and assessments made in the local Party and mass organisations.

I don't think that it was only a personal standpoint that was expressed here. It is apparently the standpoint reflecting the prevailing mood, opinions and attitudes in the whole of our society. This is very important to us.

Representatives of science are also present here. Behind them is the scientific community which is devoting very much time to thought now, conducts discussions within the framework of conferences, meetings, through the press and simply in daily conversations. I think the comrades have come here also with views of their own which reflect to a certain extent the moods in our scientific community.

Present at the conference are top officials of branches of the economy and of economic bodies. We have also invited a group of Party functionaries and, naturally, also refer ourselves to this category. This composition of the conference made possible a more balanced view on the restructuring. Everybody is for it — both at the base and at other levels of guiding the management of society. This is the first point.

Secondly, I see that everybody has displayed a very responsible attitude to the questions under discussion, and I want to specially emphasise this.

New impulses needed

Of course, we should avoid all exaggerations whatsoever. On the eve of the Central Committee's plenary meeting we must have a precise assessment of the situation at the initial stage of the reconstruction drive. We all see that this process is proceeding with difficulty. running into difficulties and contradictions. But it is proceeding. New impulses are needed for this process to accelerate and gain in strength. And not from the viewpoint of just talk but first of all from the viewpoint of solving various questions in all spheres of our society's life.

This is the first generalisation which, I think, is very important to us. Nobody is putting the restructuring in doubt. On the contrary, everything that has been said here is an attempt to do something in order to impart a faster pace and greater dynamism to it, to ensure that it produces more results and encompasses all spheres and all strata of our society.

It is not by chance that your attitude to the law on the enterprise was the second question to be discussed at the conference. I think that everything that was said here can be summed up as follows. It is impossible to hope that at a single go, on the first try or straight off we will have an ideal law on the state enterprise. For this we would have to define what is an ideal law today and will it be an ideal one tomorrow. I think we have displayed a realistic approach and everybody has said that the law is a big achievement at the present stage of restructuring the system of management. And it is good that we started precisely with the main link. As we see it this law should be adopted, we should start working in accordance with it, determining its strong and weak points and when necessary improving it. But already today it contains a good basis for launching work to introduce into practice the new mechanism of management.

All questions of a practical nature that were raised here merit attention. But I will refer to this a bit later. In principle this is how I see the situation: we are going to submit this law to the plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee and to the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

And the third question was as follows: how do

you picture the higher echelons, the centre of managing our economy at the stage of radical reform?

The discussion that we have just had is important for us in terms of principle. How do the comrades view the centre in the new conditions? The main demand is that its activity, everything that has to be decided in the centre in managing the economy should not contradict the law on the enterprise.

This idea was expressed here and, by the way, we took into account this demand at the Politburo and the Government. Nikolai Ivanovich Ryzhkov just told me that every day he has to send back several documents because they contradict the draft law on the enterprise. I think that this approach ought to be sustained till the end. We have draft documents on the State Planning Committee, on banks, the Finance Ministry, the Committee on Prices, the Committee on Labour and other departments — 12 documents all in all.

Initiative

So far we have not adopted these drafts on central bodies of economic management. The session will open, and there will be debates at which, probably, much will be said. The session will adopt the law. Then it will be possible to review the drafts again and put the finishing touches to them on this basis. One thing is clear already: the law on the enterprise will not start operation unless we resolve questions of running the economy from the centre. We are on the correct path in this respect: we are simultaneously considering and changing management not only at the level of the key link, but also at the central level. I would mention that we have considerations as to the structure of republican and local bodies. Much is yet to be clarified here, above all in respect of the correlation between the centre and local initiative.

It is clear in principle that thanks to the development of our economy, its level, dimensions and the change in the professional and cultural level of working people we are at a new stage. Naturally, it is now possible to tap more fully the available potential. Everything that we have accumulated over the previous periods should be better used, initiative should be released and broader scope given to economic independence. The centre will be in charge of main proportions, main balances, issues of defence, development of republics, and so on.

It is only on the basis of public ownership that it is possible to have a centre that is capable of forecasting, calculating, advancing and attaining objectives. This is our advantage.

There is the question of how to combine centralism with initiative. A mechanism, a system of indicators are required. We are looking for ways here.

What would I like to say in conclusion? Transition to a new system of economic management and the solution of the task of drastic restructuring in running the economy are no simple problems. There will be stages in the transition to the new mechanism of management, to the new system of running the economy.

The first stage comprises the remaining three years of the five-year period. We want to put the law into effect from next year. I think it is correct. We should, no matter how difficult this might be, accumulate experience and get schooling.

It is necessary to start preparations from the 13th five-year period.

I have already said that it is now necessary to commit maximum strength in order to base the five-year plan on the new approaches, and change to the new management system in the next five-year period. The task during these three years is to prepare everything necessary for transition to an integral system of economic management. But even after all that, when the three years have expired, when we have examined all these issues and started the year 1991, we will still get schooling. Once again, this will be a new stage.

We shall not make predictions now as to what it will be, how much time it will take. But it will be a stage that will bring us to the ultimate goals of the radical reform, new qualitative milestones in the development of the economy and the social area. This will be a serious, extensive work.

I believe there are a lot of debates and studies ahead. And we must show care not only about their contents, but also about their form. We must respect each other. It is now admitted at the state level that other countries can live in a different way. This is their business, the sovereign right of peoples. If they are denied this, then on what can international relations be built? And people concerned over the destiny of socialism, over the destiny of our people and the flourishing of the country have different experience, different viewpoints. This means that we must assure an atmosphere which would promote taking into consideration all viewpoints.

This does not mean that responsibility should be lacking in discussion. No, all of us must be highly responsible. And this can be ensured only by the ethics of discussion and respect for each other. There might even be errors. I think they should be discussed, too. But we need discussions, speeches permeated by the care for socialism, for the people, the health of our society. They must be stimulated and supported.

Responsibility

We must rebuff those who wish to propose anti-socialist alternatives to us. There are no proposals from the people to alter the system. We are all dedicated to revealing the potential of socialism. Therefore we need everything that enriches and strengthens socialism. And we must welcome debates aimed at this purpose.

I wish to thank you for your participation in this meeting, for the contribution you have made and for the support for the efforts of the Central Committee of the Party to advance the radical reform in the economy. This is the strategic direction of our work for the reorganisation.

(Moscow, June 12, TASS)

EXPERT OPINION

cheque postal order

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

Mikhail Gorbachev's response to leaders of the Six

Here follows the full text of the response by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to a joint statement by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden:

IT was with much interest that I familiarised myself with the joint statement by the leaders of the six states of May 22, 1987. I fully share the passionate call made in it for starting, at last, the process of nuclear disarmament, thus laying the foundation for a safer world in order to save the succeeding generations from the nightmare of nuclear disaster.

There is no doubt that given the political will it is possible to achieve far-reaching agreements in the field of nuclear disarmament. The Soviet Union has convincingly demonstrated by its practical deeds and large-scale initiatives that it has such a will. And this, perhaps, manifests itself most definitely and graphically in the USSR's approach to the problem of medium-range missiles.

Our recent proposals on that score as well as on shorter-range missiles, which take into account to the utmost the wishes and interests of the United States and its West European allies, seem to have removed all obstacles and put the talks on medium-range missiles onto the finishing straight. Yet the nervousness shown by some people in the West on seeing the real prospect of reaching agreement on medium-range missiles gave rise to serious doubts about the sincerity of the previous assurances by some governments in Western Europe of their interest in the total elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in the European zone.

Yet we do not lose hope that common sense will triumph and that the prospect will turn into reality. Thus an exceptionally important step will be taken for the first time since the emergence of nuclear weapons on this difficult way, which is the sole sensible way for mankind towards the total and universal elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union will spare no efforts so that

a mutually-acceptable Soviet-American agreement on medium-range missiles be drafted and signed within a short period on the basis of the agreement in principle that was reached in Reykjavik. It is precisely this task which was set to the USSR delegation at the talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva. It is now for our partners, from whom we expect reciprocal movement, to act.

I more than once set forth the Soviet Union's stand as regards the unreserved inadmissibility of escalating the arms race into outer space, our assessment of the US "Strategic Defense Initiative" programme, which is extremely dangerous to the cause of peace. The truth is unequivocal here. The placing of weapons in outer space would inevitably result in greater mutual distrust, whip up the arms race and make the world even more vulnerable.

We are resolutely rejecting the "Star Wars" plans by contraposing to them the complex of initiatives aimed at developing broad co-operation in the peaceful exploration and uses of outer space in the interests of all of mankind.

The Soviet Union strives to convince the United States of the need for an all-round strengthening of the regime of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which forms the foundation for the accords on considerable cuts in strategic offensive weapons. It must be absolutely clear that such cuts would be impossible without preserving that Treaty in full.

To prevent the torpedoing of the treaty on strategic offensive arms through putting weapons into outer space, we believe that the USSR and the USA should pledge not to abandon the treaty in the course of ten years, and in so doing, agree on a list of space-based equipment, whose launch into space, including with the aim of testing in the course of that period, would be prohibited.

I believe that the world public knows well also our principled stand on the question of nuclear

testing. I will repeat what I said earlier: the termination by the Soviet Union of the more than 18 month-long unilateral moratorium was a forced decision thrust on us.

We again and again invite the USA to start full-scale talks on a total end of nuclear tests under strict international control, including on-site inspections. It will be possible to examine, as the first steps towards that main goal, questions pertaining to the ratification of the Soviet-American treaties of 1974 and 1976. and on a substantial lowering of the threshold vield of nuclear blasts envisaged by these treaties with a simultaneous limitation of their quantity. With the aim of contributing towards the speediest ratification of the above-mentioned treaties, the USSR is prepared to reach agreement with the USA on the holding of respective calibration experiments at each other's test sites. We favour that both the national seismic equipment of the two countries and the seismic control equipment of the states of the "Six", certainly, should they agree to that, be used in conducting such experiments. We are also prepared for immediate practical measures in connection with these talks: thus. for example, that an intermediate agreement be reached with the American side on the limitation of the yield of underground nuclear tests to the threshold of one kiloton, and the number of nuclear weapon tests be confined to one to three

In a word, there is no dearth of goodwill on the part of the Soviet Union. We are open to any constructive ideas towards real disarmament.

The noble wishes of the leaders of the Six States, reflected in their joint statement, not only meet with full understanding and vigorous support on our side, but also strengthen our confidence of the ultimate triumph of human reason, stimulate us to more vigorous actions to make true the dream of a nuclear free world, for the sake of preserving human civilisation.

(Moscow, June 11, TASS)

Reykjavik: The Moment of Truth

APN round-table discussion on the results of the Soviet-US meeting.

Price 35p

The Main Soviet Proposals on Disarmament

Price 40p

USSR YEARBOOK 1987

Full of information about life in the Soviet Union. With many photographs.

Price 70p (cheque postal order).

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

Yuli Vorontsov's Teheran meetings

YULI VORONTSOV, USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister, visited Teheran from July 12 to July 15 at the invitation of the Iranian side. He was received and had conversations with President of the Islamic Republic of Iran Sayed Ali Khamenei, Speaker of the Islamic Consultative Assembly (Parliament) Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, Prime Minister Mir Hossein Mousavi, Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Velayati, Minister of Economic Affairs and Finance Mohammad Javad Iravani and had a thorough exchange of opinions with First Deputy Foreign Minister Ali Muhammed Besharati.

The state of and prospects for the development of Soviet-Iranian relations were thoroughly analysed during the meetings and conversations. Further concrete steps were outlined to expand them in various areas proceeding from the striving of the sides for a fuller use of the existing opportunities.

Topical international problems, the overall state of affairs in the world, in the Persian Gulf area and the Middle East as a whole were discussed in detail. The viewpoints of the sides on concrete situations shaping in the region were set out.

An arrangement was made to continue contacts on matters of mutual interest.

Reykjavik, the ABM Treaty and SDI

Colonel Vladimir Chernyshev, Soviet disarmament expert

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

OUR AIM: Universal International Security

Vadim Zagladin

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

Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with Jambyn Batmunh

THE determination of the CPSU and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party to enrich the content and the forms of mutually-beneficial Soviet-Mongolian co-operation in all areas was expressed during the June 15 meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Jambyn Batmunh, General Secretary of the Central Committee of Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and Chairman of the Presidium of the People's Great Hural of the Mongolian People's Republic, who made a stopover in Moscow on his way home upon completion of his visits to Hungary and Bulgaria.

A frank, comradely exchange of information and opinions on the course of implementation of the decisions of the latest congresses and plenary meetings of the central committees of both parties, the most important tasks of socialist construction, international activities of the Soviet Union and Mongolia and further development of bilateral co-operation was held in the course of the talk.

Touching upon questions of the current reconstruction in the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev dwelt on the CPSU's preparations for the next plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. The plenary meeting will consider such an important question in the country's life as formation of an integral mechanism of managing the country. Solution of this question will exert a great revolutionising impact on all aspects of labour and life of the Soviet people, implementation of plans of acceleration of socio-economic development.

The Communists and the working people of Mongolia, said Jambyn Batmunh, welcome and support the reconstruction drive in the Soviet Union. It inspires us and shows how in deed the potential of socialism should be uncovered.

Mikhail Gorbachev expressed confidence that implementation of the course of the

Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, aimed at attaining new accomplishments in economic and social development, is producing new proofs of potentialities of socialism capable of ensuring the upsurge of culture and the well-being of the people.

The leaders of the CPSU and the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party underlined the importance of building up efforts of the socialist countries. all states — big and small — for strengthening peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region, eliminating the seats of tension and developing good-neighbourly relations. The recent pull-out of part of the Soviet troops from Mongolia has been a concrete manifestation of both countries' readiness to act in this direction, in the spirit of new political thinking.

Jambyn Batmunh said that the Mongolian People's Republic fully approves of the results of the recent meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states in Berlin, and regard the documents adopted at the meeting as a major contribution to improvement of the political climate, and to the struggle for restructuring international economic relations on an equal, democratic basis.

Soviet-Bulgarian talks

TALKS between Eduard Shevardnadze, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Foreign Minister, and Pyotr Mladenov, Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, were held in Sofia on June 15.

The sides had a thorough exchange of opinions on a wide range of international problems and questions of bilateral relations.

Complete identity of views was confirmed in the assessment of the present-day situation in the world and conviction was expressed that the present-day international situation shows again that it is only the advance toward a nuclearweapon-free and non-violent world and the creation of an all-embracing system of international peace and security that can guarantee the survival of humanity.

The Bulgarian side expressed complete support for the Soviet Union's line at the talks with the United States in Geneva on nuclear and space arms.

Questions of security and co-operation in the European continent were thoroughly discussed. The course of the Vienna meeting of the participating countries in the Conference on European Security and Co-operation was analysed. The sides emphasised the importance of opening large-scale talks for purposes of radical reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe with corresponding lowering of military expenditures.

The Soviet side proclaimed again its firm support for the proposals of Bulgaria and Romania aimed at creating a nuclear and chemical weapons free zone in the Balkans, and the Soviet Union's readiness to give the necessary guarantees for non-emplacement and non-use of nuclear and chemical weapons in the zone.

Joint Soviet-Japanese venture

CONSTITUENT documents for setting up on the USSR's territory the first joint Soviet-Japanese enterprise were signed on June.11 at the Ministry of Timber, Pulp-and-Paper and Wood-Working Industry of the USSR. The Igirma-Tairiku Enterprise, with an annual capacity of 90,000 cubic metres of lumber, will be built in the Novaya Igirma Settlement (Irkutsk Region, East Siberia).

The founders of the enterprise are the all-union Irkutsklesprom Association and the Japanese firm Tairiku Trading. The Soviet side accounts for 51 per cent of the authorised capital while the Japanese partner — 49 per cent.

Irkutsklesprom will allocate a territory for the enterprise, provide building materials and equipment. lay the foundations and open up communications. In the future the association will provide the enterprise with raw materials. auxiliary materials. energy resources and transport. The complete phase of building works will be done by the all-union association Soyuzlesstroj.

The Japanese firm Tairiku Trading will supply steel structures for the production building and subsidiary facilities, complete technological equipment and spares, tools and various materials, it will conduct contract supervision and carry out adjustment and alignment operations.

A representative of the Soviet side was appointed Igirma-Tairiku general director, and his deputy is a representative of the Japanese firm. A joint board was formed, headed by the Soviet chairman. An inspection committee was set up.

To finance the joint enterprise its founders will raise credits in their countries, to be paid off within five years.

The joint Soviet-Japanese enterprise is planned to start putting out products in April 1988. Seventy-eight per cent of the sawn timber will go to Japan and the rest to consumers in the USSR and to markets of third countries.

Two approaches to development problems

By Yuri Gvozdev, Novosti political news analyst

THE meeting of the Big Seven in Venice was held almost immediately after the conference of the Warsaw Treaty states in Berlin. Global economic problems were discussed in both instances. The two "worlds" also voiced their concern over the alarming situation in the Third World. But from different standpoints.

I have before me one of the documents adopted in Berlin. It is entitled "On Overcoming Underdevelopment and Establishing a New International Economic Order". It clearly states that development and disarmament are closely bound up and explains that if stockpiles of weapons and expenditures for them are reduced. enormous funds could be obtained to eliminate hunger, poverty, unemployment and other ills of

age-old socio-economic backwardness. The socialist states back up this premise with action — their concrete proposals and peace initiatives speak for themselves.

The same cannot be said for the people who gathered in Venice. For them, any step towards disarmament comes with difficulty, and is accompanied by stipulations. The selfish calculations of the military-industrial complexes of the US and its NATO partners prevail over everything. Imperial ambitions and ideological prejudice hamper a sober assessment of realities. Under the circumstances, it is difficult to expect funds to be released soon for development needs as a result of disarmament.

The settlement of global economic problems cannot be put off either. One of them is the huge foreign debt of the Third World, which has

(Continued on back page)

The restructuring effort and public consciousness

By Alexander Yakovlev, Alternate Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

ALMOST two years have passed since the April 1985 Plenum wrote a new chapter in the annals of the country's history. This generally speaking short period has been eventful for the country, the Party and for each Soviet person. What has been happening can be summarised in the term "restructuring effort".

If one were to ask what has changed most over this time I would answer that it is we ourselves. Our social horizons have broadened. We see our past and present more fully and clearly and our future more realistically. We are still learning a great deal, but have already come to understand a great deal, too.

The restructuring drive is not a repudiation of the past. But it is a denial of those elements of the past which we cannot and may not take into the future. And not by dint of some subjective predilections or antipathies, but because particular obstructions can slow down or impede our progress. In other words, we definitely have to surmount the brake on socio-economic progress, that formidable mechanism that has already shown its capacity for generating stagnation.

Conscious, creative activity

Some may ask whether it might be better not to hurry developments. No, it is impermissible and unreasonable to remain passive, alienated and indifferently contemplative.

First of all, we are the first society in history that is consciously developing and perfecting its internal ties and relations, and not floating with the current.

Soviet society disposes of all the prerequisites for conscious, creative activity, namely fundamentally new socio-economic underpinnings, a highly developed scientific and technological and economic potential, and a Party equipped with the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism and its methodology.

We have become much stronger both materially and spiritually. The problems inherited from the old society that were plaguing us have been solved. We enjoy prestige in the world arena and possess a reliable defence. In short, Soviet society has everything it needs to progress.

However, all these assets do not make headway in and of themselves. We have to know how to use them, i.e., to work creatively, with due regard not only for what is customary, but also for new elements that constantly arise.

Furthermore, it is simply senseless to count on the judgement of time. History has decreed that the restructuring drive is imperative and, therefore, inevitable.

Theoretically, the strategy of acceleration is based on the genuinely Marxist conception of the "mechanism" of the laws governing social development.

The idea of a new qualitative state of socialist society prompts an understanding of the problem of creation as a dialectically contradictory process of the activity of people in which the very essence of socialism as well as the form are developed. "Not only phenomena are transient, mobile, current and separated only by

conventional bounds," Lenin said, "essences are, too. . . . "

Therefore, the tasks of the restructuring effort in the sphere of public consciousness are particularly complex. The social activity and creative endeavour of the public has to be enhanced. The ideological and theoretical foundation of the reorganisation must be consolidated and broadened. A constant search must be made for answers to the numerous and difficult questions which life poses. We must foresee the appearance of problems and bottlenecks, thereby promoting the reorganisation effort's advance.

Nor is it any less important to surmount processes and phenomena in the sphere of the consciousness per se that were engendered by the practice of the previous decades. Negative trends grew over a lengthy period without encountering effective opposition. It was so lengthy that an entire generation took shape whose professional and personal formation proceeded under the deforming impact of stagnation.

Socialist democracy

Dogmatic thinking occupies a place of its own among the diseases that infected the spiritual sphere and scientific thought. It is formidable in scope, in the power of its deadening influence, and in the degree of the threat it poses to the course for acceleration, for dogmatic thinking denies development by its very nature.

Dogmatism is not a scientific theory but a life's stand dictated by personal and group interests. Its essence as a social phenomenon is its impact on the very organisation of society's spiritual life and its development processes. It is from this standpoint that dogmatism can rightly be characterised as an authoritarian mode of thinking elevated to a political, moral and intellectual principle. This social function fully meets the interests of those who do not have a vital stake in development, who are personally satisfied with the convenient status quo they are accustomed to, and who do not want to or cannot take up the challenge of the time and the new phenomena of life. The ideological and theoretical underpinnings of the renewal and reconstruction presuppose a breakdown of dogmatic thinking — this essential element of the mechanism of stagnation in the social consciousness.

Socialist democracy is an effective catalyst for orienting the consciousness to revolutionary changes. And not only as the most progressive form of guiding societal life and an effective instrument against any anti-social phenomena. Democracy is also the most reliable tool of education. An active stand in life is instilled both by social experience and by trust in man, which engenders a sense of responsibility, involvement, initiative and persistence in working toward the goals set.

Let us take culture and cultural policy. Perhaps no other sphere in this country has suffered as much from dogmatic prejudice. It was with the heartlessness of officialdom that decisions were taken on what could and could not be talked or written about, filmed or put on the stage. And what is the result? It turns out that the artificial restrictions and the secretive atmosphere in which they were spawned led to the formalisation of a monopoly situation of individual persons, groupings and genres to the detriment of others.

Artistic creativity serves social needs. This is a need of society and the individual to improve themselves. The penetration of art into the essence of everyday life and an ability to extend beyond its bounds and set in motion broader social, moral and temporal criteria — such are the demands made of genuine art and simultaneously its signs. Without this work there is no moral progress, spiritual cleansing and development either of the individual or of society as a whole, nor can there be. The times demand that each fresh economic or technical achievement be viewed through the prism of the human factor.

The widespread technocratic approach to many problems, including purely social ones, is by its origin bound up with a serious underestimation of the role and importance of the social sciences. The approach which draws its beginnings from vulgar economism has not become outmoded today either. Accomplishment of economic, production and technical problems is perceived and interpreted as the direct accomplishment of social tasks. The economic management system at times receives actual priority over the system of guiding society as a whole.

Restructuring drive

In the most general terms, the function of the social sciences is to provide an integral concept of the restructuring effort not only in each sector of it but as a whole, in the interconnection of all spheres of societal life; to work a long-term concept of social development into the restructuring drive.

However, the tasks posed to the social sciences are not confined to this. The sphere of their service to society is broader. Soviet society is one that is reflecting on highly complex alternatives and reassessing values, and it is in this collective process of thinking that the social sciences must play a leading role.

The point essentially at issue is the crucial need experienced by political, economic and ideological practice for substantial advance in theoretical research in the entire spectrum of sciences of society and man. The objective prerequisites for this most certainly exist. And these prerequisites transcend purely pragmatic, utilitarian bounds. There is reason to believe that we are at the very beginning of a qualitatively new stage of both the practice and theory of socialism.

A tremendous contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory was made by the Party between April 1985 and January 1987 — a period that was extremely eventful and fruitful ideologically and politically. The 27th CPSU Congress is the outcome and a beginning. The outcome of search, analysis, reflections and breakthroughs in the decisive areas of theory and practice, of scientific socialism. A new vision of socialism and the paths and perspectives of its progress; a fresh, generalised analysis of the present-day world. The Central Committee resolution on the journal Kommunist, the speech by Mikhail Gorbachev at the conference of social scientists, and the January Plenum all enriched and concretised the restructuring concept. It is the beginning of new exploration, of a new stage in creative endeavour.

Theoretical work likewise cannot lose sight of such an element of principle as the unaxiomatic

(Continued on next page)

Visit by Soviet MPs to Indonesia

A DELEGATION of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Georgi Tarazevich, Vice-President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, stayed in Indonesia on an official visit at the invitation of the Indonesian House of Representatives between June 8 and 15.

The delegation was received by President Suharto. Talks and meetings were held with Vice-President Umar Wirahadikusumah, Speaker of the House of Representatives Amir Mahmud, Foreign Minister Mochtar Kusumaatmadja and Trade Minister Rachmat Saleh.

During talks with Indonesian statesmen and MPs, which passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere, views were exchanged on a wide range of issues concerning international affairs and bilateral ties.

The deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet informed the Indonesian side about the radical reforms undertaken by the Soviet Union in all spheres of Soviet society to speed up the country's socio-political development and

(from previous page)

nature of social knowledge, which is also most closely bound up with the capacity of the individual, classes and groups and of society as a whole for amassing, generalising and utilising experience. The entire conscious activity of people is built around this capacity. On the other hand, the record has shown that if some negative phenomena arise and remain in society for a rather long time, they can also engender "their own" experience, which is capable of deforming social relations or some part of them.

Absolutely all aspects of our domestic life need to be theoretically analysed at a qualitatively new level. However, pride of place has to be given to the actual dialectic of the development of society in the renewal and reconstruction process. Conscious historical creativity also poses the problem of the manageability of this process, including the need to develop and create an effective system of reverse ties in society. These ties are still spontaneous. And the cost is considerable, both in material and, more importantly, in human terms.

What is necessary is an all-round study of the ways and means of actively forming the needs of different strata of society and of the socialist way of life as a whole. In this context it is imperative to research the sources and nature of various deviations under socialism. We have to provide reliable theoretical substantiation for the interests of classes, strata and collectives, and ways to further reinforce ideological and social unity. Another question that arises is what the socialist mechanism of motivation should be like.

Life compels us to take a new approach to investigating the processes of world development as well. The CPSU proceeds from the belief that the changes in this development are so profound and all-embracing that they require a major, comprehensive reassessment of all its new factors and trends, a fresh look at the state of world affairs and a considerably deeper theoretical analysis of it.

The concept of the new mode of political thinking is oriented to constant renewal, to fresh approaches to domestic and foreign policy, to the economy, science and technology, to the social sphere, and to ideology. A search for the new, with an eye to making optimum use of positive elements and reducing all possible costs to a minimum, is an unshakeable norm of Party work, both in theory and in practice.

(Pravda - Novosti)

achieve a qualitatively new state of Soviet society, as well as on the participation and role of legislators in this process. The delegation stressed the wish of the Soviet people and its government to live and work in conditions of lasting peace, based on the principles drafted in New Delhi of a nuclear-weapon-free and nonviolent world, which is vital for the successful implementation of the plans of domestic development.

The closeness or coincidence of the sides' positions on urgent international issues was noted. Common concern was expressed over the continuing race of nuclear and conventional arms and the danger of its spreading into outer space. In this connection the attention of the Indonesian side was drawn to the large-scale Soviet foreign policy initiatives that, once implemented, would mark a turning point in the development of the international situation, help rid mankind of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction and create an all-round system of international peace and security. Special note was taken of the importance of the Soviet proposal on the immediate conclusion of the Soviet-US agreement on eliminating mediumrange missiles in Europe.

It was noted that this and other Soviet peace initiatives were confirmed and developed in documents adopted recently at the Berlin meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty states. They offer an integral concept of the world where the policy from the positions of strength can have no place.

New International Economic Order

The Soviet and Indonesian MPs expressed firm conviction that the road to a peaceful future lies through concerted actions of the Non-Aligned Movement as an authoritative participant in the struggle for ensuring universal peace and security.

Representatives of the two countries' legislatures favoured the funds now spent on military purposes being used for the socio-economic development of the peoples of the world. They pledged support for the just demand for a new international economic order.

When discussing the situation in the Asia-Pacific region the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Indonesian MPs spoke in favour of the search for ways of ensuring security in this region of the world and establishing broad and equal trade and economic co-operation. open to all. In this connection the Soviet delegation informed in full detail about the practical steps taken by the Soviet Union to implement the initiatives put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev in Vladivostok and New Delhi.

Having expressed concern at the tense situation in South-East Asia, the Soviet and Indonesian MPs reaffirmed their position in favour of solving the region's problems through peaceful means and negotiations. The Soviet side stated that the USSR welcomes efforts aimed at intensifying the constructive dialogue between the states of Indochina and ASEAN. The Soviet Union is prepared to promote, as far as its capabilities allow, the settlement of the situation around Kampuchea together with other states, including the countries of ASEAN and Indochina, and guarantee acceptable agreements along with other permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations.

The Soviet MPs stressed the Soviet Union's firm intention to continue to work to strengthen and develop diverse friendly ties with ASEAN member states.

It was stated with satisfaction that friendly ties between the USSR and Indonesia, based on the strict observance of the principles of equality, mutual respect and non-interference in each other's affairs, are becoming increasingly stable. The sides stated their wish to continue to promote extensive ties, including contacts between the two countries' parliaments, regarding them as an important and stable component of Soviet-Indonesian exchanges. Conviction was expressed that stronger mutual understanding, friendship and co-operation between the USSR and Indonesia would promote peace in Asia and Indochina as well as outside this region.

The delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet invited a delegation of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union. The Soviet side expressed sincere gratitude for the hospitality and warm reception extended to the delegation during its stay in Indonesia.

Anatoli Dobrynin receives George Kennan

ON June 15 Anatoli Dobrynin, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received the former United States Ambassador to the USSR and prominent American historian George Kennan at the latter's request.

Historic aspects of the development of Soviet-American relations in the past decades, the present state of these relations and the ways to level them out were discussed in an open and friendly conversation.

The American interlocutor emphasised that despite slumps and complexities in relations between the USA and the USSR, it is important to channel them into a route of peaceful constructive co-operation, overcoming the dated approaches and dangerous military confrontation which is fraught with nuclear catastrophe. George Kennan noted that the activities of Mikhail Gorbachev in precisely this direction evoke ever greater respect and increasing response from the Americans.

Foreign Ministry briefing on Israel

The Soviet Foreign Ministry yesterday requested visas from the Embassy of the Netherlands in Moscow, which represents Israel's interests in the USSR, for members of a consular group leaving for Tel Aviv to handle questions of a consular character connected with the stay of Soviet citizens in Israel, on-site investigation of the state of Soviet immovable property and adjustments of its juridical status.

This was announced by Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadi Gerasimov at a briefing.

The issue of a reciprocal visit by an Israeli group had not been raised, he said, since Israel had neither immovables in the Soviet Union nor citizens living in the USSR on a permanent basis.

The date of the visit now depended on the Israeli side, Gerasimov said. "Tentatively, our group, led by Yevgeni Antipov, deputy head of the Consular Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, could leave for Tel Aviv in the first half of July."

History condemns genocide conducted under Pol Pot

based on proceedings of Kampuchea's People's Revolutionary Tribunal

Price 40n

Available from Soviet Booklets (SN), 3 Rosary Gardens, LONDON, SW7 4NW.

Foreign Ministry spokesman on Pershing-1A missiles

AT a briefing in Moscow yesterday, Gennadi Gerasimov, spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, drew the attention of those present to the paradoxical character of the position of the United States as well as of the Government of West Germany on the issue of nuclear warheads for West German Pershing-1A missiles.

In the opinion of the American side, he went on to say, armaments belonging to "third countries" should not be subject to Soviet-American negotiations.

If one proceeds from the premise that nuclear warheads for West German Pershings are "armaments of third countries" as far as the US is concerned, does that mean that they do not belong to the United States? Whom, then, do they belong to? They cannot belong to the Federal Republic of Germany — under article 2 of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Bonn pledges not to accept nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices from anyone . . . either directly or indirectly.

For its part, the United States under the terms of article 1 of the mentioned Treaty pledges not to transfer to anyone nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices as well as control over such weapons or explosive devices, either directly or indirectly.

The US consequently remains the owner of the warheads for the Pershing-1A missiles and retains control over them. Such warheads can in no way be considered "armaments belonging to third countries", and hence should be included in

the number of American warheads slated for elimination.

Any other approach which provides for the retention in Europe of US warheads for West Germany's shorter-range missiles would make it possible to circumvent a Soviet-American accord and deprive it of real substance, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

And if today the United States received the right to set aside warheads for the West German shorter-range missiles on a legitimate basis, as it were, tomorrow it might well wish to carry through the same operation in Italy, Holland, Turkey or other NATO countries.

Theoretically speaking, one can imagine a situation whereby the Soviet Union's allies in the Warsaw Treaty could ask the USSR to keep on their territory SS-12 shorter-range missiles and provide them with Soviet nuclear warheads.

It is perfectly clear, the Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasised, that such a development of events in NATO and the Warsaw Treaty would in no way promote the accomplishment of the task of eliminating from Europe the entire complex of medium-range and shorter-range

Speaking about last week's Reykjavik session of the North Atlantic Council, Gennadi Gerasimov told the briefing that Moscow watched it closely.

The NATO leadership, he observed, accepts the Soviet proposals, removing in principle the barrier in the way of drafting a first Soviet-American treaty on real disarmament.

At the same time, the Western consent was accompanied by a number of conditions and

It is a positive signal, Gerasimov said, that the NATO countries finally agree — as all signs indicate — on the framework of talks on conventional arms.

The Reykjavik communiqué points out the interrelationship between the talks and the all-European process and says that it is necessary to continue the discussion of confidence- and security-building measures, seeking the extension of them as compared with the Stockholm accords.

The text of the document made it clear at the same time that the NATO countries have not as yet come to agreement as to the content of the mandate of the future talks and that this issue has

The communiqué did not name specifically the goal of the talks. On the contrary, references to the Brussels declaration contained in it clearly implied the need for eliminating the Soviet Union's alleged superiority in conventional arms. rather than conventional arms reduction.

The NATO communiqué contained no reply to the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee's proposal for consultations on military doctrines, Gerasimov pointed out.

"It seems that NATO realises that comparing the doctrine of 'flexible response', envisaging first use of nuclear weapons, with the defensive doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty is not in their favour.

There was now a trend in the NATO capitals, Gerasimov said, to draw a radiant picture of the Revkjavik session. "In our view, the assessment of its results depends on the West's specific stance on topical issues of disarmament and on advancement of all the negotiations."

PRAVDA:

First step needed to nuclear disarmament

ONE cannot but agree with the opinion expressed at most varied levels in many countries that a treaty to eliminate medium- and shorter-range missiles from Europe "could have already become a reality were it not for the policy of sabotage on the part of the so-called military party — the quarters in NATO countries that are strongly reluctant to stop gambling on nuclear weapons", the newspaper Pravda says on June 14.

"Bonn hedged stubbornly about its position until the last. Even now, after it had grudgingly to agree to the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles from Europe, the

Mikhail Gorbachev

For a "Common European Home" for a New Way of Thinking

> Speech at Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship Meeting Prague, April 10, 1987

The above speech is available as a Novosti booklet from Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW (01-373 7350). Price 30p.

government of the Federal Republic of Germany still insists on preserving Pershing-1A missiles with American nuclear warheads" the paper says.

"Or take the final documents of the Venice meeting of the 'Big Seven'. They say a lot about the importance of the problem of arms control. But they do not even mention the Geneva talks on the problem of medium-range missiles", it adds.

"Officially it was promised that the final definition of the agreed position of the NATO member countries would be given in Reykjavik at a session of the NATO Council. The attending foreign ministers, the press reports, 'have finally reached consensus' on Euromissiles and given 'the green light' for the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles — but with preconditions and provisos and under the accompaniment of propaganda allegations that 'the military threat from the Soviet Union has not diminished'," Pravda notes.

"You can judge for yourselves how sincere NATO's 'Yes' was in Reykjavik. As we see it, there are as yet no grounds for being excessively optimistic on this issue. The unpredictability of outflanking manoeuvers and the steps taken by Washington and some of its partners cannot but make one wary," it adds.

"More and more people on Earth are coming to believe that, given the political will of statesmen in the West and the East, it is possible to achieve far-reaching agreements on nuclear disarmament.

"The Soviet Union has proved with its practical actions that it has the requisite will, which shows most graphically in the USSR's approach to the problem of mediumrange missiles. It is the proposals of the USSR that have led the talks on medium-range missiles to the home stretch.

"Everything now depends on our partners from whom the USSR expects reciprocity.

'Life is dictating urgently that a first and exceptionally important step be finally made on the difficult but only reasonable path towards a complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere on Earth and their prevention in outer space," *Pravda* says.

Soviet Booklets

The following booklets from Novosti Press Agency Publishing House are now available from Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW (01-373 7350):

| Sovie | t | Econo | my, | the | Strat | egy | of |
|-------|-------|--------|-------------|-------|---------|-----|-----|
| Inte | ensif | icatio | n | | | | 35p |
| How ! | the | Revolu | ition w | as Wo | n | | 35p |
| | | | | m: a | | | |
| Thi | nkiı | 1g | | | | | 50p |
| | | | | at to | | | |
| edi | tion | | . . | | | £1 | .50 |
| | | | | | heauein | | |

USSR: more socialism is the essence of restructuring

By D. Vasilyev

MOSCOW views the current changes in Soviet society as being revolutionary in scope and consequences, as do most foreign observers — including those who were never able or wished to find a common language with Communists.

The obviously similar judgement from politically opposed sides comes as no surprise though. When a sharp turn of events breaks the established way of life, overthrows the customary attitudes and views, and directs the flow of public actions and sentiments into a new channel — in all such cases a better definition for what's happening than "revolution" can hardly be found.

But the revolution is not merely a radical shift, a turning point in the development of society. It always has a definite content — social, political and cultural. In other words, apart from decisiveness in the mode of actions, their direction is also important. And since it concerns the Soviet Union, the home of working socialism, the question naturally arises: What future do the present revolutionary changes hold for our socialist arrangement?

Here we and our ideological opponents in the West hold different views.

Foes of socialism most often interpret the admission of the revolutionary character of Soviet restructuring as an abandonment of the ideas and goals of socialism that "have failed to vindicate themselves".

For example, the new Law on Individual Labour is being presented as indisputable evidence of a "Soviet retreat from socialism." Western commentators are depicting it as a prologue to creating a Soviet market economy and to the rise here of private initiative and private enterprise.

And the emphasis on the autonomy of enterprises? The regime of self-financing fixed for them elevates the care for profit to the highest rank. Yet profit is the holy of holies of capitalism. Consequently, here too they perceive a departure from the socialist principles of economic organisation. Isn't this logical?

Absurd claims are thus being piled one upon another. The CPSU Central Committee's January (1987) Plenum has made a comprehensive further democratisation of Soviet society the top priority of restructuring. In the "free world's" stereotyped view that has been evolved for decades, this also does not accord with socialism in any way. If it involves more democracy, publicity and openness, then the conditioned Western mind says it's no longer socialism.

Reasoning in this way, no one, however, predicts the near end of socialism in the USSR. They're only talking about trends and expressing hopes. They, so to speak, expect much from the changes in our society.

We, too, expect much from them, but in a diametrically opposed sense.

Creativity of the masses

Breaking with routine, the new ideas in the economy and politics, the rapid unshackling of cultural life — all this has been caused and is being dictated and inspired by care for the preservation and development of basic socialist values. And if we are to talk about retreats from socialism at all, they aren't in today's way of thinking or in current practice. The sins of these departures are now history. The primary task today is to become cleansed more quickly and substantially of the views and habits that are alien to socialism, and to remove everything that straitjackets the creativity of the masses and hinders it.

How and why did socialist society find itself in the fetters of red tape and bureaucracy, widespread apathy and an industry and technology starting to fall behind the times? This is a topic for special discussion. But socialism isn't to blame for this in any case. It is significant how well our people's consciousness has grasped this point, as reflected even in phrases of daily speech. Like a religious man who, encountering temporal injustices, says of them: "It's unGodly," the Soviet citizen, angered by malfunctions and distortions in the life surrounding him, exclaims: "It's unsocialist!"

The pile of bureaucratic bans is not socialism. Long queues and shortages is not socialism. If a tailor wants to make clothes for his customers at home and gets a stern "You May Not," this also has nothing to do with socialism. And in no "communist scrolls" will one find an assertion that socialism must necessarily foster all unprofitable enterprises and shy from the firms that bring in profits. You can read only the opposite in Marx and Lenin.

It's to ensure that all is precisely socialist that the restructuring has been conceived and is being accomplished. We want our economy based on public ownership to move on confidently towards the highest level of productivity and efficiency. We want to see a steadily growing social return from economic and technological progress. We want no shadow of untruth to be voiced in the press, in fiction, on rostrums or on the screen and the moral dignity of man not to be outraged either by violations of democracy --a binding principle for socialism — or by the demagogy of idlers or self-seekers with cosy positions. especially want full scope to be given to popular initiative — personal and public, economic and political, civil and aesthetic. For socialism does not exist and develop by order; it is the living creativity of the masses.

These ideas of socialism, which raised the working class and all labour Russia for the October Revolution, are also behind the present-day changes in our country. A new revolution? No—in its profound content it is the same socialist revolution that started 70 years ago, has stood the toughest tests, achieved many triumphs and gone through troubles and ordeals—the one that did not lose but gathered strength and has now got its second wind in restructuring with its slogan: "More socialism!"

(Novosti)

(from Page 208)

topped a trillion dollars. Debt liquidation payments are today costing the developing countries one-fifth of their accumulated assets and up to one-third of their export returns. The West admits that situation is becoming critical.

The Bondage of Debt

A booklet prepared by the Institute of Latin America, USSR Academy of Sciences

Price 30p

Available from Soviet Booklets (SN), 3 Rosary Gardens, LONDON, SW7 4NW.

Washington versus
Nicaragua.

An Anatomy of Crimes Facts, Documents, Evidence

Price 40p

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

American Senator Bill Bradley (Democrat, State of New Jersey), called, among other things, upon the Big Seven to take "serious steps" at Venice to ease the debtor-states' onerous burden. The fact that we are insisting that the astronomical interest be paid off, he wrote in the New York Times, is leading to a decline in real earnings and living standards in countries where democracy is fragile as it is.

The participants in the Venice meeting agreed with the UN recommendation that the developed countries allocate 0.7 per cent of their national income to the Third World in the form of assistance. But how do things shape up in reality? A great deal is unclear here. Nor did the Big Seven's vague promise to condescend to "special treatment" for the group of the poorest African states sound convincing. Among other things, the probability that interest would be lowered for them was stated. Yet even this more than modest intention aroused irritation on the part of the United States. And, of course, the West's appeal to the developing countries to lower tariff barriers still more to preserve "an open world trading system" sounded very strange. Isn't it the Third World that suffers most from the protectionist measures taken of late in the US and EEC states vis-à-vis its export commodities?

In this connection let us return to the Warsaw Treaty document. It is the belief of the conferees

at Berlin that the foreign debt problem can be solved only by a global and just settlement that will take into account the interests of the developing countries' progress. Annual debt payments must be limited so as not to bleed their economies white. Lending rates must be lowered. The currency and financial system has to be restructured and the financial institutions operating within its framework democratised. And, of course, the West must first and foremost abandon the practice of protectionism and various forms of trade discrimination, including embargoes, blockades, and so on.

For their part, the participants in the Berlin conference confirmed their support for the peoples' right to freely choose a socio-economic system. Let them compare the available experience in the East as well as the West and apply it in their own countries. No one should impose anything on them from without. However, the Warsaw Treaty document repeatedly underscores the need for a restructuring of world economic relations on the basis of equality and in the spirit of corresponding UN decisions. They should impart an impetus to the "search for common elements" in the various approaches to world economic problems.

(N.B. The cross-heads in this bulletin were inserted by Soviet News—Ed.)