

Brezhnev

Leonid Ilyich

Our Course: **Peace**
and **Socialism**



Our Course: Peace and Socialism

A Collection of Speeches and
Articles by L. I. BREZHNEV,
General Secretary of the CPSU
Central Committee, Chairman of
the Presidium of the Supreme
Soviet of the USSR, delivered and
written in 1981

Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
Moscow, 1982

Леонид Ильич Брежнев
НАШ КУРС — МИР И СОЦИАЛИЗМ
на английском языке
Цена 55 коп.

0802000000
11103

© Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1982

CONTENTS

To My American and British Readers	7
To the African Reader	10
To the American Readers	13
Report of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Immediate Tasks of the Party in Home and Foreign Policy, <i>February 23, 1981</i>	15
Speech at the Closing of the 26th Congress of the CPSU, <i>March 3, 1981</i>	90
Speech in the Kremlin at a Reception in Honour of Delegations of Communist, Workers' and National-Democratic Parties Which Attended the 26th Congress of the CPSU, <i>March 3, 1981</i>	94
To the Italian Reader	96
From the Speech at a Meeting of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, <i>April 1, 1981</i>	98
Reply to a Question Put by the Greek Newspaper "Ta Nea", <i>April 3, 1981</i>	102
Speech at the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, <i>April 7, 1981</i>	103
Speech in Prague at the Conclusion of the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, <i>April 10, 1981</i>	110
Speech in the Kremlin at the Presentation of Awards of the Soviet Union to the USSR Pilot-Cosmonaut V. Dzhanibekov and Citizen of the Mongolian People's Republic Researcher-Cosmonaut Zh. Gurragcha, <i>April 17, 1981</i>	112
Speech in the Kremlin at a Dinner in Honour of Muammar Gaddafi, Leader of the Libyan Revolution and Head of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, <i>April 27, 1981</i>	114

Speech at the Opening of the Memorial Complex in the Hero-City of Kiev, <i>May 9, 1981</i>	118
Speech in the Kremlin at a Dinner in Honour of Denis Sassou-Nguesso, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Congolese Labour Party, President of the People's Republic of the Congo, Chairman of the Council of Ministers, <i>May 12, 1981</i>	123
Speech at the Celebration Meeting in Tbilisi on the Occasion of the 60th Anniversary of the Georgian SSR and the Communist Party of Georgia, <i>May 22, 1981</i>	125
Speech in the Kremlin at a Dinner in Honour of His Majesty Hussein Ibn Talal, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, <i>May 26, 1981</i>	133
Speech in the Kremlin at the Presentation of High Awards of the Soviet Union to the USSR Pilot-Cosmonaut Leonid Popov and Researcher-Cosmonaut Dumitru Prunariu, Citizen of the Socialist Republic of Romania, <i>June 2, 1981</i>	136
Speech in the Kremlin at a Dinner in Honour of Chadli Bendjedid, President of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, Secretary General of the Algerian National Liberation Front, <i>June 9, 1981</i>	138
Speech in the Kremlin at the Presentation of the Order of Lenin to Romesh Chandra, President of the World Peace Council, <i>June 18, 1981</i>	141
Speech at the Fifth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, <i>June 23, 1981</i>	143
To the Parliaments and Peoples of the World, <i>June 23, 1981</i>	145
Message to Jose Eduardo dos Santos, Chairman of the MPLA—Party of Labour, President of the People's Republic of Angola, Chairman of the Standing Commission of the People's Assembly, <i>June 26, 1981</i>	147
Replies to Questions by a Correspondent of the Finnish Newspaper "Suomen Sosiali-Demokraatti", <i>June 27, 1981</i>	149
Speech in the Kremlin at a Dinner in Honour of Willy Brandt, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, <i>June 30, 1981</i>	151
To the Readers of "Soviet Life"	154
Speech in the Kremlin at a Dinner in Honour of Le Duan, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, <i>September 7, 1981</i>	156
Speech in the Kremlin at the Presentation of the Order of Lenin to Kaysone Phomvihane, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, Prime Minister of Lao People's Democratic Republic, <i>September 14, 1981</i>	159
Speech in the Kremlin at the Presentation of Soviet Orders to GDR Minister of National Defence, General of the Army Heinz Hoffmann and Minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of the Republic of Cuba, General of the Army Raul Castro Ruz, <i>September 15, 1981</i>	160
Answer to a Question by a "Pravda" Correspondent, <i>October 21, 1981</i>	162
Speech in the Kremlin at a Dinner in Honour of Ali Abdullah Saleh, President of the Yemen Arab Republic, <i>October 27, 1981</i>	164

Speech in the Kremlin on Being Presented the Badge "50 Years of Membership in the CPSU", <i>October 29, 1981</i>	167
Interview to the West German Magazine "Der Spiegel", <i>November 2, 1981</i>	168
Words of Greeting to Indira Gandhi on the Occasion of the Opening of the Tropospheric Link Between the USSR and India, <i>November 2, 1981</i>	182
Speech at a Meeting with Participants in the Conference of Secretaries of the Central Committees of Fraternal Parties of Socialist Countries on International and Ideological Questions, <i>November 4, 1981</i>	183
Speech in the Kremlin at a Reception to Mark the 64th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, <i>November 7, 1981</i>	185
Speech at the Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, <i>November 16, 1981</i>	187
Speech in Bonn (FRG) at a Dinner Given in the Government Reception House Redoute, <i>November 23, 1981</i>	199
Statement to the Press Made in Bonn, <i>November 24, 1981</i>	203
Sincere Gratitude, <i>December 5, 1981</i>	204
Speech upon Receiving the Sun of Freedom Order, the Highest Award of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, <i>December 16, 1981</i>	205
Speech upon Receiving Awards of Socialist Countries on the 75th Birthday, <i>December 18, 1981</i>	207
To the Vietnamese Reader	209
To the British Reader	212
Speech in the Kremlin upon Receiving the Highest Award of the Country—the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal of the Hero of the Soviet Union, <i>December 19, 1981</i>	214
Speech in the Kremlin at the Reception on the Occasion of the 75th Birthday, <i>December 19, 1981</i>	216
Interview to the American NBC TV Network, <i>December 22, 1981</i>	219
Foreword to the Collection "On Lenin and Leninism"	222
To Editors of "Pravda", <i>December 24, 1981</i>	223

TO MY AMERICAN AND BRITISH READERS

Preface to the Book "Socialism, Democracy and Human Rights" ¹

I hope this book will satisfy the curiosity of those readers who wish to know what Soviet socialist democracy is really like, how we view human rights and how these rights are exercised in the Soviet Union.

Democracy has been a subject of debate since the time of Ancient Greece, and human rights have also been discussed for centuries. Although the concept of human rights is of comparatively recent origin, one could no doubt say that it was in a struggle for their human rights that Spartacus long ago led the slaves of Ancient Rome. The movement of history has always been towards a fuller realisation of democracy and freedom. Already last century Friedrich Engels said: "In our time democracy means communism." Today this truth—a theoretical one in Engels' day—has been confirmed by life, by the practical activity of millions upon millions of people. I am aware that in the West ideologists of capitalism are impressing upon the public a different view, extolling the real or imagined merits of bourgeois democracy and playing down, slurring over or sullyng the meaning and essence of socialist democracy.

To establish the truth it would be only fair to avoid prejudging the issue and to get first-hand information about Soviet democracy. This book contains a selection of statements made on the subject in question over the past ten years.

Knowledge makes for better understanding, and for our countries and peoples mutual understanding is especially important—if only because no argument of principle on historical or ideological issues can be settled by a nuclear duel. By destroying each other neither side would prove the merits of its interpretation of democracy or human rights. So let us place first among all human rights the most sacred of them all—the right to life and, consequently, to a lasting peace.

Our countries have different social and political systems, and so arguments and comparisons are unavoidable. In recent years

¹ Published by Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1981.

these arguments and comparisons have centred on problems of democracy and human rights.

The Soviet people have great respect for the American Revolution and for the democratic traditions of Great Britain, and they realise that the concern of the Americans and the British for human rights is backed by their history. Karl Marx, for one, called the American Declaration of Independence "the first declaration of human rights". We consider the rights and freedoms proclaimed in it a tremendous achievement for that time, but from the standpoint of today they have become elements of formal bourgeois law, which are restricted by the very nature of bourgeois society in which actual rights and privileges are enjoyed by the propertied classes, and the formally democratic institutions serve to further the interests of these classes. It may be recalled, for instance, that neither the Declaration of Independence nor the Bill of Rights abolished slavery. This is not the only example of a discrepancy between what is proclaimed and what is practised—and not only in the past either.

When among various rights the "sacred" right to private property is given priority over all the rest, in actual fact those other rights and freedoms are curtailed or even emasculated. It becomes the old issue of both the poor man and the rich man having equal rights to sleep under the bridge.

When the United Nations Charter was being drafted, it was the Soviet Union which suggested that a clause on respect for basic human rights be included in it. The USSR is a signatory to many international agreements on human rights. However, we believe that with each country concern for human rights should begin at home. And this is where we started. Readers may find it interesting to learn that the aim of the October 1917 Revolution actually was to affirm the most basic human rights for the overwhelming majority of the people in our country.

Soon after the Revolution the Soviet government issued the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia, which abolished all privileges and restrictions on grounds of nationality and religion. It was followed by the Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited People.

The establishment of socialist public ownership of the land, natural resources and the means of production became the main guarantee of not only the political but also the social and economic rights of man in the USSR.

President Carter once said that there were many injustices in life, and the rich could afford what the poor could not. It is precisely this injustice that we strove to abolish, believing that it was an inherent part not of life in general, but of the character of social life, of the social system. It is for that reason that Soviet people reorganised their society; by making social production serve the interests not of groups of people or individuals but of the whole people, they were able not only to proclaim but also actually to

secure every person's right to work, health care, education, material provision in old age and housing. In other words, people were given freedom from anxiety for their future, they acquired a sense of security.

Proclaiming and ensuring economic, social and cultural rights, together with denying any person the right to exploit others and to appropriate the fruits of other people's labour, marked the transition from formal equality to real equality and put the political rights and freedoms of citizens on a material foundation.

A distinctive feature of Soviet democracy, and of socialist democracy in general, is the involvement of millions of working people in managing both production and the affairs of state.

From the very first days of Soviet rule an immense role in the building of a new society was played by the direct participation of millions not only in elections but also in everyday management of public and state affairs. And today, at the stage of mature socialism, ever broader and more active participation of working people in running their country has firmly established itself as the main trend in the political development of Soviet society. Thus, over the past 20 years 20 million people have worked directly in state administration as deputies to government bodies at all levels—from the USSR Supreme Soviet to the district or village Soviet; a further 30 million citizens have been giving voluntary assistance to government bodies, taking an active part in their work.

During the more than 60 years that the Soviet state has existed, socialist democracy has been constantly developing, growing deeper and richer, but its essence has remained unchanged—the involvement of masses of people in running public and state affairs. The Soviets are improving the democratic principles and methods of their work, which include accountability to the electorate, the open conduct of activities, criticism of shortcomings, and combating bureaucracy; new forms of people's participation in running state affairs have appeared, work collectives—those primary cells of our socialist organisation—have become more active, and the role of public organisations, of which there are many, has increased.

We shall continue to develop and improve our democratic traditions which have grown on socialist soil and have passed the test of time.

In 1977 a new Constitution was adopted in the USSR. For several months prior to its adoption it was thoroughly and extensively discussed by the entire Soviet people. In this book readers will find answers, given in the light of that Constitution, to their questions about the rights, freedoms and duties of Soviet citizens. It is my hope that this will help readers to form a better idea of how the ideals of socialist humanism are being implemented in Soviet society, where the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all.

TO THE AFRICAN READER

Foreword to the Book "L. I. Brezhnev. Pages From His Life" ¹

I was in Africa in the early sixties—a time when the break-up of imperialism's colonial system under the impact of the liberation struggle was especially rapid. Since then I have met many statesmen, party leaders, and public figures from African countries. I constantly try to follow the life of the peoples of Africa, and have deep sympathy and respect for them.

The Soviet Union has good relations of friendly cooperation with many African countries. Our policy reposes, and has always reposed, on the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty and independence, non-interference in internal affairs and recognition of every people's right to determine its own future, its own way of development. We do our best to help the African countries overcome their difficulties, and consistently support their efforts to eliminate the aftermaths of colonialism. A number of African countries are getting Soviet assistance in building industrial enterprises, power stations, and agricultural, cultural and educational projects, in developing fishery, prospecting for minerals, in planning, personnel training, and so forth. Many Soviet teachers, engineers, doctors, agronomists and other specialists are helping the liberated African peoples to build a new, free life.

Soviet people welcome the African peoples' struggle against imperialism and for international peace and social progress. They, too, see imperialism as the main threat to the freedom and the independence of the African continent and to the prosperity and well-being of its peoples. We are in solidarity with the dedicated struggle of the people of Namibia, and the heroic struggle of the people of South Africa to end apartheid and all forms of racial discrimination.

¹ Published by the National Printing Publishers, Tanzania, 1981.

The Soviet Union and our Communist Party are working for the consolidation of peace and the security of nations, and against the arms race which is being continuously intensified by NATO. Limitation and termination of the arms race would not only reduce the threat of a world war, but would also enable countries with large military potentials to release considerable resources, a part of which could be used to aid developing countries. Africa is most directly concerned with the question of preventing any further proliferation of nuclear weapons, to which the worst enemies of the peoples of the continent—the South African racists—are straining to obtain access.

Reading this book, you will get a better idea of the Soviet people today and will learn more of the tremendous efforts, privations and sacrifices the Soviet people paid as the price for its great victories. It followed untrodden paths and tackled problems never tackled before when building the world's first socialist state. Time and again, it has had to take up arms to repulse imperialism and the forces of counter-revolution.

On becoming master of its country, the Soviet people turned the once backward and dependent Russia into a highly developed, flourishing state in an unprecedentedly short time, built a powerful modern industry and accomplished deep-going changes in the countryside, where the peasants embarked on collective labour on cooperative and state farms.

Among the most important of our gains is the truly just solution of the national question. Apart from Russians, more than a hundred nationalities inhabit the Soviet Union. In tsarist days they were objects of oppression and discrimination, and internecine strife was provoked between different nations. The October Revolution put an end to this. The equality of all nations and ethnic groups of the Soviet Union was proclaimed and put into effect. Energetic measures were taken to secure the priority economic, social and cultural growth of the once backward peoples, and this gave them factual equality in the single family of Soviet people.

At present, the Soviet people is labouring enthusiastically to carry out the grandiose plans of building communist society, the perfect and most just society on earth, and is carrying out Lenin's policy of peace and friendship among nations.

Internationalist solidarity is an organic part of the make-up of Soviet people. From the very beginning of the African peoples' struggle we ranged ourselves firmly on the side of the just cause of Africa's liberation from foreign oppression. We know and remember the glorious heroes of Africa who laid down their lives for this great goal. One of the largest educational establishments in the Soviet Union has been named in honour of Patrice Lumumba, and one of the squares in the capital of our country, Moscow, bears the name of Amilcar Cabral.

I am aware that there are forces in the world, and also here and there on your continent, who are not loath to ascribe to the

Soviet Union expansionist ambitions and to intimidate Africans with a non-existent "Soviet threat". The untruth of these contentions ought to be clear to every unbiased person.

The truth is that, relying on the aid of the Soviet Union, some African countries have strengthened their defence capability and succeeded in repulsing foreign aggression, in defending their sovereignty and territorial integrity. Our support facilitates the African peoples' sacred struggle against the colonial yoke and neocolonialism.

The peoples of Africa may rest assured that in the struggle for justice and for a better future the Soviet Union will always be their faithful and dependable ally.

TO THE AMERICAN READERS

Preface to the Book "Peace, Detente, Cooperation" ¹

Mankind is living through a crucial period of its history. An arms race without precedent in intensity and duration, which developed in the postwar period, has left on our planet enormous stockpiles of weaponry, which, should they be used in war, could cause irreparable damage to world civilization and even threaten the human race with extinction. Hence the most vital and urgent task in the world today is to end the arms race—as well as the mutual mistrust, tension, and hostility that it generates in the relations between states.

The Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community have for many years concentrated their foreign policy efforts on clearing the dark and putrid atmosphere of the Cold War which poisoned relations between states with different social systems. Guided by the great Lenin's teachings, we have worked consistently for simple, reasonable and realistic principles of peaceful coexistence, mutual respect for sovereign rights, and mutually beneficial cooperation to prevail in these relations.

We have sought to counter the policy of alienation and hostility among nations, resulting in the world balancing on the brink of war, by encouraging a transition to normal, courteous relations, to peaceful cooperation based on equality—in short, to what is now termed detente.

Such is, in effect, the primary aim of the foreign policy guidelines established by the last two congresses of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—the 24th and 25th—known as the Soviet Peace Program.

The actions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in this direction have met with understanding and response on the

¹ Published by the Plenum Publishing Corporation, New York, 1981.

part of realistic political leaders of the Western powers. As a result, highly important political documents were signed on the principles and forms of peaceful coexistence and cooperation with France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United States (1972-1973), and other states of the West.

This great political work in favor of peace and international security was crowned with the Final Act of the European Conference signed at Helsinki in the summer of 1975 by the leaders of 33 European states, the United States, and Canada. That was a veritable charter of peace, detente, and mutually beneficial cooperation.

Much has been done in later years to realize the ideas of this collective document in the development of diverse ties, contacts, and exchanges between states. The peoples of Europe have found faith in the stability of peace and the benefits of peaceful cooperation.

It was discovered, however, that detente also has enemies—active, influential, and powerful. These are circles with vested economic or political interests in international tension and the arms race. They, and no one else, have in recent years pushed the well-known decisions and steps in the West with intent to brake and freeze the process of detente, to whip up the arms race into another highly dangerous spiral, and to push the world to the brink of nuclear catastrophe, spelling doom for all nations.

This inhuman policy is being justified by threadbare fabrications about a “Soviet menace”—now to Europe, now to Asia, now to America—a menace that does not exist, and has never existed.

Today the vital interests of all nations demand an end to this dangerous downhill movement in world politics, the preservation of detente, and the curbing of the arms race. In this situation it is highly important that the public in the Western countries, primarily the United States, has knowledge of the real motives of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, which is doing its utmost to uphold precisely these noble aims in the world arena.

If the reader finds this publication helpful in this sense, I shall consider its purpose fulfilled.

In conclusion I express my heartfelt wishes for the peace and well-being of my American readers and of all the people of the United States.

REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CPSU TO THE 26TH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION AND THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE PARTY IN HOME AND FOREIGN POLICY

February 23, 1981

Comrades Delegates,
Esteemed Guests,

The statutory Twenty-Sixth Congress of our Party has begun. It is called upon, as usual, to sum up the results and to determine tasks for the future.

Appraising the traversed path, we can say with assurance that the 25th Congress correctly defined the basic trends and lines of social development. The Party's Leninist general line is being steadily put into effect; the tasks set at the previous congress have, on the whole, been successfully fulfilled.

The Tenth Five-Year Plan period saw a considerable increase in the country's national wealth. Its productive, scientific and technical potential has grown. The defence capability of the Soviet state has become greater. The well-being and the cultural level of the Soviet people have risen.

The family of Soviet peoples has become still more closely united, its bonds of friendship are still stronger.

The adoption of the new Constitution of the USSR was a major event. It ushered in a higher stage in the development of socialist democracy. Soviet people participate more and more actively in running the affairs of society and state.

The indissoluble unity of the Party and the people has grown still stronger in the past five years. As before, it is the source of our society's gigantic strength.

On the international plane, the period under review has been rough and complicated. It has been marked above all by an intensive struggle of two lines in world affairs: the line of bridling the arms race, strengthening peace and detente, and defending the sovereign rights and freedom of nations, on the one hand, and, on the

other, the line of disrupting detente, escalating the arms race, of threats and interference in other countries' affairs, and of suppressing the liberation struggle.

These years have seen a further growth of the power, activity and prestige of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community.

The revolutionary struggle of the peoples has seen new victories. Among these are the revolutions in Ethiopia, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua, and the overthrow of the anti-popular monarchic regime in Iran. In effect, the seventies witnessed the final collapse of the colonial empires.

The sphere of imperialist domination has narrowed. The internal contradictions in capitalist countries and the rivalry between them have grown more acute. The aggressiveness of imperialist policy, notably that of US imperialism, has sharply increased.

When thunderclouds gathered on the international horizon by the beginning of the eighties, the Soviet Union continued to persevere in its efforts to remove the threat of war and to preserve and deepen detente, and developed mutually beneficial cooperation with most countries of the world.

Jointly with other peace-loving countries and with realistic circles in the West we continued the struggle against the arms race throughout the period under review.

If you ask any Soviet person—whether a member of the Communist Party or not—what has highlighted our Party's path in recent years, the answer will be: it was highlighted above all by the fact that we are managing to preserve peace. And for this people of different age and occupation thank the Party from the bottom of their hearts.

It is absolutely obvious that today the Soviet Union and its allies are more than ever the chief buttress of world peace.

On the whole, comrades, the period since the 25th Congress has not been a simple one. There have been no few difficulties in the country's economic development and in international affairs.

Still, the aims we set have been achieved. This is fresh evidence of the tremendous potentialities of the socialist system, the dedication of the Soviet people, and the correctness of the principled class policy of our Leninist Party.

I. THE INTERNATIONAL POLICY OF THE CPSU

Our struggle to strengthen peace and deepen detente is, above all, the struggle to secure the requisite external conditions for the Soviet people to carry out their constructive tasks. Thereby we are also solving a problem of a truly global nature. For at present noth-

ing is more essential and more important for any nation than to preserve peace and ensure the paramount right of every human being—the right to life.

1. DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM AND THE COOPERATION OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Comrades, all these years the Party, its Central Committee and Political Bureau have devoted unremitting attention to strengthening friendship and cooperation with the other socialist countries.

Hand in hand with them we are building a new, socialist world, and a type of truly just, equal, and fraternal relations between states never seen in history before.

This, indeed, is the spirit in which our relations are shaping with the other countries of the socialist community—Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the German Democratic Republic, Cuba, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia.

A fundamental unity of views has taken root among us on all major aspects of social and economic development, and international affairs. This is a result of the continuous cooperation of fraternal communist parties, and our common achievement.

The fact that deep mutual understanding, trust, and accord exist between the leaderships of our parties is of great importance.

There have been thirty-seven friendly meetings at summit level in the Crimea during these years. Discarding the formalities of protocol, in a friendly atmosphere, we discussed the prospects of development of our relations and the key problems of world politics, and charted our future tasks. Each meeting yielded something new and useful. For this good cooperation we should like to express our heartfelt gratitude to the leaders of the fraternal countries and parties.

There was a systematic exchange of party and government delegations. Conferences of Central Committee secretaries on questions of international relations, and ideological and organisational Party work have become a regular fixture.

The Party organisations of the Soviet Union and those of the other countries of the socialist community are linked by many threads. They are linked at all levels—from republics, territories and regions, down to districts and large enterprises. The cooperation between state bodies, public organisations, and production collectives has grown lively and fruitful.

Spiritual contacts, close links in the fields of ideology and culture have become standard practice.

Relations between states have been called international since olden days. But it is only in our time, in the socialist world that they have truly become relations between nations. Millions upon millions of people take an immediate part in them. That, com-

rades, is a fundamental gain of socialism, and its great service to humanity.

The range of our cooperation extends to more and more spheres. One example is the Intercosmos programme. Cosmonauts of the fraternal countries are not working for science and the national economy alone. They are also performing a tremendously important political mission.

So allow me, from this rostrum, to extend cordial greetings to the space heroes, those brave sons of the socialist countries.

The constitutions of most fraternal countries emphasise the ideas of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union. This is a token of deep confidence in our country, and we reciprocate in kind. The new Constitution of the USSR declares friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance with other socialist countries the cornerstone of Soviet foreign policy.

The period under review has convincingly shown the highly influential and beneficial effect of the activity of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, notably its Political Consultative Committee, on European affairs and, for that matter, on world affairs as a whole. Having earlier paved the way to the European Conference, the highest political body of our Treaty has at its sittings in Bucharest, Moscow, and Warsaw come forward with a number of new initiatives which attracted wide attention all over the world. Their main purpose is to defend detente, to give it an energetic rhythm or, as they say, its second wind.

A new body, the Committee of Foreign Ministers, has been set up in these years to further our cooperation. And it is already safe to say that this was completely justified: the coordination of foreign policy actions has become more prompt.

The development of the Joint Armed Forces has proceeded without a hitch. Here, as always, good work was done by the Committee of Defence Ministers.

The Central Committee reports to the Congress that the defensive political and military alliance of the socialist countries is faithfully serving the cause of peace. It has all the requisites reliably to defend the socialist gains of our peoples. And we will do everything for this to be so in the future.

Far be it from us, comrades, to paint the picture of the present-day socialist world in exclusively radiant colours. Complications, too, occur in the development of our countries. The passage to intensive economic development and large-scale social programmes, and the moulding of the communist consciousness—all this cannot be achieved overnight. It takes time and tireless creative search. And, of course, it is essential to learn from each other.

During the years of building socialism the fraternal countries gained diverse positive experience in organising production and management, and in resolving economic problems.

For example, we know how skilfully the work of agricultural cooperatives and enterprises is organised in Hungary, and what valuable experience the GDR has gained in rationalising production and saving energy and raw and other materials. There are many interesting and valuable points in the social security system of Czechoslovakia, while Bulgaria and some other European socialist countries have found useful forms of agro-industrial cooperation.

So, comrades, let us study the experience of the fraternal countries more closely and utilise it more broadly.

As we know, the decisive sector of the competition with capitalism is the economy and economic policy. At our past congress, we, like the other fraternal parties, set the task of further extending socialist integration on the basis of long-term special-purpose programmes as a top priority. These programmes are to help us resolve the most acute, vitally important economic problems.

At present, they are being translated into concrete deeds. Integration is gathering momentum. The fruits of specialisation in production are visible in practically all branches of economy, science, and technology. We now have some 120 multilateral and more than 1,000 bilateral agreements to this effect. Coordination of the economic plans of the CMEA countries for 1981-1985 is nearing completion.

Speaking of the success of joint work, we mention with legitimate pride such large-scale projects as the nearly 3,000-kilometre-long Soyuz gas pipeline, the Mir power grid, to which new transmission lines have been added, the Ust-Ilimsk pulp and paper plant, the Erdenet ore dressing works in Mongolia, the nickel plants in Cuba, and many other newly completed projects. And before us are still greater undertakings for the good of all our community.

What the socialist countries have accomplished in economic development and in raising the living standard of people amounts to a whole era.

The past few years have not been among the most favourable for the national economies of some socialist states. Still, in the past ten years the economic growth rates of the CMEA countries have been twice those of the developed capitalist countries. The CMEA members continued to be the most dynamically developing group of countries in the world.

The CPSU and the other fraternal parties are setting their course on making the coming two five-year periods a time of intensive cooperation among the socialist countries in production, science and technology.

Life is setting us the task of supplementing coordination of our plans with coordination of economic policy as a whole. Also being put on the order of the day are such issues as aligning the structures of economic mechanisms, further extending direct ties between ministries, amalgamations, and enterprises participating in cooperation, and establishing joint firms. Other ways of combining our efforts and resources are also possible.

As you see, comrades, there are many new major problems. Perhaps it would be useful for the leaders of the fraternal countries to discuss them collectively in the near future.

It stands to reason that, like our socialist partners, the Soviet Union wants our ties to be mutually beneficial in all respects.

The Soviet Union receives many types of machinery and equipment, transport vehicles, consumer goods, and certain raw materials from the fraternal countries. For its part, it supplies the socialist market with oil, gas, ore, cotton, timber, and, of course, a variety of industrial products. In the past five years we received 90,000 million roubles' worth of goods from the CMEA countries, while our deliveries totalled 98,000 million.

Nowadays, the steady development of any socialist country, and successful solution by it of such problems as, say, the provision of energy and raw materials and utilisation of the latest scientific and technical achievements, are inconceivable without ties with other fraternal countries.

The problems that arise in the process of our cooperation are being solved jointly, and we jointly seek the most correct ways of harmonising the interests of each fraternal country with the common interest. This applies, among other things, to fixing reduced prices for oil, gas, and other primary and manufactured goods supplied to each other by the countries of CMEA.

There are special cases, too, when friends need urgent aid. This was the case with Vietnam, which became the target of a barbarian aggression by Peking in 1979. The Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community promptly sent it shipments of food, medical supplies, building materials, and arms. This was also the case with Kampuchea, which had been devastated by the Pol Pot clique of Peking henchmen.

That, comrades, is socialist internationalism in action. Soviet people understand and approve of such a stand.

All of us have a stake in the socialist market being able to meet the rising needs of the countries of our community. And the benefit of augmenting each other's economic potential is certainly not confined to the purely commercial field. This task calls for a responsible approach by economic executives and Party workers, and for a profound understanding of the fraternal countries' indissoluble community of interests.

We are also in favour of expanding commercial and economic relations with the West. That, by the way, is a factor that stabilises international relations. But here we are compelled to take account of the policy of the capitalist states. Not infrequently they try to use economic ties with us as a means of political pressure. Is this not made clear by all sorts of bans and discriminatory restrictions on trade with various socialist countries.

It should be noted in general that in recent years our countries have had to deal with their constructive tasks in more complicated conditions. The deterioration of the world economic situa-

tion and spiralling prices have played their part. The slowing down of the process of detente and the arms race imposed by the imperialist powers are no small a burden for us as well.

Another thing is the visible sharpening of the ideological struggle. For the West it is not confined to the battle of ideas. It employs a whole system of means designed to subvert or soften up the socialist world.

The imperialists and their accomplices are systematically conducting hostile campaigns against the socialist countries. They malign and distort everything that goes on in them. For them the main thing is to turn people against socialism.

Recent events have shown again and again that our class opponents are learning from their defeats. Their actions against the socialist countries are increasingly refined and treacherous.

And wherever in addition to imperialist subversive activity there are mistakes and miscalculations in home policy, there arise conditions that stimulate elements hostile to socialism. This is what has happened in fraternal Poland, where opponents of socialism supported by outside forces are, by stirring up anarchy, seeking to channel events into a counter-revolutionary course. As was noted at the latest plenary meeting of the Polish United Workers' Party Central Committee, the pillars of the socialist state in Poland are in jeopardy.

At present, the Polish comrades are engaged in redressing the critical situation. They are striving to enhance the Party's capacity for action and to tighten links with the working class and other working people, and are preparing a concrete programme to restore a sound Polish economy.

Last December's meeting of leaders of the Warsaw Treaty countries in Moscow has rendered Poland important political support. It showed clearly that the Polish Communists, the Polish working class, and the working people of that country can firmly rely on their friends and allies; we will not abandon fraternal, socialist Poland in its hour of need, we will stand by it.

The events in Poland show once again how important it is for the Party, for the strengthening of its leading role, to pay close heed to the voice of the masses, resolutely to combat all signs of bureaucracy and voluntarism, actively to develop socialist democracy, and to conduct a well-considered and realistic policy in foreign economic relations.

The history of world socialism has seen all sorts of trials. There were difficult times and critical situations. But Communists have always courageously faced the attacks of the adversary, and have invariably won. That's how it was, and that's how it will be. And let no one doubt our common determination to secure our interests and to defend the socialist gains of the peoples.

We are fighting for the just cause of peace and the security of nations, and for the interests of the working people. We have on

our side the truth of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. Our strength is in unity and cohesion.

It was said at the past congress that a process of convergence of the socialist states was taking place. That process is continuing. But it does not obliterate the specific national features or the historical distinctions of the socialist countries. We should see the variety of forms in their social life and economic organisation for what it really is—a wealth of ways and methods of establishing the socialist way of life.

Our relations with the socialist countries that are not in the Warsaw Treaty or CMEA are also developing.

Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation is going ahead in many fields. Agreed principles and accords are a good basis for its further expansion. Soviet-Yugoslav friendship has deep roots, and we have no doubts about its future.

The Soviet Union supports the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in its struggle for the country's peaceful democratic unification without outside interference, and strives to extend and enrich ties with it.

Special mention must be made of China. The experience of the social and economic development of the PRC over the past twenty years is a painful lesson showing what any distortion of the principles and essence of socialism in home and foreign policy leads to.

The present Chinese leaders themselves describe what happened in the period of the so-called cultural revolution in their country as "a most cruel feudal-fascist dictatorship". We have nothing to add to this assessment.

At present, changes are under way in China's internal policy. Time will show what they actually mean. It will show to what extent the present Chinese leadership will manage to overcome the Maoist legacy. But, unfortunately, there are no grounds yet to speak of any changes for the better in Peking's foreign policy. As before, it is aimed at aggravating the international situation, and is aligned with the policy of the imperialist powers. That, of course, will not bring China back to the sound road of development. Imperialists will never be friends of socialism.

The simple reason behind the readiness of the United States, Japan, and a number of NATO countries to expand their military and political ties with China is to use its hostility to the Soviet Union and the socialist community in their own, imperialist interests. That is a hazardous game.

As far as the people of China are concerned, we are deeply convinced that their true interests would be best served by a policy of peace and nothing but a policy of peace and normal relations with other countries.

If Soviet-Chinese relations are still frozen, the reason for this has nothing to do with our position. The Soviet Union has never sought, nor does it now seek any confrontation with the People's

Republic of China. We follow the course set by the 24th and 25th Congresses of the CPSU, and would like to build our ties with that country on a good-neighbour basis. Our proposals for normalising relations with China remain open, and our feelings of friendship and respect for the Chinese people have not changed.

Comrades, as you see, on the whole the Central Committee has been doing a tremendous amount of work in order to develop and deepen our relations with the socialist countries. In economic and cultural development, and in improving social relations and socialist democracy—in literally all fields—world socialism is advancing steadily. *And we Soviet Communists are proud of the role played in this by the Party of Lenin, by the country of the Great October Revolution.*

2. DEVELOPMENT OF RELATIONS WITH THE NEWLY-FREE COUNTRIES

Comrades, among the important results of the Party's international activity in the period under review we can list the visible expansion of cooperation with countries that have liberated themselves from colonial oppression.

These countries are very different. After liberation, some of them have been following the revolutionary-democratic path. In others capitalist relations have taken root. Some of them are following a truly independent policy, while others are today taking their lead from imperialist policy. In a nutshell, the picture is a fairly motley one.

Let me first deal with the socialist-oriented states, that is, states that have opted for socialist development. Their number has increased. Development along the progressive road is not, of course, the same from country to country, and proceeds in difficult conditions. But the main lines are *similar*. These include gradual elimination of the positions of imperialist monopoly, of the local big bourgeoisie and the feudal elements, and restriction of foreign capital. They include the securing by the people's state of commanding heights in the economy and transition to planned development of the productive forces, and encouragement of the cooperative movement in the countryside. They include enhancing the role of the working masses in social life, and gradually reinforcing the state apparatus with national personnel faithful to the people. They include anti-imperialist foreign policy. Revolutionary parties expressing the interests of the broad mass of the working people are growing stronger there.

In the period under review, the Soviet Union has concluded treaties of friendship and cooperation with Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Afghanistan, and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. Recently, a treaty of friendship and cooperation was signed

with Syria. I am sure that it will serve well to further the Soviet-Syrian friendship and the achievement of a just peace in the Middle East.

We are developing wide-ranging mutually beneficial economic, scientific, and technical cooperation with the newly-free countries. The building of large projects in these countries with some form of Soviet participation figures prominently in our relations with them.

Among the projects completed in recent years are many large ones, some even vital for the economy of the country concerned. These include the Al-Thawrah hydropower complex in Syria, which accounts for more than 70 per cent of the electricity generated in that country; the second stage of a steel mill in Algeria, which has raised its capacity to two million tons, and a plant in Guinea producing 2.5 million tons of bauxite a year.

Our country does everything it can to help many of the newly-free countries in training personnel—engineers, technicians, skilled workers, doctors, and teachers.

Tens of thousands of Soviet specialists are doing dedicated work on building sites in Asian and African countries, in industry and agriculture, and in hospitals and educational institutions. They are worthy representatives of their great socialist Motherland. We are proud of them, and send them heartfelt wishes of success.

Together with the other socialist countries, we are also helping to strengthen the defence capability of newly-free states if they request such aid. This was the case with, say, Angola and Ethiopia. Attempts were made to crush the people's revolutions in these countries by encouraging domestic counter-revolution or by outside aggression. We are against the export of revolution, and we cannot agree to any export of counter-revolution either.

Imperialism launched a real undeclared war against the Afghan revolution. This also created a direct threat to the security of our southern frontier. In the circumstances, we were compelled to render the military aid asked for by that friendly country.

The plans of Afghanistan's enemies have collapsed. The well-considered policy of the People's Democratic Party and the government of Afghanistan headed by Comrade Babrak Karmal, which is in keeping with the national interests, has strengthened the people's power.

As for the Soviet military contingent, we will be prepared to withdraw it with the agreement of the Afghan government. Before this is done, the infiltration of counter-revolutionary gangs into Afghanistan must be completely stopped. This must be secured in accords between Afghanistan and its neighbours. Dependable guarantees are required that there will be no new intervention. Such is the fundamental position of the Soviet Union, and we adhere to it firmly.

The revolution in Iran, which was a major event on the international scene in recent years, is of a specific nature. However complex and contradictory, it is essentially an anti-imperialist rev-

olution, though reaction at home and abroad is seeking to change this feature.

The people of Iran are looking for their own road to freedom and prosperity. We sincerely wish them success in this, and are prepared to develop good relations with Iran on the principles of equality and, of course, reciprocity.

Of late, Islamic slogans are being actively promoted in some countries of the East. We Communists have every respect for the religious convictions of people professing Islam or any other religion. The main thing is what aims are pursued by the forces proclaiming various slogans. The banner of Islam may lead into struggle for liberation. This is borne out by history, including very recent history. But it also shows that reaction, too, manipulates with Islamic slogans to incite counter-revolutionary mutinies. Consequently, the whole thing hinges on the actual content of any movement.

Comrades, a prominent place in the Soviet Union's relations with the newly-free countries is, of course, held by our cooperation with India. We welcome the increasing role played by that state in international affairs. Our ties with it are continuing to expand. In both our countries, Soviet-Indian friendship has become a deep-rooted popular tradition.

As a result of the recent negotiations in Delhi with Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and other Indian leaders, the entire range of Soviet-Indian relations has advanced substantially further.

Joint action with peaceful and independent India will continue to be one of the important areas of Soviet foreign policy.

We see no obstacles to friendly cooperation with Indonesia and, for that matter, with other ASEAN member countries.

In Africa, the Caribbean, and Oceania ten new states gained independence in the past five years, and were instantly recognised by the Soviet Union. The birth of the Republic of Zimbabwe, the mounting intensity of the liberation struggle in Namibia, and now also in the Republic of South Africa, are graphic evidence that the rule of "classic" colonialists and racists is approaching its end.

The imperialists are displeased with the fact that the newly-free countries are consolidating their independence. In a thousand ways they are trying to bind these countries to themselves in order to deal more freely with their natural riches, and to use their territory for their strategic designs. In so doing, they make extensive use of the old colonialist method of divide and rule.

Indeed, that is also the Western approach to the Irano-Iraqi war, which has been going on for five months—an absolutely senseless war from the viewpoint of the two countries' interests. But it is of great advantage to imperialism, which is anxious and eager in some way or other to restore its positions in that region. We would like to hope that both Iraq and Iran draw the due conclusions from this.

The Soviet Union resolutely calls for an early end to that fratricidal war, and a political settlement of the conflict. In practice, too, we are striving to facilitate this.

Now about the Middle East problem. In its bid for dominance in the Middle East, the United States has taken the path of the Camp David policy, dividing the Arab world and organising a separate deal between Israel and Egypt. US diplomacy has failed to turn this separate anti-Arab deal into a broader agreement of a capitulationist type. But it has succeeded in another way: a new deterioration of the situation has occurred in the region. A Middle East settlement was cast back.

What now? As we see it, it is high time to get matters off the ground. It is time to go back to honest collective search of an all-embracing just and realistic settlement. In the circumstances, this could be done, say, in the framework of a specially convened international conference.

The Soviet Union is prepared to participate in such work in a constructive spirit and with good will. We are prepared to do so jointly with the other interested parties—the Arabs (naturally including the Palestine Liberation Organisation) and Israel. We are prepared for such search jointly with the United States—and I may remind you that we had some experience in this regard some years ago. We are prepared to cooperate with the European countries and with all those who are showing a sincere striving to secure a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

The UN, too, could evidently continue to play a useful role in all this.

As for the substance of the matter, we are still convinced that if there is to be real peace in the Middle East, the Israeli occupation of all Arab territories captured in 1967 must be ended. The inalienable rights of the Arab people of Palestine must be secured, up to and including the establishment of their own state. It is essential to ensure the security and sovereignty of all the states of the region, including those of Israel. Those are the basic principles. As for the details, they could naturally be considered at the negotiations.

The non-aligned movement, which will have its twentieth anniversary this year, has been and remains an important factor in international relations. Its strength stems from the stand it takes against imperialism and colonialism, and against war and aggression. We are convinced that the key to any further heightening of its role in world politics—and this we would welcome—is its dedication to these basic principles.

In the mid-seventies the former colonial countries raised the question of a new international economic order. Restructuring international economic relations on a democratic foundation, along lines of equality, is natural from the point of view of history. Much can and must be done in this respect. And, certainly, the issue must not be reduced, as this is sometimes done, simply to distinctions

between "rich North" and "poor South". We are prepared to contribute, and are indeed contributing, to the establishment of equitable international economic relations.

No one should have any doubts, comrades, that *the CPSU will consistently continue the policy of promoting cooperation between the USSR and the newly-free countries, and consolidating the alliance of world socialism and the national liberation movement.*

3. THE CPSU AND THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Now about the line of the CPSU in the world communist and working-class movement.

The international working class and its political vanguard—the Communist and Workers' parties—approached the eighties with confidence. They approached them as active fighters for the rights of the working people, and for peace and the security of nations.

The communist movement continued to expand its ranks, and to win increasing influence among the masses. Today, Communist parties are active in 94 countries. In Western Europe alone, some 800,000 new fighters have joined their ranks in the past ten years. Is this not evidence of the indomitable force of attraction of communist ideas.

Our Party and its Central Committee have worked actively for the further expansion and deepening of all-round cooperation with the fraternal parties. During the period under review, members and alternate members of the Political Bureau and secretaries of the Central Committee alone have received several hundred delegations from other parties. In their turn, representatives of the CPSU participated in the work of Communist party congresses and other party functions abroad.

We have regularly briefed fraternal parties on our internal developments and our actions in the field of foreign policy. Comrades from abroad have had extensive opportunities to acquaint themselves with the practical activity of the CPSU at local level—in the republics and regions of the Soviet Union, and at enterprises. All this, as our friends attest, is helping them in their work.

Contacts with foreign Communists enable our Party, too, to get a better idea of the situation in individual countries.

As the influence of the Communist parties grows, the tasks facing them are becoming more and more complex and diverse. And sometimes that gives rise to divergent appraisals and differences in approach to concrete issues of the class struggle, and to discussions between parties.

As we see it, this is completely natural. Communist parties have had dissimilar opinions on some issues in the past as well. The facts have proved convincingly that even in the presence of differences of opinion it is possible and necessary to cooperate polit-

ically in the fight against the common class enemy. The supreme arbiter in resolving problems is time and practice. Lenin was absolutely right when he said that many differences "can, and unfailingly will, vanish; this will result from the logic of the joint struggle against the really formidable enemy, the bourgeoisie..." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 89).

Some time ago the leadership of a few Communist parties began to vigorously defend the right to specifically national ways and forms of struggle for socialism and of building socialism. But if you look at this without prejudice, you will see that no one is imposing any stereotypes or patterns that ignore the distinctions of any country.

Lenin's attitude on this score is well known. "All nations," he wrote, "will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70).

Our Party has never departed from Lenin's principle, which has by now been thoroughly corroborated by the facts of history. Consider this, comrades. In none of the now existing socialist countries have the forms, methods, and ways of the socialist revolution been a mechanical repetition of outside experience. Take the GDR or Poland, Hungary or Cuba, Mongolia or Yugoslavia—all the socialist countries, in fact, carried out the revolution in their own way, using forms that were dictated by the correlation of class forces in each of these countries, by the national distinctions and the external situation.

There had been armed struggle and peaceful forms of passage to the new social system; there had been rapid coming to power of the labouring classes and processes that had dragged out in time. In some countries the revolution had to defend itself against foreign intervention, others had been spared any outside invasions.

The establishment and consolidation of socialist foundations and the building of socialist society, as I have already said, also had and still have distinctive features in different countries.

So, as I see it, unless one ignores the actual facts, one cannot speak of any "uniformity" or contrast Communist parties according to the criterion of recognising or not recognising the ways they choose to reconstruct society.

Critical judgements of separate concrete aspects of development in our country are sometimes voiced in some Communist parties. Far be it from us to think that everything we had was ideal. In the USSR, socialism was built in incredibly difficult conditions. The Party hewed its way through virgin land. And nobody knows better than we do what difficulties and shortcomings occurred along the way, and which of them have still to be overcome.

We pay close heed to comradely, constructive criticism. But we are categorically opposed to "criticism" which distorts the socialist reality and, wittingly or unwittingly, does a good turn thereby to imperialist propaganda, to our class opponent.

As our Party sees it, differences of opinion between Communists can be overcome, unless, of course, they are fundamental differences between revolutionaries and reformists, between creative Marxism and dogmatic sectarianism or ultra-Left adventurism. In that case, of course, there can be no compromises—today just as in Lenin's lifetime. But when Communists fight for the common revolutionary cause, we believe that patient comradely discussion of differing views and positions serves their common aims best of all.

The great unifying principle, a powerful factor furthering cohesion and enhancing the prestige of the world communist movement, is the Communists' unremitting struggle for peace, against imperialism's aggressive policy, and the arms race that carries with it the danger of a nuclear disaster.

The main thing is that Communists, armed with the Marxist-Leninist teaching, see the essence and perspective of the processes in the world more profoundly and more correctly than anybody else, and draw the right conclusions from them for their struggle for the interests of the working class, the working people of their countries, and for democracy, peace and socialism.

That is the foundation on which the CPSU builds its relations with the fraternal parties. We have good friendly relations with the vast majority of Communist parties—the French, Portuguese, German, Greek, Finnish, Danish, Austrian, and other Communist parties of Europe. The CPSU has the same good relations with fraternal parties in the countries of America, Asia, and Africa, and in Australia. And we will continue to strengthen these relations in the name of our common cause—the cause of peace and socialism.

The Berlin Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe in 1976 was a big event in the life of the world communist movement. It set dependable guidelines for the working class and the broad mass of working people in the fight against the arms race, and for consolidating detente, for social progress.

The 1980 Paris Meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties gave new impetus to the struggle against the danger of war. It helped to invigorate the battle of the mass of the people of this continent to avert the grave danger to Europe implicit in the NATO decision to deploy new US nuclear missiles in Western Europe.

CPSU cooperation with other democratic forces has grown closer during the period under review. Further advances were registered, in particular, in our ties with the socialist and social-democ-

ratic parties of Finland, Belgium, Sweden, Japan, Spain, and a number of other countries—and this chiefly on questions of struggle against the war danger. Of high importance here were our contacts with the leadership of the Socialist International, our participation in the Socialist International's conference on disarmament, the contacts we had with its study group on disarmament, and the reception of its delegation at the CPSU Central Committee.

Present-day social democracy has considerable political weight. It could do more for the defence of the vital interests of the peoples and, above all, for the consolidation of peace, for improving the international situation, repulsing fascism and racism, and the offensive of reactionary forces on the political rights of the working people. In practice, however, the social-democratic leaders do not always act along these lines.

Many of them are afflicted with the virus of anti-communism. Some allow themselves to be drawn into campaigns organised by imperialism against the socialist countries, and refer to the so-called Atlantic solidarity to justify the arms race. Understandably, this policy is contrary to the interests of the working people. We disapprove of it most strongly.

But we will actively support all steps that are beneficial to peace and democracy. In view of the present complication of the international situation, we attach importance to cooperation with Social Democrats, trade unions, religious circles, and all democratic and peace-loving forces in the matter of preventing war and strengthening peace. Last year's World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace in Sofia was a good example of such cooperation.

Soviet Communists welcome the achievements of the Communist parties in expanding their ranks, tightening their links with the masses, defending the interests and democratic rights and freedoms of the working class and all the working people, and in the struggle to curb the omnipotence of monopoly, to check the spread of militarism, and for the socialist perspective in their countries.

Comrades, despite terror and persecution, despite prison and the barbed wire of concentration camps, in selfless and often very difficult everyday work for the good of the peoples, Communists in the capitalist countries remain loyal to the ideals of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

We express our deep-felt solidarity with our Communist brothers languishing in the dungeons of fascist dictatorships, with those persecuted by the police or fighting their hard battles underground. We express our solidarity with those subjected to discrimination and deprived of civil and political rights merely for their convictions, for belonging to the party of the working class.

Honour and glory to Communists, courageous fighters of the people's cause!

4. RELATIONS WITH THE CAPITALIST STATES. COUNTERING THE FORCES OF AGGRESSION. THE POLICY OF PEACE AND COOPERATION

Comrades, in the period under review the USSR continued to pursue Lenin's policy of peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation with capitalist states, while firmly repulsing the aggressive designs of imperialism.

A further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism was witnessed during these years. To be sure, capitalism has not stopped developing. But it is immersed in what is already the third economic recession in the past ten years.

Inflation has grown to unheard-of dimensions. Since 1970 prices in the developed capitalist countries have risen on average by 130 per cent, and since 1975 by 50 per cent. The inflation curve is getting steeper. Not for nothing did the new President of the United States admit in his inaugural address that the United States is suffering from "one of the worst sustained inflations in ... national history", and that "it threatens to shatter the lives of millions" of Americans.

It is more than obvious that state regulation of the capitalist economy is ineffective. The measures that bourgeois governments take against inflation foster stagnation of production and growth of unemployment; what they do to contain the critical drop in production lends still greater momentum to inflation.

The social contradictions have grown visibly more acute. In capitalist society use of the latest scientific and technical achievements in production turns against the working people, and throws millions of factory workers into the streets. In the past ten years the army of unemployed in the developed capitalist states has doubled. In 1980 it totalled 19 million.

Attempts to dampen the intensity of the class struggle by social reforms of some kind are having no success either. The number of strikers has risen by more than one-third in these ten years, and is even officially admitted to have reached the quarter-billion mark.

The inter-imperialist contradictions are growing more acute, the scramble for markets and for sources of raw materials and energy is more frantic. Japanese and West European monopolies compete ever more successfully with US capital, and in the US domestic market too. In the seventies, the share of the United States in world exports has declined by nearly 20 per cent.

The difficulties experienced by capitalism also affect its policy, including foreign policy. The struggle over basic issues of the capitalist countries' foreign-policy course has grown more bitter. Visibly more active of late are the opponents of detente, of limiting armaments, and of improving relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Adventurism and a readiness to gamble with the vital interests of humanity for narrow and selfish ends—this is what has emerged in a particularly bare-faced form in the policy of the more aggressive imperialist circles. With utter contempt for the rights and aspirations of nations, they are trying to portray the liberation struggle of the masses as “terrorism”. Indeed, they have set out to achieve the unachievable—to set up a barrier to progressive changes in the world, and to again become the rulers of the peoples’ destiny.

Military expenditures are rising unprecedentedly. In the United States they have climbed to an annual 150,000 million dollars. But even these astronomical figures are not high enough for the US military-industrial complex. It is clamouring for more. The NATO allies of the United States, too, yielding to Washington’s demands, have undertaken—though some with great reluctance—to increase military allocations automatically until almost the end of the present century.

A considerable portion of these tremendous sums is being spent on crash development of new types of strategic nuclear arms. Their appearance is accompanied by the advancing of military doctrines dangerous to peace, like the notorious Carter directive. They want people to believe that nuclear war can be limited, they want to reconcile them with the idea that such war is permissible.

But that is sheer deception of the peoples! A “limited” nuclear war as conceived by the Americans in, say, Europe would from the outset mean the certain destruction of European civilisation. And of course the United States, too, would not be able to escape the flames of war. Clearly, such plans and “doctrines” are a grave threat to all nations, including the people of the USA. They are being condemned all over the world. The peoples say an emphatic “No” to them.

Imperialist circles think in terms of domination and compulsion in relation to other states and peoples.

The monopolies need the oil, uranium and non-ferrous metals of other countries, and so the Middle East, Africa and the Indian Ocean are proclaimed spheres of US “vital interests”. The US military machine is actively thrusting into these regions, and intends to entrench itself there for a long time to come. Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean, Oman, Kenya, Somalia, Egypt—where next?

To split the expenses with others and at the same time to tie its NATO partners closer to itself, the United States is seeking to extend the functions of NATO. Washington strategists are obviously eager to involve dozens of other countries in their military preparations, and to enmesh the world in a web of US bases, airfields, and arms depots.

To justify this, Washington is spreading the story of a “Soviet threat” to the oil wealth of the Middle East or the oil supply lines. That is a deliberate falsehood, because its authors know perfectly well that the Soviet Union has no intention of impinging on either

the one or the other. And in general, it is absurd to think that the oil interests of the West can be "defended" by turning that region into a powder keg.

No, we have completely different views on how peace can really be secured in and around the Persian Gulf. Instead of deploying more and more naval and air armadas, troops and arms there, we propose that the military threat should be removed by concluding an international agreement. A state of stability and calm can be created in that region by joint effort, with due account for the legitimate interests of all sides. The sovereign rights of the countries there, and the security of maritime and other communications connecting the region with the rest of the world, can be guaranteed. That is the meaning of the proposals made recently by the Soviet Union.

This initiative gained broad support in the world, including a number of Persian Gulf countries. To be sure, there were also opponents of the Soviet proposal, and it is easy to guess in what camp. We would like to express our hope that the governments of the United States and other NATO countries will consider the whole issue calmly and without prejudice, so that we could jointly look for a solution acceptable to all.

Reaching an agreement on this issue could, moreover, give a start to the very important process of reducing the military presence in various regions of the World Ocean.

In our relations with the United States during all these years we have, as before, followed a principled and constructive line. It is only to be regretted that the former administration in Washington put its stakes on something other than developing relations or on mutual understanding. Trying to exert pressure on us, it set to destroying the positive achievements that had been made with no small effort in Soviet-American relations over the preceding years. As a result, our bilateral ties suffered a setback in a number of fields. The entry into force of the SALT-2 treaty was deferred. And negotiations with us on a number of arms limitation issues, such as reducing arms deliveries to third countries, were broken off unilaterally by the United States.

Unfortunately, also since the change of leadership in the White House openly bellicose calls and statements have resounded from Washington, as if specially designed to poison the atmosphere of relations between our countries. We would like to hope, however, that those who shape United States policy today will ultimately manage to see things in a more realistic light. The military and strategic equilibrium prevailing between the USSR and the USA, between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, objectively serves to safeguard world peace. We have not sought, and do not now seek, military superiority over the other side. That is not our policy. But neither will we permit the building up of any such superiority over us. Attempts of that kind and talking to us from a position of strength are absolutely futile.

Not to try and upset the existing balance and not to impose a new, still more costly and dangerous round of the arms race—that would be to display truly wise statesmanship. And for this it is really high time to throw the threadbare scarecrow of a “Soviet threat” out of the door of serious politics.

Let's look at the true state of affairs.

Whether we take strategic nuclear arms or medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe, in both instances there is approximate parity between the sides. In respect of some weapons the West has a certain advantage, and we have an advantage in respect of others. This parity could be more stable if pertinent treaties and agreements were concluded.

There is also talk about tanks. It is true that the Soviet Union has more of them. But the NATO countries, too, have a large number. Besides, they have considerably more anti-tank weapons.

The tale of Soviet superiority in troops strength does not match the facts either. Combined with the other NATO countries, the United States has even slightly more troops than the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries.

So, what talk can there be of any Soviet military superiority?

A war danger does exist for the United States, as it does for all the other countries of the world. But the source of the danger is not the Soviet Union, nor any mythical Soviet superiority, but is the arms race and the tension that still prevails in the world. We are prepared to combat this true, and not imaginary, danger hand in hand with the United States, with the countries of Europe, with all countries in the world. To try and outstrip each other in the arms race or to expect to win a nuclear war, is dangerous madness.

It is universally recognised that in many ways the international situation depends on the policy of both the USSR and the USA. As we see it, the state of relations between them at present and the acuteness of the international problems requiring a solution necessitate a dialogue, and an active dialogue, at all levels. We are prepared to have such a dialogue.

Experience shows that the crucial factor here is meetings at summit level. This was true yesterday, and is still true today.

The USSR wants normal relations with the USA. There is simply no other sensible way from the point of view of the interests of our two nations, and of humanity as a whole.

Comrades, for our Party and the Soviet state the past five years have been years of purposeful struggle for European peace and security.

Despite the efforts of enemies of detente, peaceful cooperation between countries of the two systems is, by and large, making good headway on the European continent. Political contacts have become broader and more meaningful. Frequently, we manage to find a common language on some major problems of foreign policy. Economic, scientific, technical and cultural ties are expanding, and

are taking on new qualities. Multilateral conferences have been held on various aspects of European cooperation.

An extensive system of ties has taken shape between the Soviet Union and France. A practically uninterrupted political dialogue is being maintained at various levels, first of all with President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing. Soviet-French trade has tripled. Our cooperation in science, technology, and culture covers more than 300 projects. And though we do not agree with all that France is doing on the international scene, our relations remain a major factor of detente, and we are for their further dynamic development.

Our relations with the Federal Republic of Germany, based on the 1970 treaty and later agreements, have on the whole developed favourably. The meetings with Chancellor Helmut Schmidt in 1978 and 1980, like the earlier ones with Willy Brandt, have made a useful contribution to European detente, and have extended the horizons of mutually advantageous Soviet-West German ties. Our trade with the FRG has nearly doubled over the past five years. Large-scale projects hold a prominent place in our economic relations, such as the shipments of equipment to *Atomash*, to the Oskol electro-metallurgical works, and to chemical enterprises, and of pipes and equipment for gas pipelines, and so on.

But there are fields, and important ones, where the positions of the USSR and the FRG diverge substantially. Suffice it to mention Bonn's occasional attempts to circumvent the quadripartite agreement on West Berlin or in certain matters to disregard the sovereignty of the GDR. We are for rigorous and complete observance of the accords reached in the seventies. This is important for the mutual understanding and cooperation of our two countries, and for European peace.

Definite progress has been achieved in our relations with Italy. There are political contacts, economic cooperation is expanding, and so are the cultural exchanges between our nations.

Soviet-Finnish relations are making good headway on a firm basis of friendship and good-neighbourliness. We give due credit to the contribution made by Finland and President Kekkonen personally to the consolidation of European security. We are also pleased that our economic ties are steadily expanding, and that joint building of large industrial projects is making good progress.

We are prepared to continue developing good relations with our neighbour Turkey, and our traditional ties with Greece. We welcome the successful development of relations with Austria, Sweden, Belgium, Cyprus, and a number of other European countries. After a break of 40 years, our relations with Spain have entered a normal course.

As for Soviet-British relations, we regret to say that here there is stagnation, but not through any fault of ours. I think that this is contrary to the interests of both the Soviet Union and Britain.

Speaking of European affairs, we must not ignore the new and serious dangers that have arisen to European peace. This refers first of all to the NATO decision of deploying new US nuclear missiles in Western Europe. This decision is no "response" to any imagined Soviet challenge. Neither is it an ordinary "modernisation" of the arsenal, as the West would have us believe. It speaks of an obvious intention to tilt the existing military balance in Europe in NATO's favour.

It must be clearly understood: the deployment in the FRG, Italy, Britain, the Netherlands or Belgium of new US missiles, targeted against the USSR and its allies, is bound to affect our relations with these countries, to say nothing of how this will prejudice their own security. So, their governments and parliaments have reason to weigh the whole thing again and again.

The vital interests of the European nations require that Europe should follow a different path—the path blazed in Helsinki.

We believe that the process begun by the European Conference should be a continuous one. All forms of negotiation—multilateral and bilateral—should be used to settle the problems that are troubling Europe.

About our relations with Japan. Gaining prominence in its foreign policy are negative elements—playing up to the dangerous plans of Washington and Peking, and the trend towards militarisation. We do not think, however, that this is, so to speak, Tokyo's last word, and we hope that far-sightedness and an understanding of its own interests will prevail there. As before, the Soviet Union is in favour of lasting and truly good-neighbourly relations with Japan.

The role in world affairs of Latin American countries, such as Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela, and Peru, has grown considerably. We are pleased to note the expansion of the Soviet Union's mutually beneficial ties with countries of Latin America and are prepared to continue expanding them.

There are also good potentialities for developing our relations with Canada. And the door to further expansion of cooperation with it will remain open, as it will remain open for other capitalist states. The door to the broadest cooperation—with governments, parliaments, business circles, cultural workers and with public organisations.

In sum, comrades, the policy of peaceful coexistence charted years ago by Lenin is exercising an increasingly decisive influence on present-day international relations. The seventies have shown this convincingly.

Life requires fruitful cooperation of all countries for solving the peaceful, constructive tasks facing every nation and all humanity.

And this cooperation is no futile utopia. Its first signs—be they ever so small so far—are already in evidence in our time. They should be noted, cherished and developed.

Useful cooperation is now under way, also within the framework of international organisations, between a considerable number of states in such fields as peaceful uses of atomic energy, the battle against epidemic diseases, elimination of illiteracy, protection of historical and cultural monuments and weather forecasting. Our country is taking an active part in all this.

In short, there already exists a valid basis for the further extension of practical peaceful cooperation among states. And the need for it is increasingly apparent. It is enough to mention such problems, for example, as discovery and use of new sources of energy, provision of food for the world's growing population, preservation of all the riches of Nature on Earth and exploration of outer space and the depths of the World Ocean.

5. TO STRENGTHEN PEACE, DEEPEN DETENTE, AND CURB THE ARMS RACE

Comrades, the central direction in the foreign policy of our Party and Government is, as it has always been, to lessen the danger of war and to curb the arms race. At the present time this objective has become one of special importance and urgency because rapid and profound changes are under way in the development of military technology. Qualitatively new types of weapons, above all weapons of mass destruction, are being developed. These are weapons of a type that may make control over them, and therefore also their agreed limitation, extremely difficult if not impossible. A new round of the arms race will upset international stability, and greatly increase the danger of another war.

The situation is made graver still by the fact that the policy of the aggressive imperialist forces has already considerably heightened international tensions with all the dangerous consequences that this entails.

There is probably no other country that has in recent years put forward before the world such a wide spectrum of concrete and realistic initiatives on the most crucial problems of international relations, as the Soviet Union has done.

Let me begin with the problem of limiting nuclear armaments, which are the most dangerous to humanity. All these years, the Soviet Union has worked perseveringly to put an end to the race in such armaments, and to stop their further spread across the world. A tremendous amount of work was done, as you know, in preparing a treaty with the United States on limiting strategic arms. Much was done during the negotiations with the United States and Britain on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. We made an important move by declaring and reaffirming that we will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries that do not permit the deployment of such weapons on their territory. But we have

also gone further in our proposals: that the manufacture of nuclear weapons be stopped and a start be made in reducing their stock-piles until they are completely eliminated.

The Soviet Union has also actively sought the prohibition of all other types of mass destruction weapons. And we have achieved something in this field during the period under review. Already operative is a convention banning modification of the environment for military purposes. The basic provisions of a treaty prohibiting radiological weapons have been tentatively agreed upon. Negotiations on removing chemical weapons from the arsenals of states are under way, though at an intolerably slow pace. Actions by the peace forces have brought about the suspension of plans for deploying the neutron weapon in Western Europe. All the greater is the outrage of nations over the new Pentagon attempts to hold the neutron Sword of Damocles over the countries of Europe. For our part, we declare once more that we will not begin manufacturing this weapon if it does not appear in other countries, and that we are prepared to conclude an agreement banning it once and for all.

The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty countries have come forward with a number of concrete proposals on military detente in Europe. In particular, we would like that the participants in the European Conference should undertake not to use either nuclear or conventional arms against each other first, that the existing military blocs in Europe and on other continents should not admit new members, and that no new blocs should be set up.

The Soviet Union and its allies have proposed convening a European conference to discuss and settle questions of military detente and disarmament in Europe. This matter is in the centre of attention at the Madrid conference.

Neither have we slackened our efforts to secure progress at the Vienna negotiations on reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. Here the socialist countries have gone more than halfway to meet their Western partners. But we've got to say bluntly that if the Western countries continue to drag out these talks while increasing their military potential in Europe, we will have to take this fact into account.

Many of the important initiatives that the Soviet Union and its allies advanced during the past five years were backed up by resolutions of the UN, including the General Assembly's special session on disarmament.

The Soviet proposals for consolidating international security and limiting the arms race remain in force. Soviet diplomats and all other officials in the foreign relations sector are continuing, under the guidance of the Party's Central Committee, to press for their implementation.

Our actions are consonant with the aspirations of other countries and peoples. Suffice it to recall that many countries on various continents have advanced proposals that won broad inter-

national support—to make Africa and the Middle East non-nuclear zones like Latin America, to set up peace zones in Southeast Asia, the Indian Ocean, and the Mediterranean. And the resolutions of the European Conference are, in effect, aimed at making all Europe a zone of that kind as well.

Comrades, we are carrying on the fight for a radical improvement of the international situation. The trustworthy compass here is, as it has been, the Peace Programme of the 24th and 25th Congresses of the CPSU.

Today the state of world affairs requires new, additional efforts to remove the threat of war, and buttress international security. Permit me to put before the Congress a number of ideas directed to this end.

In recent years, as you know, flashpoints of military conflict, often threatening to grow into a major conflagration, have flared up now in one and now in another region of the world. Experience has shown that it is not easy to extinguish them. It would be far better to take preventive measures, to forestall their emergence.

In Europe, for example, this purpose is to some extent served—and fairly well on the whole—by the confidence-building measures carried out in the military field by decision of the European Conference. They include advance notification of military exercises of ground troops, and invitation to them of observers from other countries. At present, these measures apply to the territory of the European states, including the Western regions of the USSR. We have already said that we are prepared to go further and to give notice of naval and air exercises. We have proposed—and propose again—that there should also be advance notification of large-scale troop movements.

And now we want to propose that the zone for these measures should be substantially extended. *We are prepared to apply them to the entire European part of the USSR, provided the Western states, too, extend the confidence zone accordingly.*

There is a region where elaboration and use of confidence-building measures—naturally, with due consideration for its specific features—could not only defuse the situation locally, but also make a very useful contribution to strengthening the foundations of universal peace. That region is the Far East, where such powers as the Soviet Union, China, and Japan border on each other. There are also US military bases there. *The Soviet Union would be prepared to hold concrete negotiations on confidence-building measures in the Far East with all interested countries.*

We make these far-reaching proposals for confidence building in the belief that their implementation will facilitate progress in the field of disarmament.

Further. It is sometimes said about our Persian Gulf proposals that they should not be divorced from the question of the Soviet military contingent in Afghanistan. What could be said on this score? The Soviet Union is prepared to discuss the Persian Gulf as

an independent problem. It is also prepared, of course, as I have already said, to participate in a separate settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. *But we do not object to the questions connected with Afghanistan being discussed together with the questions of Persian Gulf security.* Naturally, this applies only to the international aspects of the Afghan problem, and not to internal Afghan affairs. Afghanistan's sovereignty, like its non-aligned status, must be fully protected.

Once again, we insistently call for restraint in the field of strategic armaments. It should not be tolerated that the nations of the world live in the shadow of a nuclear war threat.

Limitation and reduction of strategic armaments is a paramount problem. *For our part, we are prepared to continue the relevant negotiations with the United States without delay, preserving all the positive elements that have so far been achieved in this area.* It goes without saying that the negotiations can be conducted only on the basis of equality and equal security. We will not consent to any agreement that gives a unilateral advantage to the USA. There must be no illusions on this score. In our opinion, all the other nuclear powers should join these negotiations at the appropriate time.

The USSR is prepared to negotiate limitation of weapons of all types. At one time we offered to ban the development of the naval Trident missile system in the United States and of a corresponding system in our country. The proposal was not accepted. As a result, the United States has built the new Ohio submarine armed with Trident-1 missiles, while an analogous system, the Typhoon, was built in our country. So, who has stood to gain?

We are prepared to come to terms on limiting the deployment of the new submarines—the Ohio type by the USA, and similar ones by the USSR. We could also agree to banning modernisation of existing and development of new ballistic missiles for these submarines.

Now about the nuclear-missile weapons in Europe. An ever more dangerous stockpiling of them is in train. A kind of vicious circle has appeared, with the actions of one side precipitating counter-measures by the other. How to break this chain?

We suggest coming to terms that already now a moratorium should be set on the deployment in Europe of new medium-range nuclear-missile weapons of the NATO countries and the Soviet Union, that is, to freeze the existing quantitative and qualitative level of these weapons, naturally including the US forward-based nuclear weapons in this region. The moratorium could enter into force at once, the moment negotiations begin on this score, and could remain in force until a permanent treaty is concluded on limiting or, still better, reducing such nuclear weapons in Europe. In making this proposal, we expect the two sides to stop all preparations for the deployment of respective additional weapons,

including US Pershing-2 missiles and land-based strategic cruise missiles.

The peoples must know the truth about the destructive consequences which a nuclear war could have for mankind. *We suggest that a competent international committee should be set up, which would demonstrate the vital necessity of preventing a nuclear catastrophe.* The committee could be composed of the most eminent scientists of different countries. The whole world should be informed of the conclusions they draw.

There are, of course, many other pressing international problems in the world today. Their sensible solution would enable us to slacken the intensity of the international situation, and allow the nations to breathe more freely. But what is needed here is a far-sighted approach, political will and courage, prestige and influence. That is why it seems to us that it would be *useful to call a special session of the Security Council with the participation of the top leaders of its member-states in order to look for keys to improving the international situation, and preventing war. If they so wish, leaders of other states could evidently also take part in the session.* Certainly, thorough preparations would be needed for such a session to achieve positive results.

In sum, comrades, the new measures we are proposing embrace a wide range of issues. They concern conventional as well as nuclear-missile armaments, land forces, and naval and air forces. They touch on the situation in Europe, in the Near East, the Middle East, and the Far East. They deal with measures of a military as well as a political nature. All of them pursue a single aim, our one common aspiration—to do everything possible to relieve the peoples of the danger of a nuclear war, to preserve world peace.

This, if you like, is an organic continuation and development of our Peace Programme in reference to the most burning, topical problems of present-day international life.

To safeguard peace—no task is more important now on the international plane for our Party, for our people and, for that matter, for all the peoples of the world.

By safeguarding peace we are working not only for people who are living today, and not only for our children and grandchildren; we are working for the happiness of dozens of future generations.

If there is peace, the creative energy of the peoples backed by the achievements of science and technology is certain to solve the problems that are now troubling people. To be sure, new, still loftier tasks will then arise before our descendants. But that is the dialectics of progress, the dialectics of life.

Not war preparations that doom the peoples to a senseless squandering of their material and spiritual wealth, but consolidation of peace—that is the clue to the future.

II. THE ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE CPSU IN THE PERIOD OF DEVELOPED SOCIALISM

Comrades, let me now turn to matters concerning the economic policy of the CPSU. Guiding the national economy constitutes the core of all Party and government activity. For it is in the economic field that the foundation is being laid for accomplishing social tasks and strengthening the country's defence potential, the foundation for a vigorous foreign policy. It is here that the necessary prerequisites are being created for the successful advance of Soviet society to communism.

1. BASIC RESULTS OF THE USSR'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE SEVENTIES AND IN THE TENTH FIVE-YEAR PLAN PERIOD

On the threshold of the seventies, the Party carried out a comprehensive analysis of the state of the national economy and defined the principal ways of solving the socio-economic problems of developed socialism. The Party approach, the political approach to the economy has invariably been based on the programmatic requirement—everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man.

From this followed the course charted by the 24th and 25th CPSU Congresses towards a more profound regearing of the national economy to deal with the diverse problems connected with improving the people's well-being. From this followed the principle formulated at the congresses requiring a determined swing to primarily intensive factors of economic growth, the principle of enhancing the efficiency and quality of all work.

Such is the long-term orientation of the economic policy of the CPSU. An important role in creatively developing that policy, and in mobilising the Communists and all working people to put that policy into practice, was played by the plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee devoted to economic development. These meetings provided a realistic analysis of the state of affairs in the national economy, concentrated the Party's attention on unresolved problems, and helped to shape up-to-date economic thinking. Each of them was, in effect, a school of socialist economic management, and taught our cadres and the entire Party the science and art of guiding the economy.

The country's development in 1971-1980 is evidenced by the following figures:

Basic Indices of the Economic and Social Development of the
USSR in the Seventies

(in thous. mln. roubles in comparable prices)

	1970	1980	1980 in % of 1970
Gross social product	637	1,061	167
National income used for consumption and accumulation	282	437	155
National income resources allocated to consumption and non-productive con- struction	219	354	162
Industrial production	352	627	178
Agricultural production (average annual output)	100.4	123.7	123
Capital investments	80.6	133.5	166
Basic production assets (at the end of the year)	531	1,149	216
Goods carried by all types of transport (thous. mln. ton-km)	3,829	6,165	161
Retail trade turnover	158.1	268.5	170
Social consumption funds	63.9	116.5	182

The national economy balance sheet furnishes convincing proof that the Party's economic strategy is correct. The country has made substantial progress in all the areas of building the material and technical basis of communism. The productive forces of Soviet society have attained a qualitatively new level. The scientific and technical revolution is developing in scope and depth, changing the very appearance of many lines of production and whole industries. Soviet scientific research occupies a position of leadership in vitally important areas of knowledge. The country's economic might is a reliable guarantee of further progress on the road of communist construction. Soviet men and women have worked hard, in "shock-work" style. Rallied closely around Lenin's Party and treating its master plans as a matter of vital concern to them personally, the working people in town and country have spared no efforts in building up the country's economic potential. Honour and glory to Soviet men and women—to the working people! They are the main, invaluable asset of our society.

Throughout the past decade there were persistent efforts to enhance the efficiency of the national economy. The most meaningful indicator here is the productivity of labour. It rose during this period by nearly 50 per cent. Scientific advances served as a basis for the further development or establishment of the most advanced industries, such as nuclear engineering, space technology, electronics and microelectronics, microbe synthesis, laser technology, the production of artificial diamonds and other new synthetic materials.

Characteristic of the seventies were big changes in the location of productive forces. In pursuance of decisions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU, territorial-industrial complexes are being formed in the European part of the Russian Federation, in the Urals, Siberia, the Far East, Kazakhstan and Tajikistan.

In the years of the Tenth Five-Year Plan these complexes accounted for the entire growth in the country's total production of oil, gas, and coal. In the north-west of Siberia the production of oil (including gas condensate) in 1970 amounted to 31 million tons; in 1980 it exceeded 312 million tons. The production of gas during that period rose from 9,500 million to 156,000 million cubic metres. More than 48,000 million cubic metres of gas is being produced by the Orenburg gas workers. The miners of the Pavlodar-Ekibastuz complex in 1980 produced about 67 million tons of coal—nearly three times the amount mined in 1970. A mounting role in the economy of the country's Asian part is being played by the Sayan, Bratsk-Ust-Ilimsk, South Yakutian, Karatau-Jambul, Mangyshlak, and South Tajikistan territorial-industrial complexes. Big opportunities for advancing east and north are being opened up by the Baikal-Amur Railway.

The industrial development of new regions is important both socially and politically. The work collectives arising there bring with them high standards of work and everyday life, and a new, contemporary rhythm of life. Another vivid chapter is being added to the annals of the Soviet people's heroic achievements.

All this is a result of the Party's far-sighted policy. All this is a result of the fortitude and enthusiasm of the workers, engineers, technicians, and scientists who—working in difficult, at times incredibly difficult conditions—have put extremely rich natural resources at the service of the national economy. What they have accomplished is a real exploit, an exploit for the sake of the people and for the good of the people.

The seventies were a period of steady growth for heavy industry. The output of the means of production increased as much as in the previous 20 years. Electric power generation doubled compared with the sixties. The country's single power grid was augmented by the addition to it of the combined power grid of Siberia.

Unique hydropower units were commissioned at the Sayan-Shushenskoye, Ust-Ilimsk, Nurek, Inguri, Dnieper, Nizhnekamsk, and other hydroelectric stations. Giant thermal power stations were completed at Zaporozhye and Uglegorsk. The nuclear power industry is expanding at a fast rate. New power reactors have been put into operation at the Leningrad, Chernobyl, Kursk, Beloyarsk, Armenian, and Bilibino nuclear power stations. The nuclear power industry is getting powerful up-to-date machinery: *Atomash*, the main supplier of nuclear steam-generating installations, has started production.

The country's metallurgy has been further reinforced. In the past ten years the national economy received 460 million tons of steel more than in the previous decade. A vast development programme has been carried out in the engineering industry. Its output in 1980 was 2.7 times greater than in 1970; instrument-making had increased 3.3-fold, and the output of computer facilities, 10-fold.

There have been appreciable quantitative and qualitative changes in the chemical and petrochemical industries. The output of these industries in 1971-1980 more than doubled. The rise in the production of chemical fertilisers was especially pronounced. At the same time the whole spectrum of chemical production is developing. The giant *Nitron* and *Polymer* amalgamations, the Tomsk Chemical Works, the Prikumsk, Omsk, and Shevchenko plastics plants, and several other new establishments form the core of the modern chemical industry.

The past two five-year plans notably strengthened the technical base of agricultural production. There were advances in the chemicalisation, overall mechanisation, and industrialisation of crop and livestock farming. Land improvement is being conducted on a large scale. To accomplish these by no means simple tasks, capital investments in the agrarian sector of the economy have been increased. In ten years they exceeded 300,000 million roubles. This is 2.3 times as much as in the previous decade.

More intensive farming techniques have made it possible—even with fewer personnel—to achieve a steady rise in production. In the past ten years production per hectare was 1.3 times greater than in the previous decade.

Another effect of more intensive methods has been a greater stability of farm production. Although three of the past five years were unfavourable, the grain harvest has averaged 205 million tons per year. The cotton crop in 1980 amounted to almost 10 million tons. The total agricultural production in the Ninth and Tenth Five-Year Plan periods was 272,000 million roubles greater than in the previous two five-year plan periods.

All this means, comrades, that the diverse and purposeful work of the Party and all the working people in the countryside, and the industries associated with it—work directed at advancing agriculture—is yielding tangible results.

The growth of Soviet economic might made it possible to accomplish a sweeping programme of improving the people's well-being in the seventies. The sum of 32,000 million roubles was allocated for state measures to increase wages and salaries, pensions, allowances, and so forth. Each such measure is a real and tangible step forward on the road most important to us—that of improving the Soviet people's life.

There have been increases in the minimum pay, and in the wages and salaries of the medium-income industrial and office workers in all branches of the national economy. In 1980 the average monthly wage exceeded 168 roubles and was nearly 1.4 times the 1970 figure. The remuneration of the collective-farm members rose at an even faster rate. Payments and benefits financed out of the social consumption funds nearly doubled.

The minimum pensions of industrial and office workers, professionals and collective farmers were increased in the Ninth and Tenth Five-Year Plan periods. The material and living conditions

of veterans of the Great Patriotic War were improved. Child allowances were introduced for low-income families. The stipends of students of colleges and universities, and specialised secondary and vocational schools, were increased. Schoolchildren in the first five forms began to receive their textbooks free of charge.

Directly related to living standards is the production of consumer goods. In the seventies it increased almost twofold over the previous decade. Nevertheless in this, as in food supplies to the population, there are problems and shortcomings, of which I will speak in greater detail later.

More housing was built in the seventies than the entire stock of urban housing that existed at the beginning of the sixties. The scale of housing construction is, comrades, a great social achievement of ours.

In sum, the main objective of the Party's economic strategy is being consistently implemented. Complex though the problems arising here are, the course charted by the Party is steadily being put into effect.

On the whole, the seventies may be summed up as a major step in developing the national economy of the country, of all the Union and autonomous republics.

The successes of the past decade were largely determined by the results of the Tenth Five-Year Plan. A general picture of what was accomplished is furnished by the following table:

Basic Indices of the Economic and Social Development
of the USSR under the Tenth Five-Year Plan Compared
to the Ninth
(average annual levels, thous. mln. roubles in comparable
prices)

	Ninth Five-Year Plan	Tenth Five-Year Plan	Tenth Five-Year Plan in % of Ninth
Gross social product	769	989	129
National income used for consumption and accumulation	329	409	124
National income resources allocated to consumption and non-productive construction	258	325	126
Industrial production	438	581	133
Agricultural production	113.7	123.7	109
Capital investments	98.6	126.8	129
Goods carried by all types of transport (thous. mln. ton-km)	4,625	5,833	126
Retail trade turnover	191.4	246.1	129
Social consumption funds	78.6	105.4	134

The socio-political meaning of these results is seen by the CPSU Central Committee in that steady economic progress served as a basis for the continued improvement of the entire system of social relations, of our socialist way of life. What has been accom-

plished is the result of the dedicated work of tens of millions of people, of the vigorous activities of Party organisations, the Soviets of People's Deputies, the trade unions and the Young Communist League, and of the scale of the socialist emulation movement. Today, as we look back on the past years, we have every reason to say that a gigantic job has been accomplished. Our great country has become stronger, richer, and more beautiful.

While paying tribute to the Soviet people's truly historic achievements, the CPSU Central Committee at the same time clearly discerns the difficulties, the shortcomings, and the unsolved problems. Not all of the targets set were achieved. Not all of the ministries and enterprises fulfilled their plans. There are still bottlenecks and disproportions in the national economy.

The reasons for this vary. They include the operation of objective factors, of circumstances beyond our control. They also include shortcomings in planning and management, and they include, too, an insufficiently exacting attitude on the part of a number of Party bodies and economic managers, breaches of discipline, and instances of mismanagement. But probably the most important reason is that the force of inertia, conventions, and habits from the period when the quantitative rather than the qualitative aspect of the work loomed the largest have still not been fully overcome.

All this was discussed in detail at the plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee. Specific decisions were taken to give a boost to the lagging branches and units of the economy. What is needed now is to use the experience gained for a still more determined drive to eliminate the obstacles impeding economic growth. There is only one way of achieving this: being more exacting, learning to work and to run things more efficiently. Learning this does not come easily. But we Communists are persistent and purposeful people. We have taken this path, and we shall not swerve from it.

2. THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE EIGHTIES AND OF THE ELEVENTH FIVE-YEAR PLAN

Comrades, the objectives fixed for the Eleventh Five-Year Plan and the eighties are set forth in detail in the CPSU Central Committee's draft Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and the Period up to 1990. Upwards of 121 million people took part in discussing it. The draft received the wholehearted approval and support of the working class, the collective farmers, and the intelligentsia.

A large number of useful proposals, additions, and clarifications were put forward, and these will undoubtedly enrich the contents of the document. Allow me, from the platform of the Congress, to thank all the comrades—Communists and non-Party people alike—who took part in discussing the Guidelines.

The proprietary interest taken by millions of working people in the Party's socio-economic plans and their concern for affairs of the state are an expression of the genuinely democratic nature of the Soviet system. This is an important guarantee of the successful fulfilment of our plans.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF THE EIGHTIES AND THE MAIN OBJECTIVE OF THE ELEVENTH FIVE-YEAR PLAN

The country has entered the new decade with a powerful economic and scientific-technological potential, and with a multi-million army of well-trained and dedicated personnel. This determines our potentialities. At the same time requirements and the scale of investments necessary both for the national economy to function normally and for the Soviet people's mounting needs to be satisfied are also growing. And we will have to meet these production and consumer requirements in complex conditions.

A number of factors that tend to make economic development more complicated will, as you know, operate in the eighties. One of them is a decline in the growth of manpower resources. Another is the growth of expenditures due to developing the East and the North, and also the inevitable increase in spending on environmental protection. To this it must be added that there are quite a few old enterprises in need of cardinal reconstruction. Then, too, roads, transport, and communications are lagging behind the growing needs of the economy. Consequently, here too earnest efforts and big outlays are needed.

Built into the draft Guidelines is the continuity of the Party's economic strategy, and they likewise take account of the specific conditions in which our country will be developing. It is from this viewpoint that the aims of economic growth and the principal ways of achieving them have been defined.

"The central objective of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan," it is said in the draft, *"is to ensure the further improvement of the Soviet people's well-being on the basis of the steady and constructive development of the national economy, accelerated scientific and technological progress, the transition of the economy to the road of intensive development, the more rational utilisation of the country's production potential, the maximum saving of all types of resources, and an improvement in the quality of work."*

In accordance with the available estimates, the national income used for consumption and accumulation is to be increased by at least 40 per cent by 1990. Capital investments are to increase by just about as much. Under the Eleventh Five-Year Plan the national income is to increase by 18-20 per cent; industrial production, by 26-28 per cent, and agricultural production, by 12-14 per cent. The total capital investments under the Five-Year Plan are estimated at 711-730 thousand million roubles.

An express condition for accomplishing all the economic tasks—in production and the social sphere—is the development of heavy industry. This applies in particular to its basic branches and, first and foremost, to *fuel and power*. I shall not cite figures—you know them. I would merely like to emphasise that the task of improving the structure of the fuel and power budget is becoming ever more urgent. It is necessary to reduce the share of oil as fuel, to replace it with gas and coal, and to expand the nuclear power industry, including fast-neutron reactors, more rapidly. And, of course, the march of events calls for a continued quest for fundamentally new energy sources, and this includes laying the foundation of a nuclear fusion power industry.

I consider it necessary to single out a rapid increase in the production of Siberian gas as a task of prime economic and political importance. The deposits of the West Siberian region are unique. The biggest of them—at Urengoi—contains such gigantic resources that it can for many years meet the country's domestic and export needs, including exports to capitalist countries. The production of gas and oil in West Siberia, and their transportation to the European part of the country, have to be made most important elements of the energy programme in the Eleventh Five-Year Plan and also in the Twelfth. Such is the view of the Party's Central Committee, and, I trust, it will be supported by the Congress.

We expect the other interested socialist countries to participate in this project, and, for that matter, in developing the nuclear power industry. This would be of substantial importance to our entire community.

If we take a long-term view, the question of synthetic liquid fuel production on the basis of coal from the Kansk-Achinsk coal-field should also be carefully studied.

The new five-year plan provides for big allocations to the development of *metallurgy*, ferrous and non-ferrous. We will, of course, put into operation new metallurgical capacities. But there is also another way of overcoming the shortage of metal—the more competent and fuller utilisation of what is produced.

Just halving losses and waste in metal-working would be equivalent to a 10 per cent increase in making rolled iron and steel products. A sizeable saving can be achieved by reducing losses in the metallurgical industry itself and also losses of metal through corrosion. Then too, just think of the effect that would be achieved on a countrywide scale by reducing the weight of machine tools and equipment, or improving the quality of the metal and fabricated metal products, or, say, expanding the production of metal substitutes. There is ample scope here for our scientists, designers, and innovators. Of course, all this also requires investments, efforts, and some time. But much less than endlessly increasing the production of metal.

The new five-year plan will be a serious test for our *builders*. A characteristic feature of the plan is the maximum concentration

of efforts on the speedy completion and commissioning of the enterprises that can assure the biggest increase in production and eliminate bottlenecks. We have already taken this course, and it has to be followed unswervingly.

I feel I must dwell specially on the performance of *transport*. In view of the serious character and scale of the problems that had accumulated in transport, we concluded that they could be solved only on the basis of a long-term comprehensive programme. The framing of such a programme is envisaged in the Guidelines.

More than half of the entire goods traffic is handled by the railways. The allocations for their development in the five-year period that has begun are being increased by more than 30 per cent. This will make it possible to modernise rolling stock and improve track facilities. It is important to concentrate on expanding station track facilities—this is an economical and quick way of increasing the traffic capacity of the railways.

The programme has to provide for the greater integration of all types of transport—railway, road and air, sea and river, and pipeline. The relocation of the power industry and raw materials base to the East necessitates expediting the development of roads, pipelines, and airports in Siberia and the Far East.

Like many other problems, the transport problem cannot be solved in isolation. Reducing transport costs is a big national problem. The road to its solution runs through the rational location of productive forces, optimal patterns of freight traffic and the exclusion of backhaul.

And, of course, there is a need for the serious improvement of passenger traffic by cutting timetable disruptions to a minimum, making railway stations and airports more comfortable, and raising the general standard of services.

The CPSU Central Committee calls on all the workers of the power industry, metallurgy, and other branches of the heavy industry, builders, and transport workers to mark the new five-year plan with innovative, shock-style work, work for the good of the country.

Comrades, every area of the economy faces its current tasks and specific problems. But there are problems that extend to all the spheres of the national economy, and the most important of them is to complete the switchover to primarily intensive development.

Making the economy more intensive and efficient—if translated into the language of practical deeds—consists above all in having the production output grow faster than the input, in achieving more while employing relatively fewer resources in production. The planning, the scientific and technological and the structural policy have to be subordinated to solving this problem. Economic methods and management policy likewise have to contribute to efficiency. Allow me to express confidence that this presentation of the problem will be fully approved by our Party Congress.

The Congress delegates will listen to and discuss the report of Comrade N. A. Tikhonov, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, concerning the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and the Period up to 1990. For my part, I would like to voice some considerations of principle relevant to our economic policy both in the coming five years and throughout the entire decade that has begun.

TO MAKE FULLER AND MORE EFFICIENT USE OF THE PRODUCTION POTENTIAL

Truly enormous resources have been involved in the national economy. It has been noted repeatedly that the Soviet Union has advanced to first place in the world in the output of many important products, which include oil and steel, cement and chemical fertilisers, wheat and cotton, main-line electric and diesel locomotives. We have the largest inventory of machine tools in the world. We have a greater number of engineers than other countries have. All this, comrades, is cause for pride.

But along with pride there must always be a deep sense of responsibility. Responsibility for having this vast potential, built up by the Soviet people, utilised in the most rational way, with maximum results.

Compared with the best indicators in the world, we use more raw materials and energy per unit of the national income. This being so, the end product from the already available resources can be boosted considerably.

I have already spoken of what can be achieved by a more rational and thrifty use of metal. This fully applies to practically all types of resources—whether they be ores, timber, or building materials. Or take oil. There are enormous possibilities in increasing the rate of its extraction from oil fields. Very much can be achieved by improving engines, and switching road transport to diesel and gaseous fuel.

A new approach is evidently needed in the extracting industries in general. They already absorb the lion's share of capital investments, yet the demand for raw materials and energy agents will increase. Consequently, the successes of the national economy as a whole will depend in a large measure on making the extracting industries more efficient. The road to this runs through accelerating scientific and technological progress, through the comprehensive, thorough-going processing of mineral resources, and through the broader re-utilisation of resources.

These tasks are topical because they concern non-renewable resources. We are responsible for their proper and thrifty utilisation not only to the present, but also to future generations. And no one has the right to forget this.

Big potentialities are inherent in making better use of production plant—machinery, equipment, and transport facilities. Our efforts should be concentrated on reducing idle time, raising the shift index, and developing energy- and material-saving technological processes.

A thrifty, economical attitude to labour resources is particularly important in the conditions of the eighties. This is a complicated matter, which calls for solving many problems of an economic, technical, social, and educational nature.

A concern for saving, for the fuller and more rational utilisation of what the country possesses, requires a new approach to many aspects of economic activity. Specifically, this requires perfecting and reinforcing the “top tiers” of corresponding industries: what is known as the fourth process stage in steel making, finishing work in construction, and the final operations in the light industry. They largely determine the quality—and, at times, the quantity—of products.

It was emphasised at several plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee that our further forward movement will increasingly depend on the skilful and efficient utilisation of all the available resources—labour, fixed assets, fuel and raw materials, and the produce of the fields and livestock farms.

It is within our powers now, comrades, to cope with the biggest and most complex tasks. But economic policy is coming to hinge on a matter that would seem simple and quite routine—a thrifty attitude to social property, and an ability to make full and rational use of everything we have. It is on this that the initiative of work collectives and the Party’s mass activities should be concentrated. It is on this that technological policy, investment policy, and the system of planning and accounting indicators should be concentrated.

The Central Committee of the Party calls on the Congress delegates to approve this conclusion as a most important principle in the economic strategy of the CPSU for the coming period.

An economy must be economical—that is dictated by the times.

TO BRING ALL BRANCHES OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY TO THE FOREMOST FRONTIERS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The conditions in which the national economy will be developing in the eighties make the acceleration of scientific and technological progress ever more pressing. There is no need to persuade anyone of the great importance of science. The Communist Party proceeds from the premise that building up a new society without science is simply inconceivable.

The CPSU Central Committee urges that the role and responsibility of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR be further enhanced,

and that the organisation of the entire research system be improved. The system must be much more flexible and mobile, intolerant of any inefficient laboratories and institutes. More consideration should be given, also, to the needs of science, to providing scientific institutions with equipment and instruments, and to expanding pilot-plant production.

The country is badly in need of having "big science"—in addition to working on fundamental problems—concentrate its efforts in a larger measure on solving key economic problems and on discoveries that could bring about truly revolutionary changes in production.

Clearly formulating the practical problems requiring the maximum attention of scientists is, above all, the job of the central planning and economic bodies, and of the State Committee for Science and Technology. At the same time science itself should be a constant "trouble-maker", pointing to the areas where there are signs of stagnation and backwardness, where the present level of knowledge could secure faster and more successful advancement. Thought should be given to ways of turning this work into an integral part of the management mechanism.

A crucial, most vital area today is the application of scientific discoveries and inventions. Research and designing has to be integrated more closely with production—economically and organisationally. We have fine examples of this: the Likhachov Automobile Plant in Moscow, the Leningrad Optical and Mechanical Amalgamation and the *Elektrosila* electrical engineering plant in Leningrad, the Paton Institute in Kiev, and many others.

But one still often encounters intolerable delays in introducing promising innovations into production, be it continuous steel casting or powder metallurgy, unique direct-current transmission lines or the production of highly durable artificial fibres. It is essential to find out the reasons why we at times forfeit our priority and spend a great deal of money for the purchase abroad of machines and technologies that we can well produce ourselves, and often of a higher quality at that.

The personal responsibility of the heads of government departments, enterprises, and institutes for manufacturing new types of products and introducing new, advanced technologies has to be enhanced. Everything that tends to make the process of introducing novelties difficult, slow, and painful, has to be removed. Workers in production must be vitally interested in making quicker and better use of the fruits of the thought and work of scientists and designers. Solving this problem is, of course, not a simple matter—it requires discarding outdated habits and indicators. But it is absolutely essential for the country, for the people, for our future.

Another point is the level of requirements with regard to the quality of products. These ought to be the highest requirements, it seems to me. We cannot and must not accept anything less than the highest world and domestic standards. We must get ourselves

accustomed to this and work for this, firmly brushing aside everything that is outdated, obsolescent, everything that life itself has cast aside.

And one thing more. In dealing with the tasks we have set ourselves, we can no longer tolerate any lagging behind of the research or design facilities of several industries—the light, food, and medical industries—and of agricultural and certain other types of engineering. It would probably be worthwhile for the Academy of Sciences, the State Committee for Science and Technology, and the ministries to carry out an assessment of the research and design facilities of various industries, and to submit proposals for a certain regrouping of scientific forces. Here we are also justified in counting on assistance from industries having especially powerful research facilities, including the defence industries.

In short, comrades, the close integration of science and production is an imperative of the contemporary epoch. The CPSU Central Committee is convinced that workers in science and technology, engineers and designers, the heads of industries and production units will do everything to meet this demand.

The cornerstone of scientific and technological progress is the advancement of science. But it is *engineering* above all that can open the doors to the new. Everything novel created by scientific and technological thought should be assimilated without delay by engineering and embodied by it in highly efficient and reliable machines, instruments, and production lines. Truly revolutionary opportunities have been opened up by the development and application of miniaturised control computers and industrial robots. They must be employed on the broadest possible scale.

Today, as we look five or ten years ahead, we must not forget that it is in those years that the economic structure the country will have in the 21st century will be established. It should embody the basic features and ideals of the new society, be in the forefront of progress, and symbolise the integration of science and production, the unbreakable unity of creative thought and creative work.

THE MAIN TRENDS IN IMPROVING THE PEOPLE'S WELL-BEING

Comrades, the Party is putting forward a sweeping programme of further improving the people's well-being in the Eleventh Five-Year Plan period and the eighties in general. This programme calls for improving all aspects of the Soviet people's life—consumption and housing, cultural and recreational facilities, working and living conditions.

The share of the consumption fund in the national income is to be increased in 1985 to 77.3 per cent. Let me remind you that in 1980 it was 75.3 per cent. The social consumption funds are to grow substantially. Upwards of 16,000 million roubles are to be set aside in the five-year plan for centralised measures to increase

wages and salaries, and other payments and benefits to the population. There are to be increases in the minimum retirement and disability pensions of industrial and office workers, professionals and collective farmers, and other measures to bring about a further improvement in the social services. State assistance to families with children is to be extended.

It is planned to begin so important a measure as raising minimum pay to 80 roubles a month, and other wages and salaries. The average monthly pay is to increase in 1981-1985 by 13-16 per cent to reach 190-195 roubles. The incomes of collective farmers from the collective farm are to rise by 20-22 per cent. It is proposed to extend several wage benefits—length-of-service increments in some eastern areas and regional premium rates.

Needless to say, improving the standard of living does not boil down to simply increasing money incomes. Today, in the view of the CPSU Central Committee, the task moving to the foreground is that of improving supplies of food and manufactured consumer goods to the population.

Production of foodstuffs has been growing throughout the past few five-year periods. At the same time the Party's Central Committee and the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, being well aware of the situation in each republic and each region, see that difficulties in supplying the population with food still exist. Steps were and are being taken in this connection along the lines both of internal resources and of foreign trade.

For a radical solution of this problem it has been found necessary to work out a special *food programme*. It should assure a considerable increase in the output of farm produce. It should integrate agriculture more closely with the industries concerned with storing and processing farm produce and, of course, with trade. In other words, its purpose is to solve the problem of assuring uninterrupted food supplies to the population in the shortest possible time. The work on this programme has just begun, and there are all the more reasons therefore to focus attention on the issues involved.

The food programme is based on the *further advancement of agriculture*. The main trends of the work to be accomplished in the agricultural field were outlined in the decisions of the July (1978) Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. They retain their validity.

The first objective is to increase the output of those agricultural products whose shortages are causing particularly disturbing interruptions in supplies. I refer above all to meat and other animal products.

Under the Eleventh Five-Year Plan it is proposed to increase meat production by more than three million tons to reach 18.2 million tons in 1985. But that is the minimum. The message of the Central Committee of the CPSU to the Party organisations in the republics, territories, and regions, to the district Party organisa-

tions, and to all the working people in the villages is this: livestock farming is today the main front in agriculture. It is necessary, comrades, to display the maximum persistence, the maximum enterprise and flexibility, to make use of all reserves and potentialities so as not only to fulfil but to substantially overfulfil the plans drawn up.

The main difficulty is the shortage of feed. The draft Guidelines provide for increasing the average yearly grain production in the eleventh five-year period to 238-243 million tons. Since the need for food grains is being fully satisfied, the emphasis must be on growing forage crops. Their share in the overall grain harvest has to be considerably increased.

More specifically, it is expedient to extend the planting of maize for grain, and also soya beans, in Moldavia, the southern regions of the Ukraine, the North Caucasus, Central Asia, and Transcaucasia. Many areas of the country have good conditions for growing peas, barley, and oats. In general, the time has come to begin switching over in a systematic and vigorous manner—with due consideration for physical and economic conditions—to a more rational grain crop structure. Science and the specialists have the biggest say in this matter.

Along with grain, it is, of course, necessary to increase the production of coarse and succulent fodder, and of protein additives. At the same time it is necessary to improve the breed and raise the productivity of livestock, and expand industrial poultry farming.

Comrades, as far as agriculture as a whole is concerned, the main problem facing it is the same as that facing other branches of the national economy—increasing efficiency and improving quality. We will continue allocating large financial and material resources to the countryside, and systematically regearing this branch along industrial lines. But the emphasis now—and this is a distinctive feature of the agrarian policy in the eighties—is being shifted to returns on capital investments, to making agriculture more productive, to deepening and improving its links with all branches of the agro-industrial complex.

It is a question of making much more efficient use of land, especially of reclaimed land, of machinery, fertiliser, and fodder, and also of increasing the yield of all crops. This calls for still greater attention to raising the skill of personnel, to scientific recommendations, to studying and utilising world and domestic expertise. It is also a question of supplying still more machinery to the farms, increasing the efficiency, service life, and reliability of the machines and equipment provided to the villages, improving the quality of crop protection, chemicals and fertilisers, and raising the standards of rural construction.

Finally, it is difficult to visualise an efficient agro-industrial complex and modern countryside without a developed road network, dependable transportation, without grain elevators, storehouses, storage sheds, refrigerators, and packing and crating facili-

ties. If any one of these links is not working well or lags behind, this inevitably affects the quantity and quality of the finished product.

Even today the volume of agricultural production makes possible an appreciable improvement in the supplies of many types of food products to the population. In the past five-year period, for instance, the average annual consumption of fruit and vegetables per capita rose much more slowly than their production. This was mainly due to losses. Therefore, while continuing to increase the production of fruit and vegetables, it is necessary to improve their transportation, storage, and processing. Tackling this is the direct job of the collective and state farms, and the Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Growing. The Party and the government bodies in the republics, territories, and regions, and the appropriate central departments, must give the new ministry maximum support.

Another job on the agenda is that of extending the variety and increasing the output of the most nutritious food products, and of improving their quality. This calls for extending the capacity of the processing industry and providing it with modern, highly-efficient equipment. It is necessary, I feel, to provide for a more appreciable growth of investments in these branches in the five-year plan. I am sure this will meet with the wholehearted approval of the Party and the people.

And, of course, an essential component of efficiency is the further improvement of the economic conditions in which the collective and state farms function. The success of all plans and all programmes depends on the attitude to the job, on the conscientious work of people engaged in agriculture, and, therefore, on the system of moral and material incentives.

The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers recently took a comprehensive decision on this matter. It censures the practice of unwarranted interference in the economic activities of the collective and state farms by certain Party and government officials. It is stated quite definitely in the decision that a unified plan of agricultural produce purchases for five years, broken down by the years, should be fixed for the republics, territories, regions, and districts, for the collective and state farms. At the same time a system of incentives is being introduced for farms that will increase their sales of produce to the state above the average annual level of the previous five-year period. This should link the material incentives more closely to ultimate results and, especially, to improved quality indicators.

It is very important that the measures listed be consistently put into effect.

The collective and state farms were and continue to be the mainstay of socialist agriculture. But this certainly does not mean that the potentialities of subsidiary individual holdings may be neglected. Experience shows that such holdings can be an important additional source in the supply of meat, milk, and some

other produce. Individually-owned vegetable and fruit gardens, poultry and cattle are part of our common wealth.

The CPSU Central Committee has deemed it necessary to take a decision on supplementary measures to develop subsidiary individual holdings. It provides for establishing conditions—both material and moral—that would make citizens more interested in subsidiary farming, and above all in raising livestock and poultry. Collective farmers and state-farm workers should be helped with regard to young stock and fodder. This applies both to those who own livestock and to those who are prepared to raise livestock belonging to collective or state farms. There is experience of this in a number of republics and regions, and it deserves to be spread.

Maximum support should also be given to farms run by industrial enterprises to supply their personnel.

Allow me, on behalf of the Congress, to express the deep conviction that in growing and processing farm produce, the working people of the countryside and industrial workers will redouble their efforts and reach new, advanced frontiers.

Prime significance in the Party's efforts to raise the standard of living should be attached to *expanding the production and improving the quality of consumer goods, and extending public services.*

We have achieved successes in this, and they are substantial. But at a Party congress it is important to concentrate on something else. For it is a fact that year after year plans for the production of many consumer goods have remained unfulfilled, especially in textiles, knitwear, leather footwear, furniture, and television sets. And the quality, finish, and assortment are not improved as they ought to be. In all these matters things must be put right without delay.

It is necessary to provide for equipping light industry with modern plant, for improving the supply of raw and other materials to it, and for perfecting the industry's planning and management. The working and living conditions of light industry personnel have to be improved. Trade must have a bigger say in determining the variety and quality of goods. It is also necessary to improve the technical equipment of communal services and public utility facilities, to distribute them throughout the country more evenly, and to train skilled personnel for them.

The programme for expanding consumer goods production and services outlined in the Guidelines assigns a big role to the heavy industries. They produce more than half of the consumer goods other than food.

Not so long ago there was a change in the management structure of the chemical industry. This has a direct bearing on the matter I am speaking about. We look to the new Ministry of the Chemical Industry for substantial advances in the production of synthetic fabrics and fibres, plastics, dyestuffs and other materials

needed to increase the quantity and—most important of all—improve the quality of consumer goods.

And, finally, local initiative is tremendously important. In no other sphere of the national economy do local potentialities and local reserves appear to play as large a role as in satisfying everyday consumer demand and in providing the population with services. It is necessary for the Soviets of People's Deputies at all levels to take concrete measures to improve the production and sale of manufactured goods, and to extend public services.

As you know, comrades, the draft Guidelines for the next five-year plan envisage a certain acceleration of group "B" production—its growth rate will somewhat exceed that of group "A". That is a good thing. What is needed is to create truly modern production of consumer goods and services, meeting the people's needs.

To conclude this topic, I would like to step beyond the boundaries of economic problems as such and to put the matter in a broader perspective. What we are discussing—food products, other consumer goods, and services—are part of the everyday life of millions upon millions of people. People go to shops, canteens, laundries, and cleaners every day. What can they buy? How are they welcomed? How are they spoken to? How much time do they spend on all sorts of household chores? It is on the strength of how these problems are solved that people largely judge our work. They judge it strictly, exactly. And this should be remembered, comrades.

Concrete concern for the concrete person, for his needs and requirements is the alpha and omega of the Party's economic policy. I am reminding you of this to re-emphasise a simple but very important point: the production of goods for the population and the expansion of consumer services are a prime Party concern. And that is how they should be treated.

TO PERFECT THE METHODS OF GUIDING THE ECONOMY

Comrades, solving the problems facing us and utilising the potentialities at our disposal depend to a large extent on the standards of guidance of the national economy, the standards of planning and management. This, no doubt, is keenly appreciated by every economic manager and every Party functionary.

The importance of discipline, the importance of personal responsibility have increased many times over in present-day conditions. This is especially true of the responsibility of the leading economic, government, and Party personnel. The interests of the state as a whole must always come before the interests of individual ministries and enterprises. Powers—and big powers at that—are vested in leaders so that they could make full use of them. But, in so doing, every leader must always remember his lofty responsibility as well—his responsibility to the men and women

he has been entrusted with leading, his responsibility to the Party and the people.

The first point I want to speak about is responsibility for state plan fulfilment. The Party has always regarded the plan as law. And not just because it is approved by the Supreme Soviet. The plan is law because only its observance assures the harmonious functioning of the national economy. Let us speak frankly: this axiomatic truth has begun to be forgotten. The practice of downward plan revision has become widespread. Such a practice disorganises the economy, demoralises personnel, and accustoms them to irresponsibility.

I am least of all inclined to adopt a formal posture. There may be rare occasions, and we do have them, when plan amendment is necessary. But they have to be precisely rare occasions, exceptions. When, however, exceptions crop up more and more often, this gives rise to understandable concern. Is it not too often that we follow the lead of those who would like to make their lives easier—be listed as leading workers and receive bonuses without actually fulfilling plans.

The time has, evidently, come to make requirements stricter both as regards plan fulfilment and the quality of the plans themselves. A plan must, unquestionably, be realistic and balanced. But it must just as unquestionably be fulfilled.

Another pressing task is to overcome the lack of coordination in the activities of various departments. At the 25th Congress of the CPSU we spoke of the need to set up a system for the management of groups of related and interconnected industries. With this purpose in view, integrated inter-industry units have been set up at the State Planning Committee of the USSR. A commission of the Council of Ministers of the USSR on the development of the West Siberian oil and gas complex, and also a Tyumen-based inter-departmental territorial commission under the State Planning Committee of the USSR, were formed recently. These are steps in the right direction. They help better to manage territorial-industrial complexes and to assess and harmonise regional and sectoral interests. Such work should be continued.

I would like to speak especially about management at the amalgamation and enterprise level. Different variants and different schemes have, as you know, been tried out. A great deal of diversified experience has been accumulated. This experience makes it clear that the quest has to be continued. The overall trend of this quest, it seems, is towards greater independence of the amalgamations and enterprises, and greater powers and responsibility of economic managers.

It goes without saying that a proper economic situation and organisational and managerial relations have to be created at the same time. This is envisaged in the decisions taken by the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of the USSR in 1979 on further improving the economic mechanism and the plan-

ning system. They have to be consistently put into effect. And at the same time it is necessary to proceed further, solving the problems that have accumulated.

It should be said in general that improving the organisation of management structures is a matter that does not tolerate routine. The living, developing organism of economic management cannot be adapted to established, customary forms. On the contrary, forms have to be made to fit the changing economic tasks. That is the only way the matter should be approached.

The problems arising in our life dictate the need to advance theory, the science of economics, and to bring it closer to the requirements of economic practice. The creative potential of the whole of our society should be mobilised. Centrally and locally, in all the links and in all the cells of the national economy, there has to be a growing understanding of current problems, and available resources have to be identified and utilised more effectively.

What is meant here is the evolution of a style of work that would organically combine efficiency and discipline with bold initiative and enterprise; a practical and businesslike approach with dedication to lofty goals; a critical attitude to shortcomings, with implicit faith in the historical advantages of the path we have chosen.

Comrades, the problems of economic management are not just economic, but political, Party problems. It has long been known that Party slogans and programmes materialise in mass activities. "The more profound the change we wish to bring about," Lenin said, "the more must we rouse an interest and an intelligent attitude towards it, and convince more millions and tens of millions of people that it is necessary." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 498). The economic policy the Party is proposing for the Eleventh Five-Year Plan and the eighties reflects the Soviet people's fundamental, vital interests. Combined and merged with the creative initiative and energy of the masses, it assures the steady progress of our society on the road of raising the standard of living and building the material and technical basis of communism.

III. SOVIET SOCIETY'S SOCIO-POLITICAL AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY

Comrades, the interrelation of economic progress with socio-political and cultural progress grows ever closer under the conditions of mature socialism. With this as its point of departure, the Central Committee of the CPSU has kept questions related to the development of Soviet society's socio-class and national structure

and to the improvement of the socialist way of life, our statehood and democracy constantly within the orbit of its attention.

1. DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIO-CLASS STRUCTURE AND OF THE RELATIONS AMONG THE PEOPLES OF THE USSR

The *coming closer together of all the classes and social groups of Soviet society* continued in the 1970s. This is an objective but by no means a spontaneous process. Here a significant role is played by the social policy pursued by the Party and the Government. Our aim is to create a society in which people will not be divided into classes. And it may be said quite definitely that we are gradually and surely advancing towards that great objective.

What gives us grounds for this conclusion?

The *working class* plays an ever larger role in the life of society. It is growing numerically. Today nearly 80 million people, or two-thirds of the employed population, are workers. This means that in our country the working class is not only the largest class numerically but constitutes the majority of the working people. The proportion of workers is steadily growing in Party, trade union, and YCL committees and in higher and local government bodies. This is how it should be, comrades, and we welcome it.

Unquestionably, the consolidation of the leading role played by the working class is linked to the rise of its ideological, political, educational, and professional level. Ten years ago only a little more than half of the workers had a secondary (complete or incomplete) or higher education. Today three-fourths have such an education. It is gratifying that the vocational training of the young people replenishing the working class is improving. In the 1960s only one-third of our young men and women learned a trade at vocational schools, but within just the period of the Tenth Five-Year Plan trades were learned by 12,500,000 persons, that is to say, by two-thirds of the workers who entered production. The very character of the labour of the modern worker is changing—it is increasingly acquiring an intellectual content.

With the industrialisation of agriculture far-reaching changes are taking place in the life of the *collective-farm peasantry*. Step by step their labour is drawing closer to that of factory workers. The number of machine operators and other workers servicing advanced technology is growing in the countryside. It is not surprising, therefore, that the proportion of collective farmers with a secondary (complete or incomplete) or higher education has grown from 39 to over 60 per cent within ten years.

The social structure of the countryside is greatly influenced by the drawing together of the two forms of socialist property and by the development of mixed economic organisations involving collective farms and state enterprises. The changes in the forms of

organising and paying for the labour of collective farmers and the fact that they now enjoy the same social insurance as factory and office workers are of no little importance. All this, comrades, leads to what Lenin termed the erasure of the distinctions in the social status of the worker and the peasant.

Of course, we still have many backward farms and many villages that have to be reconstructed, modernised, and provided with new services. Without this there can be no stable work collectives and we cannot make effective use of the countryside's present production potential for the successful fulfilment of the food programme. In short, much effort, time, and resources are still needed in order to improve the everyday services and cultural facilities in rural communities and overcome the essential differences between town and countryside.

But already today it is a pleasure to visit many collective and state farms. It is a pleasure to enter spacious, bright houses, where town amenities are adapted to the conditions and needs of rural life. The new character of work and the modern life and appearance of such villages are precisely, comrades, the beneficial fruits of our social policy.

In the period under review our *intelligentsia* has grown the quickest numerically. Today one in every four working persons in our country is linked basically to work by brain. The intelligentsia is playing an ever bigger role not only in science, education, and culture, but also in material production, in the life of society as a whole.

In turn, labour by hand and labour by brain are fusing ever more closely in the production activity of millions of workers and collective farmers. Many of them are innovators and inventors, authors of articles and books, statesmen and public figures. They are highly cultured intellectuals in the true sense of the word.

In evaluating the experience of our society's development over the past few decades, I think we can assume that a classless structure of society will take shape mainly within the historical framework of mature socialism.

The modern working class has been and remains the motive force of this process, its "social intellect and social heart", to quote Marx. Its revolutionary ideology and ethics, its collectivist psychology, and its interests and ideals are now being adopted by all the strata of Soviet society.

Naturally, the erasure of the distinctions between classes sets social policy new tasks. That policy is concentrating more and more on overcoming difficulties that range beyond individual classes, on problems requiring the closest attention to the features and interests of each group of our society.

In this context I should like to underscore the need to *even out social distinctions on, so to speak, the territorial plane*. The cultural amenities and everyday life of people differ in the various regions of our huge country. These are the distinctions that, more

often than not, complicate the manpower problem in a number of places. Implementation of the programmes for the development of Western Siberia, the zone of the Baikal-Amur Railway, and other areas in the Asiatic part of the country has stepped up the flow of people to these places. Nonetheless, to this day many people prefer to move from north to south and from east to west, although the rational location of productive forces requires movement in the opposite directions.

It is sometimes argued that higher wage and salary increments in Siberia, the Soviet Far East, and the northern regions should stop people from moving out of these regions. Increments must be made, of course. But this alone will not solve the problem. More often than not a person leaves Siberia not because the climate is not suitable or the pay is small, but because it is harder to get housing there and to put a child in a kindergarten, and cultural centres are few and far between. That is why in the next five years we plan a faster rate in building housing and the entire socio-cultural complex in these areas and a larger supply of goods for which there is a mass demand. You will all agree that the situation there must be changed, and that this must be done as quickly as possible.

In Central Asia and some parts of the Caucasus there is, on the contrary, a surplus of manpower, particularly in the countryside. This means that more inducements must be given to attract people living in these places to move to the territories now being developed. And it goes without saying that here the industries needed by the national economy must be enlarged and more facilities opened to train skilled workers of the indigenous nationality, chiefly from among rural youth.

Acting on the instructions of the 25th Congress, the Central Committee gave serious attention to charting and implementing an effective *demographic policy*, to population problems that have lately grown acute. The principal way to resolve these problems is to show more concern for the family, for newlyweds and, chiefly, for women. Everyone will agree that in many cases it is not easy to combine the duties of a mother with work in production and active participation in public life.

In the period of the Tenth Five-Year Plan steps were taken to improve working conditions for women, the facilities for family leisure, and everyday and cultural services. However, it must be said bluntly that so far there has been no perceptible change. What is needed is wider and more effective measures. These, as you all know, are charted in the Guidelines. I am speaking of the introduction of a partially paid leave of up to one year to look after a baby, a shorter working day for mothers of small children, an extension and improvement of the network of children's pre-school institutions, schools with extended-day groups, and all the everyday services. It is planned to increase the allowances for children, especially for the second and third child. Understandably, however

much we would like to, we cannot do everything overnight. But we shall perseveringly look for ways of resolving all these problems. At the same time, of course, close attention must be given to the specific situation in the different republics and regions.

A few words about yet another group of the population—pensioners. In the 1970s, their number rose from 40 to 49 million. The Party and the Government are showing constant concern for the health and well-being of labour and war veterans. Pensions and allowances alone now amount to over 43,000 million roubles annually. Moreover, we have lately increased the size of pensions. However, these increases did not extend to persons who had retired earlier. Beginning with the next five years this situation will be corrected gradually.

But there is something else that must be done—our veterans must be drawn more widely into work, particularly in the services industry. Needless to say, this should be done to the extent of their capabilities and with account taken of the needs of the national economy. In the present situation this is a very important task.

Comrades, *the fraternal friendship among all the peoples of our multinational country is growing steadily stronger.* It is our policy to increase the material and cultural potential of each republic and, at the same time, make the maximum use of this potential for the balanced development of the country as a whole. On this path our achievements have been truly historic.

Ever since Soviet power was established our economic and social policy has been framed in such a way as to bring the outlying regions of old Russia inhabited by national minorities up to the development level of the central regions as quickly as possible. This task has been successfully accomplished. Here a key role was played by close cooperation among all the nations of the country and, chiefly, by the disinterested assistance of the Russian people. Comrades, there are no backward ethnic outskirts today.

Take Kazakhstan. Its economy and culture are blossoming. More than 250 modern industrial enterprises, large workshops, and other production facilities were built there in the period of the Tenth Five-Year Plan alone. It is becoming customary for Kazakhstan to grow 16 million tons of cereals annually. Together with the cereal output of the Russian Federation and the Ukraine this forms the basis of the nation's food stock.

You all know of the striking socio-economic changes that have taken place in the Central Asian republics. I shall give you just one fact. Prior to the October Revolution the tiller of the soil knew nothing save exhausting manual labour, but today the energy supply per 100 hectares of arable land is double the nation's average.

The scale of the changes that took place in huge areas of the Russian Federation in the 1970s is impressive. A tangible contribution to the nation's economy is being made by the people of the Ukraine and Byelorussia. The economy of the Transcaucasian re-

publics is developing rapidly. Noteworthy advances have been made in boosting the efficiency and quality of work in the Baltic republics and Moldavia.

On the whole, comrades, even a simple listing of the resolutions that have been passed in the period under review and of the measures mapped out in these resolutions clearly shows the scope and diversity of the questions handled by the CPSU Central Committee and the Government in resolving pressing problems of the development of all the republics and consolidating the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. These include the new law on autonomous areas in the Russian Federation, the enlargement of the irrigation network in Central Asia, the development of reindeer-breeding in the Far North and of sheep-breeding in Kirghizia, the conservation of the resources of Lake Sevan, and many other important matters. The CPSU Central Committee's resolutions on the economic and cultural development of Abkhazia, Tuva, and Buryatia, and of the regions inhabited by the peoples of the North are being put into effect consistently.

I should like specifically to mention the non-chernozem belt of the Russian Federation. For a number of reasons this region found itself in more difficult conditions than some others. The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government have charted and set in motion sweeping measures to develop the non-chernozem belt. This task is so complex and urgent that it should be tackled jointly by all the republics and within the shortest possible span of time. We have experience of this sort of work, and it is an extensive experience. Let us recall, say, the Turkestan-Siberia Railway and the Urals-Kuzbas projects, the development of virgin lands, and the reconstruction of Tashkent. The development of the non-chernozem belt must proceed in the same spirit of teamwork and with similar vigour.

The Soviet nations are now more closely united than ever. Naturally, this does not imply that all the problems of the relations between nationalities have been resolved. The dynamics of the development of a large multinational state like ours gives rise to many problems requiring the Party's tactful attention.

The population of the Soviet republics is multinational. All nations, of course, have the right to be adequately represented in their Party and Government organs. Needless to say, the competence and ideological and moral make-up of each candidate must be carefully scrutinised.

In recent years there has been a considerable growth in some republics of the number of citizens of non-indigenous nationalities. These have their own specific needs in terms of language, culture, and everyday life. The Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the republics and the territorial and regional Party committees should go deeper into these matters and opportunely suggest ways of meeting these needs.

The national sensibilities and national dignity of every person are respected in our country. The CPSU has fought and will always resolutely fight against such attitudes alien to the nature of socialism as chauvinism or nationalism, against any nationalistic aberration, be it, say, anti-Semitism or Zionism. We are against tendencies aimed at an artificial obliteration of national identities. And, to a similar extent, we consider their artificial inflation inadmissible. It is the Party's sacrosanct duty to educate the people in a spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, to foster a sense of pride in belonging to the great integral Soviet Union.

Experience shows that the intensive economic and social development of each of our republics speeds up the process of their coming closer together in every field. National cultures are thriving and enriching one another, and we are witnessing the moulding of the culture of the whole Soviet people—a new social and international community. In our country this process is taking place as it should take place under socialism—on the basis of equality, fraternal cooperation, and free will. The Party makes sure that these Leninist principles of its nationalities policy are observed. We will never depart from them.

2. STRENGTHENING THE MATERIAL AND INTELLECTUAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE SOCIALIST WAY OF LIFE AND THE MOULDING OF THE NEW MAN

Comrades, the restructuring of all social relations along the collectivist lines implicit in the new system is consummated in the period of developed socialism. This restructuring encompasses the material and intellectual spheres, the entire way of our life.

Soviet society is a society of *working* people. Now, as before, the Party and the Government are doing much to make the work of people not only more productive but also more meaningful, interesting, and creative. To a great extent this will be fostered by the eradication of manual, unskilled, and arduous physical labour. Millions of people in our country are still engaged in such labour. This is not only an economic but a serious social problem. To resolve it means to remove the substantial barriers to the conversion of labour into the prime vital need of every person.

Socialism gives rise to a new attitude to work. Socialist emulation has been and remains one of the most vivid manifestations of this attitude. These is not a single factory, collective farm, or construction project that does not feel its life-giving breath. The magnitude of this patriotic movement is impressive: today it involves more than a hundred million people. It gives shape to exemplary understanding of social duty, heroism and dedication in work. Many of the front-ranking working people who have distinguished them-

selves in this movement and are known throughout the country are in this hall today.

Socialist emulation spells out innovation by the people. Underlying it are the people's high level of consciousness and initiative. It is this initiative that helps to reveal and tap the potentialities of production, and enhance efficiency and quality. But in practice—there's no hiding it—socialist commitments are sometimes not worked out from below but handed down from above, from higher bodies. This is prejudicial to the very spirit of labour emulation. In it the emphasis should be on upwardly revised plans and other similar initiatives going from below to the top: worker-team-factory-industry. Only then should these initiatives be dovetailed with the state plan. This accords with the nature of socialist emulation and with the planned character of our economy.

Everybody appreciates that people work better and with more pleasure where they sense constant efforts to improve the conditions of their work and life. A factory or a farm is a home where a person spends at least one-third of his life. There everything should be convenient and modern—from the workplace to lockers and canteens.

Regretfully, we still have economic executives who feel that these are minor matters. This attitude is fundamentally wrong and harmful. The Political Bureau of the Central Committee has time and again taken such executives, including ministers, to task. There must be rigid control to make sure that the resources allocated for the social development of industrial enterprises, towns and villages are used exactly for what they are designated, in full, and within the established timetable. Reports from the localities on the commissioning of new industrial projects usually do not indicate what has been done for those who will work there, how many houses, kindergartens, libraries, and medical facilities have been built. Let us agree that such reports will be considered valid only if the programme for housing and amenities envisaged in the plan for the given project has been fulfilled. I think the Congress will support this formulation of the question.

Comrades, *distribution* has been and remains a sphere to which the Party accords special attention. The orientation and depth of the changes taking place in this sphere are illustrated, for example, by the following facts. During the 1970s the number of families of factory and office workers, professionals, and collective farmers in which the income exceeded 100 roubles per month (in terms of per member of the family) almost trebled. The number of families in which the income (in the same terms) is less than 50 roubles per month has diminished in approximately the same proportion. In other words, we are seeing not only a rise but also a drawing closer together of the living standards of all groups of working people. This tendency will gather momentum—and the more efficiently everybody works the faster it will do so.

Under socialism the main criterion of distribution can only be work—its quantity and quality. Regretfully, this is not always the

case in practice. All sorts of levelling and instances of paying wages solely for appearing at work and not for its results, and the granting of undeserved bonuses—all this adversely affects production and the psychology of people.

Our system of material and moral incentives should always and everywhere ensure a just and objective evaluation of the labour contribution of each and every person. People who work conscientiously should be given every encouragement, while idlers and slackers should be left no loophole for living high on slipshod work. Those who want to live better should work more and better. I think this is clear to all.

We have no unemployment. The right to work is recorded in our Constitution and ensured in real terms. However, on the recommendation of many people the Constitution also records that shirking socially useful work is incompatible with the principles of socialism. This implies that all organisational, fiscal, and juridical levers should be used to close once and for all every opening for parasitism, bribery, profiteering, unearned incomes, and infringements upon socialist property.

The CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of the USSR have recently passed a decision on improving the work of the distributive industry and public catering, on raising the efficiency of their personnel and enlarging their material resources, and on straightening out the rules governing trade, the distribution of foodstuffs and manufactured goods. Moreover, concrete steps have been mapped out to put an end to machinations with scarce commodities, reinforce the efforts made by the relevant state agencies to stamp out all forms of abuse in this sphere, and tighten workers' control. I am sure that the people will wholeheartedly approve these steps.

One of the most noteworthy features of the Soviet way of life is the growth of the benefits that people get from *social consumption funds*. During the past five years they have increased by nearly one-third and this year alone they will amount to 121,500 million roubles. This is an enormous sum of money. It is spent on improving the living conditions of the people, on protecting their health, and on education, the upbringing of children, social security, and culture. It should be spent effectively, with the greatest benefit for the people.

Housing, as you know, is a major item of our social programme. As I have already noted, during the past five years housing construction has been proceeding on a huge scale; this scale will be maintained nationwide. At the same time, we know that many families still share flats with scant conveniences, and that many newly-weds wait for housing for years. And since this is still not a simple problem, it means that special attentiveness, fairness, and decency, if you like, are needed in the distribution of housing. Everywhere this distribution should involve public organisations and it should be supervised rigidly by them. Also, the building of

cooperative housing should proceed on a larger scale and its forms should be improved. At the same time, stricter demands should be made of people who take an irresponsible attitude to the use and maintenance of housing. I think the Fundamentals of Housing Legislation, the draft of which is now being discussed nationwide, will help to put things in order here.

In the period under review, the instructions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU concerning the *development of public education* have, on the whole, been successfully carried out.

A major goal has been achieved—the transition to compulsory universal secondary education has been consummated. Today the main thing is to improve the quality of instruction and of work-oriented and moral upbringing in schools, to do away with formalism in assessing the results of the work of teachers and pupils, strengthen the link of education with life in practical terms, and prepare schoolchildren better for socially useful work. Here, the decisive role is played by the teacher, of course. We should not stint concern for his work and everyday life, and for improving his qualifications. But then more demands are being made of his work.

Besides, the quality of school curricula and textbooks has to be improved. It has been correctly pointed out that they are much too complicated. This impedes instruction and places an excessive load on children. The Ministry of Education and the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences should waste no time correcting this situation.

The achievements of the Soviet system of higher and specialised secondary education are well known. During the past five years alone it has trained 10 million specialists for our national economy.

However, much in this system can and should be improved. I am referring mainly to the quality of instruction and to the strengthening of its link with production. Fuller use should be made of the scientific potential of institutions of higher learning in which nearly half of all our doctors and candidates of science are concentrated. Economic development is accompanied by changes in the demand for people specialising in one profession or another. This means that the system of planning the training of specialists at institutions of higher learning should respond quickly to these changes.

The 25th Congress called concern for the *health of Soviet people* one of the most important social tasks. In 1977 the CPSU Central Committee and the Government adopted a detailed decision on measures aimed at further improving the public health system. Its implementation is yielding results. Today, in the course of a single shift, our polyclinics can serve half a million more people than five years ago. Specialised medical care and the cardiological service have been considerably enlarged. Disease-prevention has grown more effective.

However, there are still many shortcomings. The work of polyclinics, prophylactic centres, and outpatient clinics, which serve 80 per cent of all sick people, should be substantially improved.

Regretfully, in some places they have lagged behind the potentialities of medicine, there is a shortage of personnel, especially of middle and junior level, the equipment is obsolete, and modern medicines are in short supply. Plans for the construction of hospitals and health-building centres fall behind schedule.

We highly value the honest and selfless work of our doctors, nurses, and other medical personnel. This makes our disappointment all the greater when letters come in about instances of medical personnel abusing their duties, of lack of consideration for people. The Ministry of Public Health, Party committees, the YCL, and the trade unions are obliged to take an implacable stand against such instances and extirpate them completely. Everything must be done to enable Soviet people to receive timely, skilled, and considerate medical care always and everywhere.

Concern for people's health is inseparable from the development of *physical culture and sport*. The Moscow Olympics strikingly showed the remarkable achievements of Soviet athletes. However, we have always been interested not only in athletic achievements but also, and above all, in giving physical culture and sport a mass character. The advances in this sphere are self-evident. Nonetheless, for most people sport is still only a spectacle. This situation should be corrected. Physical culture should be part of the everyday life of large segments of the population, particularly of children.

Comrades, the fact that the cultural life of Soviet society is becoming more diversified and richer is an unquestionable achievement of our workers in culture, of our *literature and art*.

It is the business of literary and art critics to state their professional judgements. But it seems to me that all readers, theatre and TV audiences, and radio fans feel that a new tide is rising in Soviet art. Many talented works have been produced in recent years—in all our republics. This concerns literature, the theatre, cinematography, music, painting and sculpture.

Stirring revolutionary themes continue to be heard in the work of our cultural workers. The images of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and many other dedicated revolutionaries and the heroic history of our country inspire them to create new interesting works in the most diverse genres of art. The works of authors devoted to the military theme foster love of country and staunchness in hardship.

Creative workers have been unquestionably successful in producing vivid images of our contemporaries. These move people, prompt debates, and make people think of the present and the future. The Party welcomes the civic passion and irreconcilability to shortcomings implicit in the finest works, art's active intervention in the solution of our society's problems. Remember what Mayakovsky wrote: "I want the State Planning Committee to sweat in debates, setting yearly assignments for me." It is gratifying that in recent years literature, cinematography, and the theatre have been raising serious problems over which it would not be out of order

for the State Planning Committee to do some sweating. And not only that committee.

The heroes of these works are people from different walks of life: a building team leader, a collective-farm chairman, a railway worker, an army officer, a pilot, or an eminent scientist. But in each of them the reader or the viewer sees his own thoughts and feelings, and the embodiment of the finest qualities of the Soviet character.

Soviet art could not fail to respond to the growing attention that our society is giving to questions of ethics. The relations among people at work and in everyday life, the complex inner world of the individual, and the latter's place on our restless planet are an inexhaustible field for artistic quests. Here it is important, of course, that the topicality of themes should not be used as a cover for drabness and mediocrity in art. The heroes of works of art should not withdraw into trivial affairs but live with the concerns of their country at heart, a life filled with endeavour and a persevering struggle for the triumph of justice and kindness.

On the contrary, ideological poverty, philosophical indiscrimina-tion, and a departure from a clear-cut class assessment of individual historical events and personalities may harm the creative work of even talented people. Our critics, literary journals, unions of workers in the arts and, above all, their Party organisations should be able to correct those who are carried away in one direction or another. And, it goes without saying, they should take an active, principled stand in cases when works appear that discredit our Soviet reality. On this point we should be firm. The Party was not and can never be indifferent to the ideological orientation of our art.

And one more point. One hardly needs to say how important it is that everything around us should bear the stamp of beauty and good taste. We are proud of the Olympic projects and some residential neighbourhoods in Moscow, the rejuvenated gems of the past and new architectural ensembles in Leningrad, and the new building projects of Alma-Ata, Vilnius, Navoi, and other towns. Nevertheless, as a whole urban development stands in need of greater artistic expressiveness and diversity. We should avoid cases such as that of the film character, who, by irony of fate, found himself in another town and was unable to distinguish either the house or the flat he got into from his own.

Soviet people have an immense craving for art. Everybody knows how difficult it is sometimes to get a ticket to a good play, buy an interesting book, or visit an exhibition. But this respect, this love for art places a great responsibility on the artist to his people. To live with the interests of the people, to share their joy and grief, to assert the truth of life and our humanist ideals, to be active in the building of communism—this is precisely what spells out the genuine national character and the genuine Party commitment in art.

True to the Leninist policy in culture, our Party takes a solicitous and respectful attitude to the artistic intelligentsia and orients it on the fulfilment of lofty creative tasks. This contributes to the further consolidation of the body of artistic workers and to the advancement of society's intellectual life. There is no doubt that Soviet workers in culture will gratify us with new artistic discoveries.

Comrades, the Soviet citizen is a conscientious worker, a person with a high level of political culture, a patriot, and an internationalist. He has been brought up by the Party, by the country's heroic history, by our entire system. He lives the full-blooded life of a builder of a new world.

Naturally, this does not mean we have resolved all the problems of *moulding the new man*. Here we are faced with quite a few problems. Upbringing is successful only when it rests on the solid foundation of socio-economic policy.

We have large material and intellectual potentialities for the ever fuller development of the individual, and we shall continue to increase these potentialities. However, it is important that each person should be able to utilise them intelligently. In the long run this depends on the interests and needs of the individual. For that reason our Party sees the active, meaningful shaping of these interests and needs as a major aim of its social policy.

Most Soviet people work honestly, with heart and soul. By right they enjoy—and do so reasonably—the many benefits that society gives them and look after and multiply our national wealth. But there are people who seek to give less to the state and take as much as they can from it. This is the sort of mentality that gives rise to egoism and philistinism, to avarice, and to indifference to the concerns and affairs of the people. Drinking inflicts considerable damage on society and painfully hurts the family, and, speaking frankly, it is still a serious problem. All work collectives, all public organisations, and all Communists should do everything to combat this ugly phenomenon.

As you can see, comrades, much remains to be done to perfect the socialist way of life, to extirpate all that hinders the moulding of the new man. This is an inalienable part of the social policy of the Party, whose aim is to promote the well-being and happiness of Soviet people.

3. THE CONSTITUTION OF THE USSR AND THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET POLITICAL SYSTEM

Comrades, the most significant changes in the economic, public, and intellectual life of Soviet society and the profoundly democratic character of the state of the whole people are telescoped in the new Constitution of the USSR. We all remember the tremendous

upsurge of the people's creative effort and civic activity generated in the course of the discussion of the draft Fundamental Law.

A new phase commenced in the work of the *Soviets of People's Deputies* with the adoption of the Constitution of the USSR and then of the constitutions of the Union and autonomous republics.

There has been a perceptible invigoration of the work of the highest bodies of state authority—the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Supreme Soviets of the republics. By coupling legislation, administration, and supervision, the Supreme Soviets actively guide the work of the Councils of Ministers, the ministries and the departments. This helps to identify and eliminate shortcomings in good time and enhances the general vitality of state life.

An immensely useful effect is produced by the present renewal of Soviet legislation on the basis of the Constitution. New laws are making it possible to regulate various aspects of social relations with greater precision and accuracy. The work of perfecting legislation will continue. Here there are three priority areas: management of the national economy, the exercise by citizens and public organisations of their Constitutional rights, and completion of the publication of the Code of Laws of the USSR.

Comrades, we have enacted quite a few good laws. Now it is chiefly a matter of their precise and steadfast implementation. Any law lives only when everybody everywhere complies with it.

There is much of interest and new in the work of the local Soviets. Without slackening attention to the local economy and services for the population, they are making a growing contribution to ensuring comprehensive economic and social development. They are more active in coordinating and controlling the work of the enterprises and organisations on their territory. This, comrades, is very important. The CPSU Central Committee supports precisely this orientation in the work of the local Soviets.

We have almost a million Communist deputies. They should use their prestige and experience to turn every session of the Soviet and every sitting of its standing commission into a council of the people in the true sense of the word, into a collective quest for the most correct solutions.

The essence of Soviet democracy, of democracy in action lies in concern for the common work, for the development of production, in comparing notes, in frank and principled criticism and self-criticism, and in promoting the socio-political activity of every citizen.

All-embracing *people's control* of the work of administrative bodies and officials is an essential component of Soviet democracy. Not a single violation, not a single case of abuse, wastage, or indiscipline should be overlooked by the people's control inspectors. The CPSU Central Committee orients them on more energetic and resolute action.

In strengthening socialist legality and law and order a great responsibility devolves on the *organs of justice, the courts, the procu-*

rator's office, and the Soviet militia. The professional knowledge of the officials of these organs should combine with civic courage, incorruptibility, and a sense of justice. Only people of this calibre can worthily discharge the important duties consigned to them. The Soviet people quite rightly expect that they should work with maximum efficiency, that each crime is properly investigated and those guilty of it punished according to their deserts. In this matter the organs maintaining law and order will have the total support of the Party and, I have no doubt, of all our people.

The intensity of the class struggle on the international scene makes high demands on the work of the *state security agencies* and on the Party staunchness, knowledge, and style of work of their personnel. The State Security Committee of the USSR operates efficiently, on a high professional level, and abides strictly by the provisions of the Constitution and the norms of Soviet legislation. It keeps a sharp and vigilant eye on the intrigues of imperialist intelligence services. It resolutely cuts short the activities of those who engage in anti-government, hostile actions and encroach upon the rights of Soviet people, upon the interests of Soviet society. The work that it is doing merits the deep gratitude of the Party, of all our people.

In the period under review the Party and the Government did not for a single day lose sight of questions related to *strengthening the nation's defence potential, its Armed Forces*. The international situation obliges us to do this.

The combat potential of the Soviet Armed Forces is a durable alloy of high technology, military skill, and indomitable morale. Sons and grandsons of heroes of the Great Patriotic War are now in the ranks of the defenders of the Soviet Union. They have not gone through the grim trials that fell to the lot of their fathers and grandfathers. But they are devoted to the heroic traditions of our army and our people. Whenever the interests of the nation's security and the defence of peace require it, and when victims of aggression have to be helped, the Soviet soldier appears before the world as a disinterested and courageous patriot and an internationalist prepared to face any hardship.

It so happens that the opening of our Congress coincides with Soviet Army and Navy Day. Permit me to extend warm congratulations to our country's glorious defenders on behalf of all the delegates. The Party's Central Committee is confident that they will continue dependably to guard the peaceful, constructive work of the Soviet people.

Comrades, the Constitution of the USSR has greatly enhanced the role of public organisations in the development of our democracy. The largest of these are the *trade unions*. Now that they have enrolled the millions of collective farmers, the trade unions embrace practically all the working people. They have exceedingly broad tasks and rights. They protect the interests of working people, take

part in resolving economic, social, and cultural problems, and do much to foster socialist emulation, invention, and innovation.

Still, I think I'll be making no mistake if I say that our trade unions sometimes lack initiative in exercising their broad rights. They do not always act with perseverance in questions concerning the fulfilment of collective agreements and the rules on labour safety, and still poorly react to cases of violations of labour legislation, to bureaucratic practices, and red tape.

This means that the trade unions and work collectives should tighten their control of decision-making concerning all questions of the work and life of people and take a larger part in planning and managing production, selecting and placing personnel, and effectively utilising the funds at the disposal of enterprises and organisations.

The Party regards the trade unions as a pillar of support among the masses, as a powerful means of promoting democracy and drawing people into the building of communism. One of Lenin's precepts was: "Contact with the masses, i.e., with the overwhelming majority of the workers (and eventually of all the working people), is the most important and most fundamental condition for the success of all trade union activity." He insisted that trade unionists should be in the thick of the workers' life, know it inside out, be able unerringly to assess the mood, the level of political awareness, and the actual needs of the masses without the slightest false idealisation, and have the ability to win the complete confidence of the masses by a comradely attitude to them and solicitous satisfaction of their needs. I hope every trade unionist will always and in everything check his actions with this behest of Lenin's.

There are more than 40 million young men and women in the *Leninist Young Communist League*. We often say that the YCL is our replacement and the assistant of the Party. This is correct, absolutely correct. Young people who are between the ages of 18 and 25 today will tomorrow form the backbone of our society. The most important, the central task of the YCL is to help form the rising generation into politically active, knowledgeable people, who like and know how to work and are always prepared to defend their country.

On the whole, the YCL is coping with this task. It has to its credit hundreds of projects in the most diverse parts of the country. It is taking a larger share in the administration of the state, of all public life. That is the course that should be maintained.

But it is not in our tradition to confine ourselves to praise. It is no secret that some educated and well-informed young people are at the same time politically naive, and their professional training goes along with an insufficiently responsible attitude to work. Much of this is a result of omissions by the YCL.

Consequently, more emphasis should be placed on educational work. I have in mind labour training, moral upbringing, and ideological and political education. This by no means implies that there

should be more "activities" of all sorts. There should be a live, creative atmosphere in every YCL organisation. Everybody knows that a truth is assimilated properly when it is experienced and not merely taught. The YCL should organise the study of Marxist-Leninist theory in such a way as to fuse it organically with the practical affairs, with the life of its members.

Here much depends on the Communists, on us, comrades. We have the experience, and our conviction that Marxism-Leninism is right has stood the test of decades. This wealth must be passed on to young people. In this lies the sure guarantee that Soviet young people will always hold high the banner of communism.

IV. THE PARTY-VANGUARD OF THE SOVIET PEOPLE

Comrades, at the 25th Congress the conclusion was drawn that under developed socialism the role of the Party grows in society. The past five years have borne this out. Today Lenin's well-known words that the Party is the intelligence, honour, and conscience of our times are more clearly appreciated and carry more weight than ever in the light of the Soviet people's impressive achievements.

The Communist Party grows, gathers strength, and matures together with our society's development, with the changes in its socio-political and cultural make-up.

In the period under review the membership of the CPSU grew by 1,800,000. Today it has 17,480,000 members. Of these 43.4 per cent are factory workers, 12.8 per cent are collective farmers, and 43.8 per cent are members of the technical, scientific, and creative intelligentsia, workers in education, medicine, and culture, people working in the administrative apparatus, and members of the Armed Forces.

During the past five years the CPSU has been joined by more than 1,500,000 of the finest members of the working class: this comprises 59 per cent of the newly admitted members. Of the new members over 10 per cent are collective farmers. The influx of members of the Soviet intelligentsia continued. Almost three in four of those who joined the CPSU during these years were members of the Leninist YCL.

The number of people wishing to join the Party is growing. The approach to admitting new members has become more exacting. Better use is made of the probation period to test the political, professional, and moral qualities of aspiring members. Not all pass this test. In the past five years 91,000 probationers were not admitted to full membership. This is a more or less normal sifting out.

As I have already said, the finest, most advanced people join the Party. However, stray and unworthy people sometimes get into the CPSU. Let me give you one figure. Since the 25th Congress

nearly 300,000 people have been expelled from the Party for deeds incompatible with the calling of Communist.

It must be stated categorically that our attitude to people who comport themselves unworthily and violate the Party Rules and the norms of Party ethics was, is and will be irreconcilable. Nobody can expect indulgence where it is a matter of the honour and prestige of our Party, of the purity of its ranks.

This strict approach is what ensures the monolithic unity of the CPSU, its ability to head Soviet society, and confidently lead the Soviet people along the road to communism.

1. IMPROVEMENT OF THE METHODS OF PARTY LEADERSHIP

Comrades, Party congresses, which blaze the highroad, as it were, of Soviet society's onward advance, are the highest expression of the CPSU's leading role. Plenary meetings of the Central Committee also have a large role to play.

In the period under review there were 11 plenary meetings of the Central Committee. They were convened regularly and the discussions were conducted in a businesslike manner and in a spirit of self-criticism. In short, we have abided by Leninist norms and traditions.

As I have already said, the basic directions of economic development were analysed annually at plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee. Other problems of a long-term character were also considered.

In 1977, in connection with the draft Constitution of the USSR, there was a substantive examination of the questions related to the development of socialist statehood, of our entire social system in the conditions of mature socialism. The Central Committee plenary meeting in July 1978 was devoted to the further elaboration of the Party's agrarian policy. The plenary meeting in June 1980 specified the Soviet Union's stand on fundamental foreign policy issues and the tasks of the struggle for detente in an international situation that had deteriorated.

In the period under review there were 236 meetings of the *Political Bureau*. Its work was concentrated on key issues linked to the practical fulfilment of the resolutions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU and plenary meetings of the Central Committee, to new developments in home and foreign policy.

The questions considered by the Political Bureau were carefully prepared beforehand. The range of these questions was extraordinarily wide and many-faceted. Many of them are steadily growing increasingly complex. In some cases the Political Bureau set up special commissions to study developments comprehensively

and generalise them, and also to take the needed practical steps quickly.

Quite naturally, various opinions were stated and many comments and recommendations were made in the course of the preparations for meetings and during the discussions. However, all decisions were adopted in a spirit of complete unanimity. This unity underlies the strength of collective leadership.

The Political Bureau may be described as the militant headquarters of our many-million-strong Party. It accumulates the collective wisdom of the Party and gives shape to Party policy expressing the interests of the whole of Soviet society, of all Communists and non-Party people.

The selection of personnel, organisation and inspection, and practically all the current questions of Party life comprised the round of work of the *Central Committee Secretariat*. During the period under review it held 250 meetings.

By and large, comrades, the proceedings of the plenary meetings, the Political Bureau, and the Secretariat were purposeful and well-organised. This work rests on the firm foundation of Marxism-Leninism.

The Political Bureau and Secretariat of the Central Committee showed constant concern for *enhancing the role and responsibility of the republican, territorial, regional, district, town, and urban-district Party organisations*. The state of affairs in the localities was studied in detail and the reports of many Party committees were examined. Conclusions binding on the entire Party were drawn on the basis of thorough, comprehensive discussion.

There is much that is valuable and instructive in the work of each Party organisation. I shall remind you of only a few interesting facts.

The Party organisations of Moscow and Leningrad achieved good results in promoting innovatory work by production collectives and in the communist education of the people. This was the wellspring of many patriotic initiatives which were supported and adopted throughout the country.

The magnificent achievements of the wheat-growers of Kazakhstan and the cotton-growers of Uzbekistan are linked to the improved work of Party organisations in introducing a scientific system of land cultivation and advanced practices into agriculture. The work of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan in mobilising the people for the pre-schedule fulfilment of tenth five-year plan assignments merits a positive assessment.

The Communist Party of Georgia secured a considerable enhancement of the rate of that republic's economic and social development.

There is much of interest in the experience of the Communist Parties of the Ukraine and Byelorussia in the matter of selecting and training personnel and in conferring a greater responsibility on executives for concrete areas of work. The Party organisations of

Armenia and Latvia have been able to set the sights of work collectives and of all management and planning bodies on improving the quality of industrial output. The Communists of Estonia have given a boost to the intensification of production. The Novosibirsk and Sverdlovsk regional committees of the CPSU have done much to broaden the links of science with production.

The Central Committee gave its support to the emulation movement begun by the people of the Don area to bring projects up to their rated capacities ahead of schedule, the initiative of the Party organisations of the Kuban and Dnepropetrovsk regions to improve the quality of farm output, and the experience of the work collectives of the Urals and the Kuznetsk Basin in economising on metal, fuel, and energy.

The creative initiatives of many Party organisations merit special mention at this Party forum. The richer and more diversified local experience is, the more productive becomes the work of the Party as a whole.

During the period under review the CPSU Central Committee had to subject the work of some Party committees to blunt criticism and correct their leaders. When this did not help they were disciplined.

Of course, the results of the work of a regional or district Party organisation are the sum of many and very diverse components. Nonetheless, energetic and competent Party leadership is decisive. If in its sector every Party organisation uses all potentials and brings order into everything, the whole country will make bigger progress. For that reason enhancing the role of regional and district Party committees is an important, serious and, I would say, constant task.

Primary Party organisations play a role of paramount importance in fulfilling big and varied tasks of communist construction.

Today the CPSU has 414,000 primary and 457,000 shop organisations, and more than 618,000 groups. The Central Committee sought to invigorate these organisations to the maximum, demanding that local Party bodies give them their constant attention.

Primary Party organisations are vested with the right to control the work of managements. It is important that they exercise this right to a larger extent and in the best way possible. Whether it is a matter of personnel, the fulfilment of economic plans, or the improvement of people's working and living conditions, the Party organisations should adopt a principled stand and not take their cue from the management when the latter is wrong. In short, they should firmly implement the Party line.

In many cases departmental or bureaucratic barriers are still an impediment to the fulfilment of economic, and not only economic, tasks. Who, if not the Party committees of ministries and departments, should be in the forefront in breaking down these barriers? They should guard state interests more resolutely and uncompromisingly.

From the rostrum of this Congress I should like to wish them to display more initiative and take a more principled stand.

Comrades, as Lenin said time and again, the essence of Party leadership lies in the selection of personnel and in the verification of performance.

In the period under review considerable work has been accomplished to secure a further *improvement of the qualitative composition and placing of executives*, to enhance their qualifications.

In accordance with the instructions of the 25th Congress, many specialists working in the economy were assigned to Party work. At present three out of every four secretaries of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Union republics and of territorial and regional committees and two out of every three secretaries of city and district Party committees have a technical, economic, or agricultural education. This is gratifying. But it must be taken into account that a segment of the specialists who have come into the Party apparatus from industry do not have sufficient political experience and, in some cases, bring economic management methods into Party organs.

It is necessary to improve the political training of these comrades and help them to acquire the necessary experience of Party work. On the other hand, to become a Party leader in the real sense of the word it is not enough to study in a Party school. The comrades appointed to Party executive work should, as people say, have had their seasoning in the thick of the working masses so that they should know what is in the minds of the workers, peasants, and intellectuals of our country and what their life, needs, and interests are, not from documents but from personal experience. We should make it a rule that all the Communists considered as a reserve for promotion should go through precisely that school, the school of life, the school of practical work among the masses.

The formation of a dependable reserve of cadres has been and remains an important task. Of great significance from this angle has been the restructuring of the work of higher Party schools and of educational institutions training managerial personnel for the national economy, in particular, the setting up of the Academy of Social Sciences and the Academy of the National Economy. During the past period 32,000 persons have finished Party educational institutions. More than 240,000 Party, government, and ideological cadres have received training at courses.

I feel that special mention must be made of the participation of women in executive work—Party, local government, economic, and other work. It has to be acknowledged that so far not all the possibilities are being used to promote women to executive posts. This must be corrected.

In the period under review the Central Committee gave more attention to *checking the fulfilment of adopted decisions*. We began to hear reports from more executives of different levels who

are personally responsible for specific areas of work. The Council of Ministers of the USSR, the ministries and departments, and the Party and local government bodies in the republics, territories, and regions were oriented on working along these lines. More was done by the Party Control Committee of the CPSU Central Committee and by the commissions of local Party bodies to combat violations of Party and state discipline. On the whole, quite a lot is being done. However, verification of fulfilment is still a weak spot in the work of a large number of Party organisations.

For example, the CPSU Central Committee's examination of the work of Communists in a number of USSR ministries showed that many shortcomings in economic activity are due to a lack of a smooth-working system of control and to armchair leadership.

Regretfully, to this day not everybody has understood the simple fact that the art of leadership does not consist in producing and circulating directives on every occasion. Once a decision is adopted steps must be taken to have it carried out strictly within the set time limits. This is the purpose of reinforcing verification. For its part this verification should be systematic and quick both from above and from below.

The style and methods of leadership are a question of importance to the entire Party, to the whole people. It is the direct duty of every Party leader to remember this and to be guided every day and in everything by Leninist norms.

2. QUESTIONS OF INNER-PARTY LIFE

Comrades, when the preparations for the 26th Congress were started, the Central Committee called upon all Communists to hold *election meetings* to discuss the Central Committee draft for the Congress creatively and self-critically, as far as possible in relation to realities, to the specific questions uppermost in the minds of Communists.

The work of Party organisations cannot be really effective if members attend meetings solely in order to sit them out and hear the speakers listed beforehand. As at the plenary meeting of any Party committee, at a Party meeting all urgent matters must be discussed in depth and seriously. It was of the utmost importance, of course, that the preparations for the Congress were conducted in precisely that way.

The election meetings showed that members of our Party heard and responded to the call of the Central Committee. In most cases they were highly productive. The meetings of primary and shop Party organisations and of Party groups were attended by 96 per cent of the membership. Nearly 10,000,000 people took the floor.

The content of what was said is indicative of the Communists' sense of responsibility for their work, for everything that is being done in the Party and in the country. The meetings, conferences, and congresses exactly assessed the work of elected Party organs. They criticised omissions and shortcomings and made many valuable suggestions.

This, comrades, is the Party's collective mind. This is the Party's single will, an expression of the Communists' unity around the Central Committee.

Democratic centralism is an immutable norm of the life of the Communist Party. And this presupposes, in particular, the closest possible link between the centre and the localities, between the Party's leading organs and its rank and file. Moreover, it is a two-way link.

Letters and suggestions from citizens are an immensely important channel of the Party's living bond with the masses. The people have unbounded confidence in the Party, speak candidly to it of the most pressing issues of public life, work, and everyday life, frankly state their views and concerns, and criticise existing shortcomings. The Central Committee attaches great significance to work with letters and to prompt response to them. In the period under review this work was considerably improved, owing, in large part, to the formation of a Letters Department in the Central Committee apparatus.

Speaking of letters, of which the CPSU Central Committee receives about 1,500 every day, I must say the following. Many of them are, regretfully, indications of serious omissions in the localities. Many of the questions raised by the people can and should be settled by the heads of industrial enterprises and district and town authorities. It is the duty of every Party functionary, of every leader to the people and the Party to examine letters, requests, and complaints from citizens with tact and consideration.

I emphasise that this concerns letters that are sincere and honest. As regards all sorts of anonymous vilifications, the Party stand is well known: there should be no room for them in our life. Those who come forward with well-founded, businesslike criticism do not have to hide their faces.

Inner-Party briefing is an inalienable element of the Party's democratic life. The CPSU Central Committee kept local Party organs, the Communists broadly and promptly briefed on questions of home and foreign policy and on organisational and ideological work. At the same time, the CPSU Central Committee and all Party committees began to make more use of information from primary Party organisations. This helps to take public opinion into account and form a clearer idea of the state of affairs in the localities.

A very important matter is to keep all Soviet citizens informed of Party affairs. Publicity in the work of Party organisations is an effective means of strengthening the Party's ties with the mas-

ses. We are doing much in this respect, but there are certain things that could probably be improved.

The instructions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU stimulated the extension of *criticism and self-criticism* in the Party. Everything should be done to continue fostering this positive trend, to assert in all Party organisations a spirit of self-criticism and irreconcilability to shortcomings.

Any attempt at persecution for criticism must be resolutely cut short. Our stand on this question is clearly recorded in the Party Rules. It is also reflected in the Constitution of the USSR. There must be no condoning of those who muzzle criticism—such is the demand of both the Party and the state law.

3. THE PARTY'S WORK IN IDEOLOGY AND POLITICAL EDUCATION

Comrades, the conditions in which all of us live and work have lately undergone significant changes. The Soviet citizen has changed. He is more knowledgeable and informed, and his intellectual requirements have grown considerably.

At the same time, the resources available to our ideological workers have grown. The newspapers and journals, which have a circulation of 380 million copies, are a dependable channel of day-to-day information. The screens of 75 million TV sets light up daily in our country. And this means that tens of millions of families can get the necessary explanations of the Party's policy and new information, and enrich themselves intellectually and culturally.

On the other hand, the class enemy's propaganda media have become more active and he is stepping up his attempts to exercise a demoralising influence on Soviet people.

Are all these new developments and circumstances being taken fully into account? Are the huge potentialities of our propaganda used to the hilt? There is only one answer to this and it is: Not yet.

In view of this the Party's Central Committee has formulated the *tasks to improve ideological work and political education*. These are spelled out in the CPSU Central Committee's decision of April 26, 1979. This is a long-term document.

In fact, it is a question of restructuring—yes, this was not a slip of the tongue, I said restructuring—many sectors and areas of ideological work. Its content should be more topical and its forms should fall in line with the present-day requirements and needs of Soviet people.

It is very important that propaganda should not shun sensitive issues and should not be afraid to deal with what are termed difficult questions. Our Party's policy is clear. We are prepared to answer any questions that Soviet people want to ask. This must be

done with greater courage, bearing in mind that if we do not answer them the enemies of our country will try to take advantage of this to smear socialism.

And another thing. Ideological education must be conducted in a vivid and interesting manner, without stereotype phrases and a standard set of ready-made formulas. The Soviet citizen is an educated and intelligent person. When he is spoken to in a thoughtless, bureaucratic language, when general verbiage is invoked instead of concrete living reality and actual facts, he simply turns off his TV or radio, or sets aside his newspaper.

Our Party has great confidence in the many-thousand-strong contingent of Soviet journalists and highly values their difficult work. Naturally, all of us want our media always to be a true voice of Party and public opinion. Every article in a newspaper or journal and every TV or radio programme should be regarded as an earnest talk with people, who want not only a truthful and prompt exposition of facts but also an in-depth analysis of these facts and serious generalisations. We hope that together with the many millions of contributors to our press, Soviet journalists will always display a high degree of social involvement and sense of responsibility, being guided by the Leninist principles and traditions of Party journalism.

A word of gratitude is also due to the huge number of Communists and non-Party people who carry the Party's thoughts to the people and explain its policies. These are lecturers, propagandists, and agitators. As a rule, they work voluntarily, in their free time. They are doing something that is useful and needed by the people. Heartfelt thanks to them.

At the same time, there is also food for thought here. Have not forms of our mass political work become too fossilised? After all, it was one thing to address people who were inadequately trained and had little education, and another—to speak to the present-day Soviet citizen. Obviously, this should be given thought, and serious thought at that. If anybody, ideological workers are the ones who should have a high sense for the new.

In the period under review much attention was given to *Party education*.

Nearly 23 million people are studying in the Party education system. A set day for political education has been introduced practically everywhere. The science-and-practice conferences held in recent years in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Baku, Tbilisi, and Chelyabinsk were devoted to exchanges of advanced expertise and to creative quests in the sphere of education. A further impetus to this activity was given in October 1979 by the All-Union Conference of Ideological Workers.

We have examples of Party education organised imaginatively in a number of production collectives, for example, in Moscow, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, and the Donets Basin. The experience of conducting seminars on methodological problems of social and natural

sciences at the Novosibirsk scientific centre has won wide recognition.

In Party education the main criterion is, I would say, the results it yields. What do we want to achieve? We want Party policy to fuse with the activity of the masses. We want Party education to teach people, to use Lenin's words, "to act in the way communism really demands" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 285). In other words, we want actual unity between the Party's ideological-theoretical, political-educational, organisational, and economic work. This is our aim. But this is not always the situation everywhere.

To this day theoretical training at many Party schools and seminars is not adequately tied in with the pressing social and production problems worrying people. Formalism and scholasticism, which reduce people's interest in theoretical study, have not been entirely extirpated.

Evidently, we should, without being carried away by an urge to go on endlessly increasing the number of people attending seminars, resolutely move towards an improvement of the quality of study, of that of the Communists in the first place. This cannot be achieved without a more considered approach to the selection, training, and prompt briefing of our propagandists.

The propagandist is, after all, the principal figure in the system of Party education. It is on him that what seminars, political schools, and universities will be like depends in many ways: whether they will be a place where, more often than not, boredom reigns and people merely sit out the hours designated for them or, on the contrary, they will everywhere become effective centres of live Party thought and word. The attitude of people to Party education depends primarily on the Party's ideological and propaganda activists. People should be eager to attend Party classes to discuss pressing problems of theory and Party policy collectively, get answers to their questions, and widen their theoretical-ideological knowledge.

The Party's ideological and propaganda activists play the paramount role in further developing Marxist-Leninist education of the masses, their creative initiative in carrying out the tasks of communist construction.

Comrades, the Marxist-Leninist party cannot fulfil its role if it does not give due attention to putting into proper perspective all that is taking place, to generalising new phenomena, to *creatively developing Marxist-Leninist theory*. We have always regarded this as a task of supreme importance and have given it considerable attention in the period under review as well.

Since the 25th Congress the Party's theoretical armoury has been augmented with a number of significant generalisations and conclusions. Of what has been accomplished in the field of theory, mention must be made, in the first place, of the elaboration of the conception of developed socialism. On the basis of this conception, the Party has spelled out and specified the ways and time limits for

the attainment of our programme aims, and defined long-term strategy and tactics.

Party documents and scientific studies of recent years deal with various aspects of mature socialism. Works have been written that analyse the experience of world socialism and show the laws governing the world revolutionary process. Good studies have been written of the history of the international working-class movement, the present stage of capitalism's general crisis, and the development of state-monopoly capitalism. There have been major advances in the study of present-day international relations.

In short, extensive work has been accomplished and it merits acknowledgement. But far from everything in the sphere of social science is satisfactory. The inclination towards scholastic theorising, mentioned also at the 25th Congress, has not been entirely surmounted. Instead of trying to get to the bottom of new developments quite a few philosophers seek to prove what has already been proved. Many unresolved problems have accumulated in the political economy of socialism. More attention should be given to the social effects of the scientific, and technological revolution. Developments in society's political life must be analysed more profoundly and with greater courage. Little is still being done to study public opinion.

These are only some of the questions that have to be tackled.

Comrades, the Central Committee believes there is one more major question of significance to the whole Party that must be brought up for discussion.

In the period under review all the changes in our country and all our actions on the world scene were put into effect in accordance with the Party's programme provisions. On the whole, the present Programme of the CPSU correctly mirrors the laws of social development. But 20 years have passed since it was adopted.

In that time extensive experience has been accumulated of socialist and communist construction in the USSR. This experience incontrovertibly demonstrates that our advance to communism is being accomplished through the stage of a developed socialist society. This, as it has already been noted, is a necessary, natural, and historically long period of the formation of the communist system. This conclusion was drawn and elaborated by the Party in recent years and, unquestionably, it should be duly recorded in the Party Programme.

Evidently, the Programme should clearly identify the changes that have taken place in the structure of our economy and underscore and specify long-term aims.

Needless to say, our point of departure here should be Lenin's precept that the programme establishes only basic principles, that it is impossible and inappropriate to foretell particulars in it.

New and fundamentally important phenomena and processes have appeared also on the international scene.

In the socialist world these are the steady drawing together of fraternal countries and the development of economic integration. Obviously, lessons should be drawn also from the difficulties encountered in the development of socialist countries.

Moreover, the Party Programme should record such fundamentally important phenomena of international life as the abolition of imperialism's colonial system and the enhanced political role played in the world by dozens of new states, many of which are setting their sights on development in the direction of socialism.

It is evident that some new phenomena in the capitalist world, specifically the features of the present stage of capitalism's general crisis and the rapidly growing role played by the military-industrial complex and the transnational corporations, require study.

Our Party has accumulated vast experience of struggle for peace, for detente. As a result, the theory and practice of peaceful coexistence have been enriched.

In view of what I have said we apparently *should introduce the necessary amendments and additions into the present Programme. If this proposal is approved by the delegates to the Congress, the Central Committee could be instructed to redraft the Programme of the CPSU.*

* * *

Comrades, time flies. At this Congress we shall have to consider the plans of the Party, the plans of the country for the eleventh five-year period and look farther—up to the year 1990. In fact, the make-up of our country at the close of the twentieth century, on the threshold of the third millennium, will depend to a large extent on what we decide during these days.

The twentieth century has brought with it more changes than any previous century. And no country has made a more tangible contribution to these changes than the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the homeland of the Great October Revolution, the first country of triumphant socialism. This is the seventh decade that its invincible Leninist banner has been held aloft.

There is no country or group of countries and no ideological or political school that has not felt the influence of socialism to one extent or another. This is a reality of the closing years of the twentieth century.

New life is not born easily. The road of social progress is hard and sometimes painful. This makes the achievements of socialist society all the more significant and vivid, and the deeds of its builders and defenders all the more impressive.

To our Communist Party, to us Soviet Communists has fallen the enviable role of being at the fountainhead of the socialist transformation of life. To our lot has fallen the honourable mission of safeguarding and upholding peace.

Our aim is communism and it is a majestic aim. Every labour achievement, every year of heroic accomplishment, and every five-year plan brings us nearer to that aim. This is the standpoint from which the Party assesses the coming five-year period. Much will have to be done. The tasks that will have to be fulfilled are big and complex. But we will most definitely carry them out.

Soviet people look to the future with confidence. But their optimism is not the self-confidence of favourites of destiny. Our people know that everything they have has been created by their own labour and protected by their own blood. Also, we are optimists because we have faith in the power of labour, because we have faith in our country, in our people. We are optimists because we have faith in our Party and know that the road it is indicating is the only sure one.

Honour and glory to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a party of builders of communism!

May our great country, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, continue to grow stronger and flourish!

Long live peace!

Long live communism!

SPEECH AT THE CLOSING OF THE 26th CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

March 3, 1981

Comrades, the first plenary meeting of the new Central Committee of our Party elected by the Congress has just ended. Permit me to report on its results. At the first plenary meeting of the Central Committee, held in an atmosphere of exceptional unity and cohesion, the leading organs of our Party were unanimously elected. The plenary meeting unanimously elected Comrade *L. I. Brezhnev* General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Permit me, comrades delegates, to express my sincere gratitude for the honour and great trust I have been accorded by being re-elected General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The plenary meeting unanimously elected as members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee comrades *L. I. Brezhnev*, *Yu. V. Andropov*, *M. S. Gorbachyov*, *V. V. Grishin*, *A. A. Gromyko*, *A. P. Kirilenko*, *D. A. Kunayev*, *A. J. Pelše*, *G. V. Romanov*, *M. A. Suslov*, *N. A. Tikhonov*, *D. F. Ustinov*, *K. U. Chernenko*, and *V. V. Shcherbitsky*.

Comrades *G. A. Aliyev*, *P. N. Demichev*, *T. Ya. Kiselyov*, *V. V. Kuznetsov*, *B. N. Ponomaryov*, *Sh. R. Rashidov*, *M. S. Solomentsev*, and *E. A. Shevardnadze* were elected Alternate Members of the Political Bureau.

Comrades *L. I. Brezhnev*, General Secretary of the Central Committee, *M. A. Suslov*, *A. P. Kirilenko*, *K. U. Chernenko*, *M. S. Gorbachyov*, *B. N. Ponomaryov*, *I. V. Kapitonov*, *V. I. Dolgikh*, *M. V. Zimyanin*, and *K. V. Rusakov* were elected Secretaries of the Central Committee.

Comrade *A. J. Pelše* was confirmed as Chairman of the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee.

The CPSU Central Auditing Commission elected Comrade *G. F. Sizov* its Chairman.

Comrades, the newly elected members of the CPSU Central Committee, alternate members of the Central Committee and members of the Central Auditing Commission have asked me to express to the Congress delegates their heartfelt gratitude for the great

trust shown in us. We greatly appreciate this trust, we are well aware of the full measure of responsibility we bear and we assure you that we will do everything in our power to ensure that the historic tasks set by the Congress will be successfully carried out. We see this to be our duty to the Party and to the people.

All the work of our Congress was conducted in a spirit of unity and cohesion, which make our Party mighty and invincible. May I assure you that the new leading Party bodies will carefully preserve and strengthen the unity of our Party ranks, the guarantee of all our triumphs!

For eight days intensive work has been proceeding here in this hall. We have summed up our progress over the past few years, we have shared our joys and disappointments and have jointly mapped out plans for the future.

Once again we have been able wholly to appreciate the full scale and, at the same time, the full complexity of the tasks facing the Party and the country.

We intend to concentrate all our efforts in two related directions. One is the building of communism, the other is the strengthening of peace. Indeed, this was the very mandate Communists and the whole people gave to the delegates at Party conferences. This mandate has now been translated into the language of Party decisions.

Today we see better than we did yesterday and see more. We know what we are doing well and where there are difficulties. A picture of our country's successful development and of the intricacies of international politics was presented to the Congress in all their totality and many aspects.

The Congress approved fundamental and at the same time specific directives for the future. All our endeavours are now being focussed on their implementation. When the Congress delegates return to their Party organisations they will have to join in the tremendous work of translating Congress decisions into practical deeds. And it is above all a matter of securing the complete fulfilment of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan.

What does this require? First of all, a high sense of responsibility and firm, truly communist, conscious discipline. But no less necessary, of course, are inspired thought, the tireless search for what is new and support for it. A constant display of initiative—initiative everywhere and in everything—is needed. We are confident that the stimulus provided by the Congress will enrich the work of each collective, of each district, region and republic, and of the entire country.

The thousands of reports received during these days of labour victories of the Soviet people, dedicated by them to the 26th CPSU Congress, resounded like a triumphant salute in honour of the Congress of Lenin's Party, and as powerful support for its work. Workers at enterprises and power plants, toilers in the fields, skilled stock-breeders, construction workers, transport workers, people in

the arts and sciences brought joy to their Motherland by new achievements, by splendid new deeds. On behalf of all the delegates I would like to express sincere gratitude to those participating in the pre-Congress emulation drive for their great sense of patriotism, for this wonderful expression of the unity of the aspirations, goals and deeds of the Party and the entire people!

The hundreds of thousands of letters from organisations, labour collectives and citizens conveying best wishes for the success of the work of the Congress also vividly attest to this. I think you will all support me when I say: heartfelt thanks to those who wrote such letters!

Soviet people know the Party motto is—Everything for the sake of Soviet man, for the benefit of man. They know this and therefore warmly support Party policy. But we also know something else: nothing comes without an effort. Any improvement in living conditions can be achieved only by the hard work of Soviet people themselves. Mature socialism gives every citizen very broad opportunities for revealing his capabilities. What remains to be done is to exercise these opportunities. And emancipated, conscious labour, labour for one's own benefit and for the benefit of one's society can accomplish everything!

I think we can be confident that the plans mapped out by the Congress will be not only fulfilled, but overfulfilled!

The 26th Congress showed once again that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a mighty, healthy and mature collective. Communists are truly the unbending mainstay of our society, its living soul. They are the genuinely revolutionary vanguard of the people.

Both from past and present experience, we are well aware that the role of the leading force in society does not come of its own accord. This role has to be earned, to be won in the course of constant and unceasing struggle for the working people's interests. And this role is consolidated by the fact that the Party is steadily deepening its ties with the masses of the people, takes their needs and concerns to heart.

In unity with the people lies the Party's strength!

In unity with the Party, in its leadership lies the people's strength!

Comrades, the entire course of our Congress and all the documents it adopted have once again shown that our main concern in the international arena, the principal foreign policy aim of our state has been and remains the preservation of peace.

Our foreign policy programme is one of continuing and deepening detente, a programme of struggle for ending the arms race.

Our Party has shown once again that the Soviet people have not only the desire but the political resolve to do everything for peace—for a lasting, unshakable peace. We not only have the will to struggle for peace, but a precise and clear-cut programme for this struggle.

Comrades, our Congress has been attended by the greatest ever number of delegations from Communist, workers' and other revolutionary parties in the entire history of the CPSU. The speeches by our comrades in struggle here at the Congress and at meetings in Moscow and other cities have further strengthened our faith in the invincibility of social progress, and in the inevitability of the revolutionary transformation of the world.

We are deeply grateful for the kind words expressed here about our Party and about our country. You may rest assured, dear comrades, that Soviet Communists, true to Lenin's behests, will continue to follow steadily the tested internationalist course of our Party.

The need for unity for peace and human progress was a theme permeating all the speeches of comrades from abroad. In our age these two concepts are inseparably linked. Peace is the crucial condition for progress in all fields of human endeavour. And we are convinced that if Communists, revolutionaries, all healthy and reasonable forces fully realize the responsibility they bear and act in a united front, the plans of the enemies of peace will undoubtedly be frustrated.

Comrades, ever since great Lenin founded our Party, it has been advancing confidently along the road he indicated of building socialism and communism.

How many times during this period has our inevitable collapse been predicated! How many times have attempts been made to force us to renounce our planned objectives! How many times have our opponents tried to persuade us that we are mistaken, that our road is not a correct one...

And what has happened? Most of those people have long since been forgotten. But socialism is alive! It is developing. It is steadily advancing. And we do not just believe, but firmly know that our supreme goal will also be achieved, a communist society will be built!

We are confident of this because we believe in the sacred truth of our ideals. We are confident of this because we realize how inexhaustible is the might of our people. We are confident of this because we know that the Marxist-Leninist course of our Party is the correct one.

So let us boldly go forward along the road leading to communism!

May the unbreakable unity of the Communist Party and the Soviet people continue to strengthen!

May the unity of the socialist community, of all revolutionary forces of the entire planet continue to strengthen!

Glory to our Leninist Party!

Long live the great Soviet people!

Long live peace!

Long live communism!

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT A RECEPTION
IN HONOUR OF DELEGATIONS OF
COMMUNIST, WORKERS' AND NATIONAL-
DEMOCRATIC PARTIES WHICH ATTENDED
THE 26th CONGRESS OF THE CPSU**

March 3, 1981

Dear comrades and friends,

Our esteemed guests,

On behalf of the members and alternate members of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Auditing Commission, just elected by the Congress of our Party, I heartily welcome you all at this reception.

Eight days which will go down in the history of our Party and country are over. Eight days of busy work at the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

You, our dear guests, participating in this work, could feel for yourselves what a seething and rich life our Land of the Soviets is living, how great and many-faceted is the range of tasks the Party of Lenin is accomplishing in the course of communist construction.

Decisions were adopted which will largely determine the road of our people for the next five years and for longer periods. Big and complex deeds, important and difficult tasks await the Soviet Communists, all Soviet people.

Drawing up our plans for the future we set ourselves, above all, two main targets, simple and clear ones: the welfare of the people and lasting peace. The 26th Congress of the CPSU has convincingly reaffirmed this.

We are very glad, dear comrades, that you took part in our Congress and cordially thank you for the speeches made to the Congress delegates and to working people of our enterprises.

You will soon be leaving for your countries and continue your noble activities. The conditions of these activities are very different, but we are all united by our allegiance to the ideals of justice, the freedom and happiness of the working people, and, of

course, by our ardent commitment to the cause of maintaining and strengthening peace on earth.

I believe our Congress has clearly shown that the Soviet Communists are fully aware of their share of internationalist responsibility in the struggle for these lofty aims.

The new important peace initiatives, endorsed by our Congress, eloquently show how persistently and tirelessly we are striving to rid the peoples of the threat of another world war and of the burden of the arms race. We are convinced that they will receive the active support of all sane and sound forces in the world.

In conclusion, I should like to reassure you, dear friends, that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will continue to do its utmost for further strengthening the ties of friendship and solidarity linking us with the peoples of the fraternal countries of socialism, with the mass of the working people of all countries.

I propose a toast:

To the great cause of freedom of the peoples and the social progress of mankind!

To fresh successes in strengthening detente, curbing the arms race and consolidating universal peace!

To your health, dear comrades!

TO THE ITALIAN READER

Foreword to the Book "L. I. Brezhnev. Pages From His Life" ¹

The book which the Rizzoli publishing house is offering you has already come out in many countries. I see this fact as, above all, evidence of growing interest in the Soviet Union, its history and its people. And, of course, one must get to know one another better to achieve mutual understanding.

There is much in common in the life stories of Soviet people of my generation. We have all experienced need and adversity, the nightmare of wartime years, the joy of victory and pride in the fruits of our labour. To all of us the meaning of life is to work and to work for the communist renovation of our country, for the happiness of our people, for peace.

You will agree that it is not easy to write an introduction to one's own biography. I must confess that I took up my pen only because this introduction gives me an opportunity of voicing some thoughts on relations between the Soviet Union and Italy.

Our people have long since cherished kind feelings towards your country, which gave mankind Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo, Dante and Verdi, Garibaldi and Gramsci. No purpose is served by simplifying the history of relations between our two states. It has known both bright and dark pages. At the same time the experience of history has affirmed and continues to affirm the simple but important truth: peace and accord have always benefited both nations, and Europe too.

I think that the Soviet Union and Italy can go far along the path of cooperation, political, economic and cultural. Much has already been done for that by both sides. But also plenty of opportunities have, unfortunately, been missed. Why is this happening?

¹ Published by the Rizzoli Publishing House in Italy in 1981.

The main reasons are insufficient trust, the inertia of fear remaining from the "cold war", the continuing arms race.

Whatever way you look at it, the reckless expansion of military arsenals breeds political stagnation and creates the delusion that war is inevitable. It damages the interests of peaceful cooperation and prevents European countries from jointly tackling the solution of such global problems as the development of the power industry, protection of the environment, the development of the ocean, stamping out the most dangerous diseases, and so on.

We are convinced that the true road to a world of peace and harmony lies not through the deployment of the new American missiles in West European countries but through reducing military confrontation, through the mutually beneficial division of labour, supplementing each country's economic possibilities, through broader exchanges of goods and cultural values.

Pursuing a policy of detente, increasing their cooperation by degrees, our two countries can make a considerable contribution to the improvement of the political climate in the Mediterranean, on the European continent and throughout the world.

The Soviet Union most definitely stands precisely for such cooperation with the Republic of Italy.

In conclusion I should like to wish well-being and happiness to the readers of this book, to all Italian friends.

FROM THE SPEECH AT A MEETING OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR

April 1, 1981

One may confidently say that even the short space of time that has elapsed since the Congress has shown the tremendous mobilising impact of its decisions. The Congress equipped the Party, all the components of our political system with a clear-cut programme. The main thing now is to give real substance to this programme, to organise, as Lenin taught us, the powerful and well-knit joint labours of millions of people.

The Party organisations of the Republics, Territories, and Regions at meetings of their most active members have now defined their specific tasks in carrying out the Congress decisions, and so, too, have plenary sessions of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and the Central Committee of the Young Communist League, as well as thousands of work collectives.

Of no less importance is the fact that the Soviets of People's Deputies have also joined in this genuinely countrywide effort in a most active manner. For does not this mean more than 50,000 elective bodies, over two million deputies and tens of millions of voluntary helpers. These very figures indicate the mighty creative forces the Soviets possess.

It would be the right thing for every Soviet thoroughly to discuss and map out its own programme of action for carrying out the Congress decisions. This work is already under way. And it is a very good thing that in many places it began from below, from those Soviets which are directly linked with the people, with work collectives. I am speaking of district, city, settlement and rural Soviets. After all, it is here first of all that the people's initiative is displayed, that work gets under way to carry out plans and socialist emulation gathers momentum.

It is also important that the Regional and Territorial Soviets and later the Supreme Soviets of the Republics should give the

most careful consideration to all the valuable proposals that will be advanced by lower Soviet bodies, so that not a single proposal should be lost and popular initiative should have the maximum effect.

Of course, taking part in carrying out the Party Congress decisions, the Soviets will at each level be acting within their particular framework. For local government bodies this, above all, means improving public services, carrying out the food programme, increasing the output of consumer goods and fulfilling plans for the construction of housing, schools, hospitals and children's nurseries. And in such matters the Soviets and their executive committees must act not as suppliants but as strict and exacting masters, they must make better use of their wide powers of co-ordinating and controlling. The recent resolution of the Party's Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the government on enhancing the role of the Soviets in economic development should serve as a good stimulus for this.

Speaking about the Supreme Soviets, I would like to re-emphasise how important it is more closely than ever to combine legislative work with administration and control. Without relaxing the attention we pay to legislation—and it is developing in our country in an active and planned way—we must step up our everyday organising activities, ensure the strict and unswerving observance of laws and fulfilment of plans. Our Party's policy and socialist law have as their starting point one and the same principles and pursue one and the same aim: the well-being of the working people. And the full force of the law should serve this lofty aim.

In this respect particular tasks face the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is after all, figuratively speaking, the summit of the entire pyramid of our government bodies and is invested with very broad powers. It is from this premise that the plan of the Supreme Soviet's activities in the current year, submitted for your consideration, proceeds. It has been drafted so that the supreme government body should keep within its field of view the key problems raised by the 26th Congress, the experience of the Soviets of many Republics and the development of ties with parliaments in other countries in the cause of peace and cooperation among nations.

In conclusion I would like to emphasise that it is now a case of stepping up the activities of the entire system of Soviets in solving the tasks set by the Party. And there should be no doubt whatever that they will be solved. The strength of Soviet government lies in its very close ties with the mass of the people. Invigorated by their initiative and activity, the Party organises and directs the people's efforts into a single channel. This is a pledge of our successes, a pledge of the strengthening and development of the socialist state system.

In the resolution it has adopted the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet observes that the principal task of the Soviets of People's Deputies is to carry out the decisions of the 26th Congress

of the CPSU and provisions formulated in the Report of the CPSU Central Committee and in the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1984-1985 and for the Period Ending in 1990, which were endorsed by the Congress.

The Soviets of People's Deputies, their executive and administrative bodies should make full use of their constitutional powers to ensure the comprehensive economic and social development of the respective territories, to raise the efficiency of production, to improve every aspect of the Soviet people's everyday life, to satisfy their material and cultural needs, to intensify the policy of economy and to strengthen state and labour discipline.

In recent years we have been hearing regular reports on measures taken by the USSR Council of Ministers to carry out the resolutions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and proposals submitted by the Commissions of the Chambers and individual deputies. This is an important innovation. Thanks to it the mechanism of socialist democracy has begun to function more smoothly and efficiently.

From the report made by Comrade N. A. Tikhonov one may draw the conclusion that this time, too, the USSR Council of Ministers has given very careful consideration to the recommendations and critical remarks submitted by deputies. This is all the more gratifying since this concerns the proceedings of the latest session of the USSR Supreme Soviet which was held in an atmosphere full of anticipation of the Congress. Addressing the session, deputies concerned themselves not only with the current year but also with achieving a good pace throughout the entire five-year plan period, and they made proposals of major economic importance.

It is gratifying to note that the analysis of planning data being done by the Commissions is becoming ever deeper. And a feature of the recommendations worked out here is that they are well grounded. This indicates the increased competence of the control exercised by the supreme government body. Such control enables the USSR Supreme Soviet better to direct the work of its subordinate bodies and to make the economic mechanism function smoothly, which to no small degree, as was noted at the Congress, helps to raise the general tone of government work. This means that our constitutional formulas are successfully passing the test of time and are being filled with real vital substance.

Unfortunately, as the Commissions of the Chambers have reported, a number of materials received from the ministries and other departments contain only general promises to improve the state of affairs. This cannot, of course, satisfy us. It is very important that the proposals of deputies should not only meet with understanding in words but also be backed up by specific deeds.

I think the USSR Council of Ministers will heed this critical remark of ours. It should continue to press for carrying out measures worked out by ministries and departments, and by the governments of the Republics, prompted by the proposals of representa-

tive bodies. For their part the Standing Commissions of the Chambers should not relax their supervision.

The major long-term significance of all this work is obvious. It will, above all, help to give the draft of the 11th Five-Year Plan maximum fullness, to improve this document in respect of the needs of society and the Soviet people.

In the resolution it adopted on this issue the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet notes that the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Ministries, State Committees and other departments, the Councils of Ministers of the Union Republics take measures to implement the proposals and critical remarks of the Standing Commissions and deputies. The Presidium has instructed the USSR Ministries, State Committees, and other departments, and the Council of Ministers of the Union Republics to ensure implementation of the measures worked out for putting into practice the proposals and critical remarks submitted by the Standing Commissions of the Chambers and deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet. In so doing they should be guided by the tasks put forward in the Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th Congress and the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and for the Period Ending in 1990.

**REPLY TO A QUESTION PUT BY THE GREEK
NEWSPAPER "TA NEA"**

April 3, 1981

Question: Addressing the 26th Congress of the CPSU, Mr. President, you paid particular attention to the struggle for easing international tension. You said specifically that the USSR will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries which do not allow such weapons to be sited on their territory. Can your statement take the form of specific guarantees for such countries as Greece, for instance?

Answer: The Soviet Union has already stated more than once that it will never use nuclear weapons against countries which refuse to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons and which do not have such weapons on their territory. This is a sufficiently firm guarantee. But we are prepared to go further and at any time to conclude a special agreement with any of the non-nuclear countries, including, of course, Greece, if for its part it undertakes not to have nuclear weapons on its territory.

I avail myself of this opportunity on behalf of the Soviet people to wish the Greek people peace and prosperity.

SPEECH AT THE 16TH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

April 7, 1981

Dear Comrade Husak,
Dear comrades,

Let me convey to the delegates of the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, all the Communists and working people of the country words of friendship and fraternity from your comrades-in-arms—the Soviet Communists, from all our people.

As for myself I am always happy to visit Czechoslovakia. Your beautiful country has become something like a second motherland to me. I stepped onto its soil for the first time nearly 40 years ago with our army units, side by side with the servicemen of the Ludwik Svoboda corps. This is the fourth congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia at which I am leading the delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and I treasure the opportunity of being together with you, dear friends, on this remarkable day.

The CPSU delegation listened with profound interest to the report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia delivered by Comrade Husak. The clear and realistic analysis of the results of the past years, the posing of major and realistic tasks in home and foreign policy, a clear course set for the further development of socialist democracy and the initiative of the people—all this shows that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia stands firmly on positions of Marxism-Leninism. This is the most reliable guarantee of the confident advance of your country towards new social and economic accomplishments.

Comrades, this year you will also mark the 60th anniversary of the foundation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Your Party is approaching its jubilee as a militant and mature social force that has accumulated a wealth of valuable experience of po-

litical struggle and of the management of society. This experience is the guarantee of successful socialist construction in Czechoslovakia itself. It is also of great significance to other parties, to the international communist movement as a whole.

This experience includes vigorous political activity in organising the advanced section of the working class in conditions of a bourgeois republic, the underground struggle against the Hitlerite invaders, fighting against them on the fronts and the organisation of popular uprisings for the freedom and independence of the homeland, for the sake of its social renovation.

The victory of the socialist revolution of 1948 was of really historic significance. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which was at that time headed by the outstanding revolutionary Klement Gottwald, was able to lead millions upon millions of the working people of town and country; it ensured a peaceful transition to the construction of socialism.

The victory over the forces of counter-revolution in 1968, the ability to draw profound political conclusions of long-term significance from the events of that time—this is also a great contribution by Czechoslovak Communists to the development of the world revolutionary process, a great service they have rendered to all the fraternal countries.

In a word, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has passed with honour through considerable difficulties and trials, carrying aloft its Marxist-Leninist banner. And we your Soviet comrades and associates wholeheartedly say: "Glory to the party of the Czechoslovak Communists!"

We pay tribute of our special respect to the outstanding leader of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and President of the Republic, prominent leader of the Communist and working-class movement, Comrade Gustav Husak. A veteran of the Party, he played a major role in many crucial stages of its activities.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is now confidently leading the Czechoslovak people along the way of building a mature socialist society. Key problems of your country's social and economic development are being resolved in a socialist way. You have ample reason to be proud of the level of material well-being of the masses that has been achieved in Czechoslovakia. Cherishing the rich cultural heritage of your peoples, you are steadily advancing science, the arts, public education, the health services and sports—everything which serves the principal aim of socialism—the increasingly full satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural requirements of the members of society, the all-round development of the individual.

All this is to the everlasting credit of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, it is evidence of the correctness and farsightedness of its political course.

While rightly assessing your accomplishments, you also clearly see the emergent difficulties, sharply criticise existing shortcom-

ings and actively seek the best ways to eliminate them. This is shown by the report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the course of its discussion at the Congress.

Comrades, you probably know that the same exacting and responsible approach to its activities was displayed in the work of the recently held 26th Congress of our Party. It cannot and must not be otherwise. Vladimir Lenin taught us to assess our work in a sober and critical way. And as long as Communists follow this behest they will be able to solve any task.

Comrades, I can inform you with deep satisfaction that the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress evoked a lively response in our country, they were met with warm approval by Communists and the entire Soviet people. Regarding the Party's cause as their own vital cause, Soviet people have embarked on practical fulfilment of the extensive plans of communist construction which were outlined by the Congress.

The countries of the socialist community are tackling varied and, of course, increasingly profound and difficult tasks along the path of the further development of the society of mature socialism. And we have to do this in conditions of mounting opposition and, sometimes, openly hostile actions on the part of the most aggressive forces of imperialism.

In this situation, more than ever before, the key to success for all of us lies in the following. First, to work ever better, more efficiently, in a more organised way, developing our economy, culture and socialist democracy. Second, continuously to strengthen the unity of fraternal countries, their all-round, increasingly deep cooperation in all areas, in the most rational way to join our forces and resources in the interests of each of our countries and of the entire community.

Much is already being done in this respect, and even more will have to be done. You are well aware of this, comrades. It must be specially emphasised that our all-round and profound cooperation is developing on a consistently socialist basis—on the basis of equality, mutual respect, account of each other's interests and real revolutionary solidarity. It is thanks to this that our "socialist cooperative", to quote Lenin, means no encroachment upon the sovereign rights of its participants, but, what is more, provides reliable backing for them.

Let us take only the fact that it is precisely thanks to cooperation within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance that our fraternal countries can today meet many of their most vital economic requirements.

As you know, there are plans for a considerable development of cooperation in the extraction of gas and iron ore. Czechoslovakia, like the USSR, is already doing much to develop nuclear power engineering. Atomic energy will enable us to meet a substantial proportion of the requirements of our two countries and of other fra-

ternal countries. It is clear that it would be much more difficult to tackle on one's own a task of such magnitude.

It may be said with confidence, comrades, that the steady improvement in the work of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation meets the vital interests of each of the countries of the socialist community.

Our achievements, however, make our class enemies restless. They are trying to do everything to halt the advance of socialism, to erode it from within. To this end they are resorting to every means, such as economic pressure and blackmail, lying propaganda, flattery, demagoguery, the support and encouragement of counter-revolutionary forces where they still exist, and many other types of subversive activities.

All this, comrades, you know from your own experience, which has convincingly shown that the plans of the forces of reaction have no future.

Similar attempts are now being made in relation to the Polish People's Republic. But Polish Communists with the support of all genuine patriots of Poland will be able, one must believe, to give a fitting rebuff to the designs of the enemies of the socialist system, who are at the same time the enemies of Poland's independence, they will be able to uphold the cause of socialism, the genuine interests of the Polish people, and the honour and security of their country.

As for the Soviet Union, it was and remains a loyal friend and ally of socialist Poland. On this score, I am sure, we have a common stand with Czechoslovakia, just as with the other countries of the socialist community.

It is in a difficult external situation that the glorious Republic of Cuba—an inseparable part of the community of socialist states—is solving the tasks of its development. The Soviet Union firmly and invariably supports and will continue to support the fraternal Cuban people. We wholeheartedly wish them further achievements in socialist construction, we wish them peace and prosperity.

Comrades, guarding our socialist community, we are thereby protecting the most precious asset of all peoples—peace and security. This is so because the socialist countries are today making a decisive contribution to the cause of averting war, because they are the standard-bearers of the policy of detente and disarmament.

We in the Soviet Union at the 26th Congress of our Party recently put forward several quite specific proposals aimed at settling the most acute and urgent international problems in the interests of peace and the security of all peoples. They resounded all over the world and met with a positive response on all continents. We value the energetic and active support given to these proposals by our friends and allies, including, naturally, socialist Czechoslovakia.

Here in the centre of Europe I would like to dwell on just one of the new Soviet proposals.

The unbridled nuclear arms race in Europe is becoming mortally dangerous for all European nations. In order in some way to start the practical solution of this problem, we propose for the time being at least drawing a line under what exists, that is to say, preventing further deployment and replacement of Soviet and NATO medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. This, naturally, includes the American forward-based nuclear weapons in that region. This moratorium could be valid until a permanent treaty is concluded on the limitation and, even better, reduction of the above-mentioned nuclear weapons of both sides in Europe.

Naturally, our proposal of a moratorium is not an end in itself. It has been made with the intention of creating a more favourable atmosphere for talks. On this issue—I have stated this before and repeat it now—we see the aim to be precisely the reduction by both sides of the amount of nuclear weapons accumulated in Europe. This is quite feasible without worsening the conditions of security of either East or West.

As is known, our proposal has met with a very positive response in broad political circles and among the public in Western Europe. But the reaction of those who apparently did not like it was not slow in coming either.

It is said that the new Soviet proposal aims at consolidating an alleged superiority of the forces of the Warsaw Treaty member countries. This is certainly not so. I spoke of this in detail at the 26th CPSU Congress. If one casts a glance at the nuclear potentials which both sides now have in Europe, what is obvious is the approximate equilibrium of the forces of both sides. This has, by the way, been repeatedly admitted in the West. FRG Chancellor Schmidt, for instance, in a public speech in February this year clearly denied that the East-West equilibrium of forces in Europe had been upset. But the Chancellor expressed apprehension that "the Russians might be on the point of upsetting it". US Secretary of State Haig also recently spoke of "the relative equilibrium and parity". However, he voiced anxiety, alleging that this equilibrium might change in the USSR's favour by the middle of this decade.

In the light of such an appraisal of the current situation and the prospects of its development, the leaders in Western countries should logically have jumped at our proposal. Instead some of them are trying to minimise its significance, certainly not because the correlation of forces in Europe has changed in a few days. They are doing this because they would like to change it in the West's favour and are unwilling to bind themselves by a moratorium.

But such attempts—and this should be clearly understood—will only force the other side to take retaliatory steps. And again there will be a vicious circle—the situation in Europe will become even more hazardous for all. Is it so difficult for the governments of Western powers to realise this?

On the whole, comrades, our proposals signify settlement of the most urgent international problems which are of prime impor-

tance for the consolidation of peace. We propose that the parties concerned should hold businesslike, constructive talks on these issues—at any level, without any preliminary strings attached. If anybody has other reasonable proposals, we are ready to consider them too.

But, frankly speaking, so far we do not see any particular readiness for negotiations on the part of the governments of the Western powers.

Sometimes we are told that all this is very interesting, but calls for long study and there is supposedly no reason to hurry. At the same time one is given to understand that the decision as to the position that will be adopted depends not on the particular government, but on others. Meanwhile, the arms race continues to escalate and the international situation continues to deteriorate.

At other times, they try to present claims to us, to set preliminary conditions. They claim some “right” to rule the roost in nearly all parts of the planet, they demand that, as “payment” for Western consent to negotiations, we should stop considering the interests of our own security and give no assistance to our friends when they are the victims of aggression or threatened with attack.

A strange stand, to say the least.

Let us suppose for a minute that the Soviet Union were to declare: Before starting talks on the settlement of certain urgent international problems, let the Western powers change those aspects of their policy which we, and many others, definitely do not like. Let the United States, for instance, first withdraw its troops from such and such a country, from such and such military bases abroad. And let it terminate its support for and arms deliveries to certain dictatorial terroristic regimes.

Would anybody seriously accept such an approach to talks? It is hardly conceivable. We would be called simpletons insufficiently versed in politics, or people who create deliberate obstacles and delays and avoid negotiations because they have other far from peaceful intentions.

The experience of history, including that of recent decades, convincingly shows that success in talks between states comes only when attempts to dictate terms to each other are discarded, when there is a real will for peace and mutual respect for the partners' interests. It is precisely on this basis that major international agreements which helped consolidate peace and peoples' security have been achieved. I may mention, for instance, the State Treaty on the restoration of independent and democratic Austria, the 1971 Agreement on West Berlin, the treaties which the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the German Democratic Republic have signed with the Federal Republic of Germany, the Soviet-American accords on the limitation of strategic armaments, and, of course, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed in Helsinki.

The same approach to the Soviet Union's constructive proposals, advanced at the 26th CPSU Congress and brought to the notice of the governments of the corresponding states, we expect from these governments. For our proposals have been advanced not for the sake of propaganda, but in order to help achieve mutually acceptable accords for the sake of peace—peace in Europe, Asia, America, the Near, Middle and Far East, for the sake of universal peace.

Dear comrades, in conclusion let me express confidence that the Communists, the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia of Czechoslovakia will be able to cope successfully with the important tasks of building mature socialism, tasks which face the Party and the country. Guided by the directives of the current Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia you will undoubtedly make your country even richer and more beautiful, the life of the people even better, you will make a fresh contribution to our common cause, that of ensuring peace and security in Europe and the whole world. We wish you complete success in all these glorious deeds.

Long live the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia!

Long live the fraternal Czechoslovak people!

Long live eternal Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship!

Let the great community of the countries of socialism flourish and strengthen!

Let there be lasting peace on earth, let there be reliable security of the peoples!

Let us advance ever forward, friends, towards our just and noble goal—the construction of communism!

SPEECH IN PRAGUE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE 16th CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

April 10, 1981

Dear Comrade Husak,
Esteemed comrades and friends,

Each congress of a fraternal party is a great event of international significance. It convincingly demonstrates what influence the world communist movement has gained in our time.

Meetings at the forums of fraternal parties are a source of useful experience for all of us, an inspiring stimulus, they invigorate us and give us new energy for the struggle for our common cause.

Yet another example of this is the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, which has just ended its work in beautiful Prague.

On behalf of the foreign delegations present here I would like to express sincere gratitude to the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia for the opportunity accorded us to attend this congress of the glorious party of the Czechoslovak Communists.

I think I am not mistaken in saying that a common feeling pervades all of us at this moment. It is satisfaction with the results of the congress that has just concluded.

The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia has once more convincingly shown that it is the acknowledged vanguard of its people, it is confidently leading them along the road of economic, cultural and social progress and is persistently looking for and finding a solution to the complex problems facing the country on the basis of creative Marxism.

The congress has given the Communists and all working people of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic a clearly defined plan of further work in the construction of a developed socialist society on Czechoslovak soil.

And, of course, comrades, to us representatives of the large family of Communist and workers' parties, as well as probably to

the representatives of revolutionary-democratic parties and national-liberation movements, one more circumstance is of special importance.

I mean the fact that the Czechoslovak Communists consistently maintain loyalty to the ideas of proletarian, socialist internationalism, that they are making their worthy contribution to the great cause of the struggle for lasting peace in Europe and throughout the world, the struggle for the freedom and equality of nations and for social progress.

Allow me on behalf of the foreign guests cordially to congratulate our dear hosts on the successful holding of the congress. We wish all the Communists and working people of fraternal Czechoslovakia that they should fully implement the guidelines for the future outlined by the congress.

We warmly congratulate the comrades elected to the leading bodies of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia—the Central Committee, its Presidium and its Secretariat—on the high trust accorded to them. I am sincerely glad wholeheartedly on behalf of all of us to congratulate Comrade Gustav Husak on his re-election to the high post of General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and to wish him good health and many years of life and creative activity.

I propose a toast:

To the new successes of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the fraternal Czechoslovak people!

To our socialist community, to the alliance of all the revolutionary and progressive forces of today!

To peace and socialism!

To the health of all the comrades present here!

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT THE
PRESENTATION OF AWARDS OF THE SOVIET
UNION TO THE USSR PILOT-COSMONAUT
V. DZHANIBEKOV AND CITIZEN OF THE
MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
RESEARCHER-COSMONAUT ZH. GURRAGCHA**

April 17, 1981

Dear comrades,

We are marking today a joyous and significant occasion. Back from their space journey are two sons of the socialist countries—Comrades Dzhanibekov and Gurragcha. They have done an excellent job and made a good present to socialist Mongolia, our long-standing and true friend. The land of the first Mongolian cosmonaut is now preparing for the 18th Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and will then be marking the 60th anniversary of its glorious people's revolution. So it may be said that the present fits the occasion.

On this April day our memory goes back to the unforgettable 12th of April, 1961, when the whole world heard Yuri Gagarin's famous "Off we go!"

Space researchers have gone a long way in the years that have passed. Their equipment has changed and become more perfect, the tasks more complicated, and the terms of stay in space longer. But one thing has remained unchanged—only brave people with deep knowledge and capable of quickly and correctly acting in any highly complicated situation are equal to jobs in space orbit. Very briefly, only people of Gagarin's mettle are up to it.

It so happened that for a number of years, even before the first space launching, I was associated with the work of Soviet rocket specialists. I had the good fortune to know well Mstislav Keldysh, Sergei Korolyov, Mikhail Yangel and many other outstanding scientists and designers, who were paving the way to the stars for mankind.

All of us dreamed and tried to look ahead, of course, wondering what it would be like in twenty years' time. More often than not dreams are ahead of reality. But in the case of space research it turned out differently: reality has outstripped our dreams.

This flight is the eighth performed by international socialist crews, and Comrade Gurragcha is the first of the second hundred spacemen. At this very minute Comrades Kovalyonok and Savinykh, who but recently played host to our heroes aboard the *Salyut-6* station, are continuing their space mission.

It is thanks to the makers of space technology and thanks to cosmonauts that we now know more about outer space and the earth. We also know more about man's potentialities.

I should like to emphasise that the Soviet Union has always been a confirmed supporter of continued practical international cooperation in space. May the boundless expanses of space be pure and free from any kind of weapon. We are for attaining through joint effort a great humane goal, that of precluding the militarisation of outer space.

Comrades, for the successful implementation of a space flight aboard the orbital research complex *Salyut-6—Soyuz* and for courage and heroism displayed, Hero of the Soviet Union Vladimir Dzhanibekov has been awarded the Order of Lenin and a second Gold Star Medal, while Comrade Zhugdermidiyn Gurragcha, researcher-cosmonaut, a citizen of the Mongolian People's Republic, has been made Hero of the Soviet Union with the award of the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal.

I wholeheartedly congratulate you, comrades, on the awards and wish you all the best! I wish you happiness, good health and fresh accomplishments!

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT A DINNER IN
HONOUR OF MUAMMAR GADDAFI,
LEADER OF THE LIBYAN REVOLUTION AND
HEAD OF THE SOCIALIST PEOPLE'S LIBYAN
ARAB JAMAHIRIYA**

April 27, 1981

Esteemed Comrade Gaddafi,
Esteemed Libyan friends,
Comrades,

We are glad to welcome again here in the Kremlin you, Comrade Gaddafi, and the Libyan leaders who arrived together with you.

When representatives of the USSR and Libya address each other as "comrade" this well reflects the nature of the relations that have arisen between us, relations of equality, mutual respect and revolutionary solidarity.

Our states differ considerably. There are also certain differences between us of an ideological nature. But this does not prevent us from being good comrades, associates in the struggle for the rights and freedom of peoples, against imperialist oppression and aggression, for a durable and just peace and social progress.

Our cooperation is of special significance in conditions of the present complication of the international situation.

The reason for this complication is well known. It is the policy of aggressive imperialist circles, the enemies of socialism and national-liberation revolutions, of those who are bent on exploiting the natural wealth and labour of other peoples, and profiting from the arms race.

The revolutionary peoples of Vietnam and Cuba, of Algeria and Angola, of Ethiopia and Afghanistan, the peoples of independent India and of the Arab countries neighbouring on Israel, which has been armed by the Americans, the peoples of a number of countries of Central and South America—all of them, each in their own way, have felt or are still feeling the effects of the policy of today's imperialist colonialists, the policy of bribes and sabotage,

acts of intervention and bloody wars against the peoples. Libya, too, knows from its own experience what the blackmail and threats of imperialists and their placemen are.

Imperialists have no wish to accept the fact that the world in which they dominated and ruled for so long is refusing to serve them and to submit to their will, but is determined to advance along its own independent path.

History is deciding this question in favour of the freedom of the peoples. Two-thirds of the states in the world of today are countries that have freed themselves from colonial oppression and imperialist dependence.

But the imperialists have no regard either for the will of the peoples or for the laws of history. The liberation struggle of the peoples causes their indignation. They describe it as "terrorism". They use any pretext for interference in the affairs of other peoples and for military and political expansion and, when there are no such pretexts, they artificially create them.

Recall, for instance, how official Washington used the question concerning a group of American diplomats who were detained in Iran some time ago. They have long since returned home safely but the powerful US fleet that was brought into the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf area allegedly to "rescue the hostages" is to this day cruising in those waters, threatening neighbouring states and universal peace.

Who will believe that the United States of America and its allies are concerned for the security of the oil supply routes from the Persian Gulf area if they even refuse to agree to that security being reliably ensured by an international agreement?

Or take the situation in the Middle East as a whole. It is now already clear to everyone that the authors of the Camp David collusion and those who are continuing that course today have by no means intended and do not intend to make the first step toward an overall peaceful settlement.

What we in the USSR and you in Libya and other countries of the "Front of Steadfastness" said from the very beginning is now clear to all: that Camp David was in fact the first step not to lasting peace in the Middle East but to the knocking together of a military bloc including the US, Israel and Sadat's Egypt, spearheaded against the Arabs.

Matters have already reached the point of openly drawing up plans for the long-term deployment of American troops in Sinai and, it may well be, elsewhere in the Arab East. Is this not a direct challenge to the Arab peoples? And this is, of course, a grave threat to the security of other countries situated not far away.

We in the Soviet Union highly esteem the principled stand taken by Libya on these issues. Together with other progressive states you are consistently working against the imperialist schemes and encroachments on the rights of the peoples.

We are profoundly convinced that there is only one way to establish a lasting and just peace in the Middle East. It is the way of an honest collective search for a comprehensive settlement on a principled and realistic basis—including, of course, the realisation of the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine.

And I wish to stress once again what I said recently at the 26th CPSU Congress: The Soviet Union is prepared to take a constructive part in this work, it is prepared to participate in the international conference together with the other countries concerned.

And one more thing. The present American Administration, which is apt to see the "hand of Moscow" in all events taking place in the world, is repeatedly launching appeals to the USSR and its allies to agree on observance of some kind of a "code of rules of conduct" in relations with the young states of Africa, Asia and Latin America. It is alleged that in that event there will be more tranquillity in the world.

What can one say to this?

If what is meant are some "rules" which will perpetuate imperialist brigandage and dictation to the above-mentioned states, the establishment of some "spheres of influence" and so on, then, of course, we shall never agree to it. This runs counter to the principles of our policy.

At the same time the USSR has always been and is in favour of strict and full observance of the principle of equality and of the generally recognised norms of international law in relations between all states, such norms as, for instance, those that are embodied in the United Nations Charter, in the Helsinki Final Act or, say, in the well-known agreements of the seventies between the USSR and the US, agreements which, regrettably, are now being flouted by the US authorities.

We believe the application of these norms to relations with the young states of the three continents in the present situation means roughly the following:

— recognition of the right of each people to decide their domestic affairs themselves, without outside interference; renunciation of attempts to establish any forms of domination or hegemony over them or to include them in the "sphere of interests" of any big power;

— strict respect for the territorial integrity of these countries, the inviolability of their frontiers; there should be no outside support for any separatist movements aimed at partitioning those countries;

— unconditional recognition of the right of each African, Asian and Latin American state to participate on an equal basis in international life, to develop relations with any countries of the world;

— complete and unconditional recognition of the sovereignty of those states over their natural resources and also *de facto* recognition of their complete equality in international economic relations;

support for their efforts aimed at eliminating the vestiges of colonialism and eradicating racism and apartheid in accordance with the well-known resolutions of the United Nations;

— respect for the status of non-alignment chosen by the majority of African, Asian and Latin American states; renunciation of attempts to draw them into the military-political blocs of the big powers.

Such is the "code of conduct" that we recognise and are always prepared to observe. And we call on the United States, other permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and, naturally, all other states to follow suit. Then there will really be more tranquillity in the world and the peoples will be able to be more confident of the future.

In conclusion, let me say again that we value friendly relations with Libya very highly and are confident that they will be developed further as a result of the talks that began today.

I propose a toast:

To our good friend and leader of the Libyan revolution Comrade Muammar Gaddafi!

To the health of all our esteemed Libyan guests!

To friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Libyan peoples!

To the freedom and equality of all peoples, to peace throughout the world!

SPEECH AT THE OPENING OF THE MEMORIAL COMPLEX IN THE HERO-CITY OF KIEV

May 9, 1981

Dear Kievans, esteemed delegates of the glorious hero-cities of our country,

Dear comrades,

First of all allow me to convey to you heartfelt congratulations from the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and the Soviet Government on the occasion of today's truly national holiday—Victory Day.

There is not a single spot in our vast country, nor a single Soviet family, for whom this holiday will not be marked by profound emotion and feelings of sacred grief and great patriotic pride. Indeed, as a popular song goes, this holiday has a taste of powder, for it is a holiday which evokes both joy and sorrow in us all.

It is right to open the majestic memorial complex dedicated to the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people on this very day. As a man who fought in the war from the beginning to the end and who participated in the battles for the liberation of the Soviet Ukraine and its glorious capital, I am deeply moved by this ceremony today.

The Great Patriotic War began forty years ago. Those belonging to the older generation probably remember well the fair summer day of June 22, 1941, the day when the most sinister forces of imperialism, the forces of bloody fascism, plunged our country into a blaze of war. They did not conceal their goals. They wanted to destroy socialism. They wanted to erase from geographical maps the very country whose people had dared to throw off the yoke of capital. They wanted the dark night of savage cruelty and sadism, and the brash ignorance of a drill sergeant to reign over mankind for many years to come.

Fascism had been preparing for its perfidious aggression for a long time. Relying on the support of world reaction, it amassed

immense power. Together with its allies it conquered almost the whole of Europe and a sizable part of Asia. It seemed to many people in the West at the time that nothing could oppose its drive.

But the Soviet people resolutely stood in the way of the fascist plague. Rallying around the Party of Lenin, they rose to the defence of their country, their freedom, their fundamental ideals. Thanks to their staunchness and heroism the Soviet people succeeded in reversing the course of events.

We were not alone in our struggle against fascism. We remember well our fearless comrades-in-arms—partisans, the heroes of the Resistance in many countries occupied by the Hitlerites. We remember the soldiers of our allies in the anti-Hitler coalition. But we cannot forget the obvious fact that it was the Soviet people who bore the brunt of the war.

Our Motherland lost twenty million of its sons and daughters. They could have become heroes of labour at factories and in the fields, engineers or scientists, poets or conquerors of space, in other words, the builders of the great happiness of people. But fate decided otherwise. Their lot was to give up their lives in the name of the happiness of the Soviet people. And they did give up their lives, so that their comrades, their children and grandchildren could accomplish what had been planned, so that people could live in peace.

Fighting at the front, the war heroes knew and felt that the whole country and the whole of the people were behind them. The battlefield and the rear were a single whole. And those who in the years of the war were working selflessly in the rear did almost the impossible to bring Victory nearer.

The grand monument which we unveil today is the monument to them all—all the victors.

It is a token of respectful memory to those who fought in the name of the life and happiness of the Motherland, in the name of delivering the peoples of Europe and other continents from fascist slavery.

It is a token of gratitude and profound respect for those who were forging the weapons of victory in the rear.

Immortal is the feat of those who fought against fascism and defeated it. This feat will live for centuries.

The war ended long ago. And still the voices of our relatives and our war comrades who died in the war sound in our memory. We see their faces, our hands feel the warmth of their firm handshakes. We remember what they talked about, what we dreamt of together.

Death has no power over them, for they are living in our hearts, in our deeds and accomplishments. They are together with us both in times of work and joy. We can clearly see their best features, their indomitable will, their heartfelt faith in the triumph of our revolutionary ideals in the generations which were born and grew up after the war.

In the unforgettable victorious spring of 1945 we, the front-line soldiers, believed that this world war would be the last one. We believed that never again would our children hear the thunder of explosions and the piercing scream of air-raid sirens, would never see blood flowing or flames destroying their homes. This belief multiplied our forces in the decisive battle against the enemy. So thought millions upon millions of people in our country and all the continents. Their hopes cannot and must not be deceived. The Soviet Union was doing and is doing everything in its power for this purpose.

The Soviet people have shown that they can make good use of the fruits of peace. The dreams of frontline soldiers, of all the people who lived through the horrors and privations of the war years, about how mighty and beautiful our country would be after the victory, have come true.

One of the vivid examples of this is your beautiful Kiev, a hero-city revived from ruins, more resplendent than ever before. And there are many more cities in our country which rose from ashes through the will of the Soviet people. The signs of new life can be seen everywhere in our country. These are the cascades of the hydropower stations on the Volga and the Dnieper, the Yenisei and the Angara, the workshops of KAMAZ, and the Baikal-Amur mainline which cuts through the hitherto inaccessible taiga. These are the oil and gas of Tyumen, space rockets and the atom in the service of the peaceful life of the people, millions of houses with all modern conveniences, new schools, universities and theatres, comfortable kindergartens.

The future course of building communism in our country has been clearly mapped out in the decisions of the 26th Congress of the CPSU.

But to accomplish what we have planned we need peace.

Meanwhile events in the international arena remind us with ever-increasing persistency that peace is not something that comes automatically. No, it does not, unfortunately. Peace is, in fact, being threatened, and threatened seriously. We must work hard to preserve it.

There are quite a few sober-minded people among those who today shape the policy of capitalist countries. They understand that the emphasis on strength, the emphasis on war in relations with the socialist world is madness nowadays, that there is only one reasonable road—peaceful coexistence, mutually advantageous cooperation.

But there are also statesmen in the capitalist world who, judging by everything, are accustomed to thinking only in terms of strength and diktat. They actually regard the attainment of military superiority over the Soviet Union as their main political credo. The solution of international problems by way of talks and mutually advantageous agreements appears to be way down their list of priorities, if they give serious thought to it at all.

Among them there are also those who openly state that peace is not the most important matter, that there are things more important than peace.

Just think, comrades. Can one imagine a more horrendous position, a more cynical disregard for the destinies of nations, including their own nation, for the lives of hundreds of millions of people?

For it is a fact that the means of waging war, the means of mass destruction have now acquired such scope that their use would put in question the existence of many nations and, more than that, the whole of modern civilisation.

For this reason to repulse the policy of those who like military ventures, to come out for the strengthening of universal peace, means today to come out in defence of the very life of mankind, in defence of everything great, lofty and priceless that has been created by people throughout millennia.

I do not have to mention how absurd are any plans which aim by means of threats, economic blockade or military aggression to impede the development of socialist countries or the struggle of peoples for national freedom and social justice. The Second World War and the three and a half decades after it have shown with sufficient clarity that such methods not only fail to benefit the imperialists but also produce results opposite to those that they hoped for. It appears though that there are people who do not learn from the lessons of history.

As to the Soviet Union, it is not the first time that we are hearing slander, threats and inventions about our policy. But we do not give in to intimidations. We have strong nerves and we have passed through a lot. We are not exponents of the arms race, we are its opponents. We could find a totally different use for the means that it absorbs. But if we are compelled, we shall have a quick and effective reply to any challenge by belligerent imperialism. For it is our prime and most sacred duty to ensure the security of our country and its allies, to ensure reliable peace for the Soviet people.

The experience of the postwar years shows that war can be prevented. What dangers have not originated in the past three and a half decades! There was the "cold war". There were dangerous moments and, one may say, critical ones. But the imperialists did not succeed in pushing mankind into the abyss.

We succeeded by our weight and by our policy to influence the international climate, to make it less rigorous. For a whole decade international relations developed under the sign of detente. This is the most valuable achievement of the 1970's. It is a result of the persistent joint efforts of the Soviet Union, the fraternal countries of socialism, and all sober-minded forces of our time.

Fear and prejudice, lies and hatred—these are worst enemies of peace. They are being cultivated by imperialist reaction as it aggravates international tension.

In the present situation the need has never been greater for circumspection and a balanced approach, and at the same time for honest, bold efforts in the name of accord, in the name of international trust.

Comrades, the recent Congress of the CPSU confirmed that peace is the supreme aim of the Soviet Union's international policy. The set of initiatives put forward by the Congress has been named by people a Peace Programme for the 1980's. We know well that in the struggle against the dangerous plans of the preachers of a new war, in the struggle for lasting peace, all the peoples of the world are on our side.

The advancement of the Programme, naturally, is only the beginning and not the end of the matter. All the work, all the struggle still lie ahead. We are not claiming monopoly in the cause of strengthening peace. We are for a dialogue on a broad scale and any constructive idea will always find understanding on our part.

No matter where talks are conducted and no matter what problems they are devoted to, we always have given and will give pride of place to the interests of peace and peaceful cooperation.

We have come out and will come out in favour of eliminating crises and hotbeds of military conflicts generated by the imperialists, and putting an end to wars, both declared and undeclared.

The international situation can be better or worse, but it is essential not to stray from the correct path. We shall work insistently to ease tensions, to preserve detente and ensure its further development. This is the key issue.

Our intentions are pure and noble. Our might is great. But we shall never turn it against other peoples. It serves and will serve the cause of peace.

The freedom and security of other countries is an essential condition of our own freedom and security. At the same time our freedom and security is a necessary prerequisite of the free and independent development of other countries.

Great is the nation which is aware of the bonds with its history, which can utilise all the best from its historical traditions and make it an asset of the present day. The Soviet people are in full possession of this marvellous feature. The opening of this memorial is fresh proof of this.

I am sure that this grandiose memorial complex, which rose on the high bank of the Dnieper, will be dear to all Soviet people. It will always symbolise the victory of life over death, of reason over insanity, of good over evil.

Glory to the Soviet people, a heroic people, a victorious people!
May peace triumph on earth!

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT A DINNER IN
HONOUR OF DENIS SASSOU-NGUESSO,
CHAIRMAN OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE CONGOLESE LABOUR PARTY, PRESIDENT
OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO,
CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS**

May 12, 1981

Dear Comrade Sassou-Nguesso,
Esteemed guests,

Comrades, we are glad cordially to welcome the party and state delegation of the People's Republic of the Congo, a country which represents the new and free Africa, the community of young states advancing along the road of political and social progress.

The time has passed when Africa was a domain of foreign oppressors, when decisions affecting the destinies of the African peoples were adopted behind their backs, in the narrow circle of colonial powers and international monopolies.

Some 50 states of Africa have gained independence in the period since the Second World War. Their joining in international affairs brought a fresh healthy breeze into world politics. A good spokesman of the views and aspirations of those states is the Organisation of African Unity, which proclaimed as its lofty aim the rallying of the African countries on anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist foundations.

Africa's role in international affairs today is a weighty and undeniable one. Its voice is resounding ever more confidently in the solution of the main problems of our time.

The imperialists, the direct heirs of those who by iron, fire and bloodshed turned free peoples into slaves and who plundered and oppressed them for decades, do not wish to reconcile themselves to this. They seek to impose their concept of world order upon the international community, a concept which would justify neo-colonialist piracy, methods of diktat and violence, and would free their hands for suppression of the national-liberation movements.

Our stand here is the exact opposite.

What kind of Africa would Soviet people like to see? The same as Africans would themselves—peaceable, independent and prosperous, for Africa is the sphere of vital interests of the Africans alone and of no one else.

We are in favour of letting the African peoples independently determine the road of their development and think that their freedom of choice should be honoured. We are emphatically against attempts by imperialism to turn the African continent into another region of military-political confrontation.

May Africa be a continent of peace, free of foreign military

bases and nuclear weapons. We are in favour of the proposal of the Organisation of African Unity that the turning of Africa into a nuclear-free zone should be embodied in a specific agreement, and are prepared to do our utmost to support such an agreement.

May Africa be completely cleansed of the vestiges of colonialism, racism and apartheid, and of the criminal rule of the racists where they still retain power today. We steadfastly oppose the illegal occupation of Namibia. Our sympathies are with the just struggle of the Namibian people, headed by their true representative, SWAPO. And we believe that the day is not far off when their struggle will be crowned with victory.

We want to see Africa fully overcome the aftermath of the colonial past—famine, poverty, disease and cultural backwardness. We wish a successful conclusion to the struggle of the newly-free countries for economic independence, against domination by imperialist monopolies, for the establishment of an equitable international economic order.

Africans themselves must manage all the wealth of their continent.

Another thing we wish the newly-free states of Africa is to live in peace and concord with each other and to settle disputes which sometimes might emerge between them at a negotiating table on the basis of the lofty principles proclaimed by the Organisation of African Unity.

The Soviet Union has always rendered and will render all possible assistance to the peoples of Africa in the attainment of these lofty aims.

Dear Comrade Sassou-Nguesso, Soviet-Congolese relations have a strong and reliable foundation. It is our common ideals in the struggle for peace and social progress. Their most important element is the successful development of cooperation between the CPSU and the Congolese Labour Party, which was one of the first in independent Africa to proclaim as its aim the building of a new society on the principles of scientific socialism.

Tomorrow we will sign a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and the People's Republic of the Congo. This is an important event in the life of our states and peoples. The treaty will undoubtedly make traditional friendly Soviet-Congolese relations rise to a still higher level. It will also be a factor making for an increase in the international weight of young independent Africa in our intricate and contradictory world.

I propose a toast to the further development and deepening of friendship between our Parties, states and peoples.

To the successes of the Congolese people in building a new life!

To the health of Comrade Sassou-Nguesso, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Congolese Labour Party, President of the People's Republic of the Congo and Chairman of the Council of Ministers, and to our Congolese friends!

**SPEECH AT THE CELEBRATION MEETING IN
TBILISI ON THE OCCASION OF THE 60th
ANNIVERSARY OF THE GEORGIAN SSR AND
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GEORGIA**

May 22, 1981

Dear comrades, on the occasion of the glorious 60th anniversary of the Georgian SSR and the Communist Party of Georgia I am glad to convey the most sincere and cordial greetings to you and all the working people of the Republic on behalf of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

Your holiday is a holiday for all Soviet people, for the whole large family of the Soviet peoples. It is known all over our country that Georgia is a beautiful land inhabited by open-hearted people, who have since time immemorial valued human nobleness, enthusiastic work, valour in battle and fidelity in friendship.

Georgia's historical destinies were not easy. For centuries it was invaded by foreign conquerors, who devastated the country. But generations of your ancestors proved to be as solid as the rocks of the Caucasus. They upheld their independence and created and preserved their distinctive, in many respects unique, national culture. A salutary role here was played by Georgia's voluntary joining with Russia and friendship with the great Russian people, which deepened from century to century.

The finest sons of the Georgian people were active participants in the October Revolution, they fought courageously on the fronts of the Civil War. In the grim years of the Great Patriotic War Georgia's sons and daughters selflessly rose in defence of their Soviet homeland. Two hundred and seventy thousand of them—almost a third of the people from the Republic who went to the front—gave their lives in the struggle against the aggressor. The memory of these people is sacred.

Socialism has brought Georgia real freedom, roused the deeply ingrained creative forces of its people. Like all our republics,

Georgia has changed beyond recognition during the years of Soviet rule.

The metallurgical, motor, mechanical engineering, chemical and many other industries have been actually created anew in the Republic, and recently your plentiful land gratified us by striking oil. Today Georgia is in fact going through a fresh and very important stage of industrialisation at the highest technological level.

There is the same picture of innovation in agriculture. In the 10th Five-Year Plan period you achieved record crops of tea, citrus fruit, grapes, fruit and vegetables. The interesting experiments, which are being carried out in the Republic, are being closely studied in our whole country. I mean the improvement in the management of production and the procurement of farm produce, work incentives, cooperation between socialised farms and personal subsidiary economies.

Now take science, culture and the arts in Georgia. Scientists of the Republic have made quite a number of outstanding discoveries. Remarkable works have been produced in the fields of literature, painting, music, theatre, cinematography and architecture of Soviet Georgia, which have enriched the multi-national Soviet culture. Recent years have seen a considerable upsurge in artistic creativity. And in this field, of course, an important role is being played by the guiding activity of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia, which has found a correct style of work with masters of culture, is helping them and actively assisting their creative quests.

All Soviet people also know Georgia as our all-Union health resort. They are grateful to you for the warm hospitality, for what you do to preserve the health of millions of working people.

On the whole the Republic's contribution to the general well-being of the country is steadily increasing. Over ten years industrial output has doubled and the average annual output of farm produce has increased by fifty per cent. The targets of the 10th Five-Year Plan period as regards the main indices of economic and social development have been fulfilled ahead of schedule. These are good achievements, comrades.

Georgia has got off to a confident start in the new, 11th Five-Year Plan period, too. You have produced 80 million roubles worth of industrial products in excess of the plan to mark the jubilee. I congratulate you on this success.

It is gratifying to note that an atmosphere of genuine international friendship prevails in Soviet Georgia. Georgians and Russians, Abkhazians and Ukrainians, Ossetians, Armenians and Azerbaijanians, Greeks and Kurds—people of more than 70 nationalities—are working hand in hand for the benefit of the Republic and the entire Soviet people. The experience of your Republic is another convincing proof of the correctness of our Party's Leninist nationalities policy.

Your achievements are the result of the persistent work of hundreds of thousands of working people in the Republic. They are also the result of the organising and political activity of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia, the Bureau of the Central Committee headed by Comrade Shevardnadze, whose vigour, creative approach to work and adherence to principles we all know and value.

We all remember what negative phenomena once took place in the Republic. They were named in the resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU as regards the Tbilisi City Party Committee and in a number of other documents of the Central Committee, which were directly addressed to the Communists and working people of Georgia. The aim of these documents was in the first place fundamentally to improve the situation in the Republic, to strengthen its economic potential and to help the working people more successfully resolve the tasks of building communism.

The Party organisation of the Republic has drawn correct conclusions from this criticism. You succeeded in launching a principled and uncompromising struggle against negative phenomena, for strengthening Party and state discipline, for a correct policy as regards cadres. Much has been done to ensure positive processes in the Republic's economic and social life. Care must continue to be taken so that the moral atmosphere in Georgia be as pure as your mountain air, and that young people are well acquainted with and carry on the best traditions of the older generations, selfless workers and patriots infinitely devoted to the Homeland. Soviet Georgia's leading workers are our common pride and glory, and on the day of the jubilee the country expresses gratitude to them on behalf of the entire Soviet people.

But, of course, comrades, everything that has been said does not mean that you have no serious problems and shortcomings in work. There are, regrettably, quite enough of both.

In the next few years Georgia is to improve its performance as regards some essential indices of economic development. In farm output, especially the output of meat, milk and eggs, for example, you are lagging behind. In industry you still have great turnover of manpower and losses of working time. You must put new production facilities into operation more speedily. The reconstruction of several major enterprises and the development of the young oil industry and of facilities for the extraction of manganese and copper ore are to be conducted at an accelerated rate. Quite a lot is also to be done to resolve the housing problem and several other social problems. You have a very important problem of making fuller use of manpower resources. These must more actively be drawn into the solution of key economic problems both in the Republic and outside it.

You raise the question of building a railway straight through the Caucasian Range. This idea has long been in existence. The difficulties involved in such a construction project are enormous.

But no fewer difficulties are created by the lack of a railway. Perhaps the time has come to study more closely this very complex engineering problem which is, however, also a very important economic one.

Ensuring the further rise of Georgia's economy calls for increasing the effectiveness and specialisation of its agriculture. Your contribution to the implementation of the all-Union food programme should be increased. You have untapped reserves here.

The task which the Party has now set on the scale of the whole country is within the shortest possible time to ensure the reliable supply of foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials for our people. We must solve this task and we will solve it by all means. The food programme is currently being drawn up. It is not the fruit of merely theoretical calculations, it must be based on the experience and potentialities of the economy. Hence it is very important that collective and state farms, districts, regions and all the republics should specifically determine what can be their maximum, I stress, maximum contribution to this matter of paramount significance. We must give careful thought to ensuring that each rouble of capital investment, each additional ton of fertilizer should be fully repaid by the growth of productivity of fields, orchards and farms.

Both collective and state farms, all the people employed in agriculture must be truly interested in ensuring more and more farm produce for the benefit of the whole country. They must have both moral and material incentives. Skilful use of local resources, close attention to the climatic and other particular features of a given zone, the correct choice of the set of crops—all this can be done more effectively on the spot. It must be made the rule not to impede the grass-roots initiative but to encourage it provided, of course, it does not run counter to state interests at large.

Stock-breeding is, of course, the most important component of the food programme. No wonder that the 26th Congress called it the main front in agriculture. But in your Republic the results in this field still leave much to be desired. Stock productivity is growing at an insufficiently fast rate. So it is correct that you have now taken the course of turning Georgia into a republic of highly developed stock-breeding. The key to ensuring the upsurge of stock-breeding is strengthening the fodder base. In this respect the current five-year plan period must become to a considerable degree one of fodder production.

Agriculture is not isolated from other sectors of the economy. Agricultural production is secured now not only by work in the fields and on the farms, but also by the operation of hundreds of factories and by the perfect organisation of transport. So it is clear, comrades, that in considering the task set by the Party in resolving the food problem, every ministry, organisation and enterprise must in its plans provide for specific measures to assist this drive. I mean the indices of growth of supplies of equipment, mineral fer-

tilizer, fuel and other means of production for agriculture, the processing of farm produce, expanding the construction of production facilities and cultural and everyday service facilities in the countryside.

I would like to touch specifically upon another issue which concerns both town and country. It is the drive for rational, thrifty utilisation of material resources, an effort to prevent losses of all kinds. We lose far too much produce because we have not yet learnt to take good care of the national wealth. We suffer losses because of the half-hearted attitude of certain people in production, because of the miscalculations of designers, because here and there managers of enterprises lack a statesmanlike approach, because of poor organisation of the transport and storage of products.

Serious attention must be devoted to ensuring the prompt and complete processing of the whole harvest raised at collective and state farms. Of great importance in this drive is a thrifty approach and initiative on the part of the management of collective and state farms and of all workers in the countryside. It is also one of the most important objectives of the relevant ministries, of all Party, government and economic bodies. We have to reach a stage at which literally not a single kilogram of grain, fruit and vegetables is lost.

Losses do not come about by themselves, particular people are to blame. We are not sufficiently strict in calling these culprits to task. On the other hand, we do not yet sufficiently encourage those who can save raw materials, fuel and energy, who can save every kopeck belonging to the state. And this must be done by all means, comrades. Not for nothing is our economy called a people's economy. The whole of its development is subordinated to the people's well-being. We are strong enough to block all the channels by which losses arise, if we mobilise all our Party, government, trade union, Young Communist League organisations, and the people as a whole for this drive. The active involvement of all the working people in the drive to prevent losses is a good form of participation by the masses in the administration of the affairs of society.

Comrades, the 26th Congress of the CPSU has given an invigorating impulse to the labour and political activity of the entire Soviet people. The decisions of the Congress are stimulating the people's thoughts and sharpening their sense of the new. The atmosphere of enthusiasm, which prevailed at the Congress, has swept the whole country. The Soviet people met the spring of the new five-year plan period quite well, which is convincingly shown by statistics. The main thing now is not to lose momentum but confidently to follow up the successes we have achieved while advancing to fresh gains. I believe that your Republic, too, will cope with this task.

Comrades, let me now dwell a little on international affairs.

The foreign policy ideas of the 26th Congress of the CPSU are doing their job, clearing the way to a serious political dialogue, to talks on the basic problems of war and peace. Had it not been for these major and bold initiatives of our Congress the whole of the present political landscape would have seemed as flat and featureless as the Caucasus would be without the Caucasian Range. Three months have passed since the Congress and none of the themes suggested by us for discussion have lost any of their significance. On the contrary, their urgency is increasing.

Take, for instance, the region of the Near East, which for Georgia as well as for all our country is really near. What is taking place there is cruel, tragic and dangerous. Indeed, can one close one's eyes to the lack of rights and the suffering of millions of Palestinians? Can one remain indifferent to the fate of Lebanon, which is being literally bled white, torn by the Israeli military? One reckless step and a military conflagration may enfold the entire region of the Near East. It is hard to tell how far the sparks of such a conflagration would fly.

The Soviet Union put forward a proposal which offers a good chance for working collectively to stabilise the situation in the Near East. I refer to the calling of an international conference on this question. Our proposal on this score has met with a broad positive response in Arab countries and in many other states.

We are for active negotiations in order to improve international relations. This fully applies to the situation in the Persian Gulf and around Afghanistan. This situation has deteriorated because Washington has tried to put gross pressure on Iran and organised intervention against the Afghan revolution. The situation was even more aggravated by the unprecedented concentration of US armed forces in the whole region.

How to ease the situation? We see several opportunities here: to talk separately about ensuring peace and security in the Persian Gulf region and also separately about settling the situation around Afghanistan—or to discuss the international aspects of both these questions in connection with each other. In doing so, of course, it is necessary that the sovereignty of all states in the zone should be reliably safeguarded. There must be no question of interference in their internal affairs. So the Soviet Union is ready for negotiations, indeed for different varieties of negotiations. The only trouble is that in the NATO camp, where they are so fond of talking about "Soviet expansion" and the "Soviet threat", they have still said nothing about our proposals.

As regards Afghanistan, our position is clear. We stand for its full independence, we respect its status as a non-aligned country. The USSR, like Afghanistan itself, favours a political settlement that will put an end to the undeclared war against Afghanistan and give it dependable guarantees of non-interference.

Agreement on a political settlement would make it possible in accord with the Afghan side to establish time limits and the

order of withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. The non-resumption of intervention against Afghanistan must be reliable and guaranteed. Troops could be withdrawn gradually as the agreements reached were translated into reality. Matters are held up, above all, by the stubborn refusal of the Pakistani leaders to come to terms with Afghanistan and stop interfering in its affairs.

Comrades, we have just celebrated Victory Day. And in a month's time it will be forty years since the beginning of the Great Patriotic War. These dates—May 9 and June 22—make us think again and again about what is happening in Europe, where world wars twice began. In the seventies Europe knew the taste of detente. But now the situation is changing for the worse. This is primarily because of NATO's decision to deploy new American medium-range missiles in Western Europe. This NATO plan, which was recently reaffirmed at the Rome session of the council of this bloc, is aimed at satisfying the Pentagon's boundless appetites. It does not accord with the interests of the security of Europeans. The question of limiting and even reducing nuclear-missile armaments in Europe on the basis of the balance of forces and observance of the principle of equality can and must be decided through negotiations. We are ready for them. It is now up to Washington.

At the same time I must with full sense of responsibility say that we cannot leave without consequences the deployment on European soil of new American nuclear missiles aimed at the USSR and our allies. In that event we shall have to think about additional defence measures. If necessary, we shall find impressive means of safeguarding our vital interests. And the NATO planners must not then complain.

But, I repeat, this is not our choice. A peace based on mutual intimidation has no attraction for us. We prefer a peace in which the levels of armaments become lower and lower and the scale and quality of cooperation in all fields grow and improve.

The Soviet Union is for agreements that can lessen the acuteness of the military confrontation between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty. These aims are specifically served by the proposal to call a conference on military detente and disarmament in Europe. The question of such a conference is now being discussed at the meeting of representatives of 35 states in Madrid. The USSR's statement on its readiness to spread confidence-building measures to the entire European part of our country was a major step designed to remove obstacles in the way of the convocation of such a conference. Provided, of course, Western states also take a similar step. But for no obvious reason they are pretending to forget about it. If Western states are not prepared to say now what their reciprocal step will be in extending the zone of confidence-building measures, they could give their reply not in Madrid but directly at the conference.

The movement against the deployment of new American missiles and for starting talks with the Soviet Union as soon as possible is now growing in West European countries. Many statesmen there are aware of the need to preserve detente. More and more people are realising that a policy of refusing to have talks and of reliance on military force is a policy of repudiating common sense.

More than eight centuries ago the great Rustaveli said: "Do not boast of your strength, people! Drop this silly game! . . . For a tiny spark is enough to burn down a forest!" It would be good if people in all countries and on all continents heeded this wise call and followed it today when the threshold of the third millennium of our era is already in sight!

Dear comrades, you are having a wonderful holiday and you are celebrating your jubilee in a worthy manner. It may be said that the jubilee celebrations here are permeated with the spirit of friendship of the peoples, fine labour enthusiasm, pride in what has been achieved and the great plans for the future. And this is a very good thing. For there is much hard work ahead of all of us.

What may I wish you for the future? To act more boldly, work even harder and further raise the prestige of Soviet Georgia. Soviet people are confident that your sunny republic will more than once gladden our country with new labour victories.

I wish you more success, comrades, and great personal happiness!

Long live Soviet Georgia, the bearer of four orders!

Fraternal greetings to the Communists of Georgia!

Long live the inviolable friendship of the Soviet peoples!

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT A DINNER IN
HONOUR OF HIS MAJESTY HUSSEIN IBN
TALAL, KING OF THE HASHEMITE
KINGDOM OF JORDAN**

May 26, 1981

Your Majesty,
Esteemed Jordanian guests,
Comrades,

I am very glad to greet our distinguished guest from Jordan, who has come to the Soviet Union on a friendly visit. The visit and the Soviet-Jordanian negotiations that have begun convincingly show that relations between our countries are developing successfully.

Jordan is a small country. But the political weight of states is not measured by the size of their territories and the number of their population. It is determined by their course in international affairs, by their contribution to safeguarding peace on earth. It is only through the joint effort of all states, large and small, that it is possible to uphold and consolidate peace—a just peace, based on respect for the sovereign rights of every people and on non-interference in other countries' affairs.

This task has been and remains the cardinal one in the foreign policy activities of the Soviet state. The package of new constructive proposals that have recently been put forward by the Soviet Union is aimed at the solution of this task. Among them is the proposal for fresh collective efforts aimed at reaching a political settlement in the Middle East.

We note with satisfaction the proximity of the positions of the Soviet Union and Jordan on many international problems and, above all, on the problem of establishing a lasting and just peace in the Middle East.

The clouds have now darkened again over that region. Israel's aggressive actions in Lebanon have brought the Middle East to a dangerous brink.

One asks: what right at all does Israel have to strike blows from the air, from the ground or from the sea against another sovereign state?

And by what logic can one lay responsibility for the consequences of Israel's aggressive actions not on Israel but on the one who rebuffs it?

It is clear that nobody has given Israel any such right and, if it is possible to speak of any logic at all here, it is the logic of imperialist brigandage.

To stop Israeli aggression, to prevent a new war in the Middle East is the direct duty of all who are interested in the peace and stability of this region, in preserving Lebanon as an independent state with territorial integrity. It is important, while it is still possible, to extinguish the passions around Lebanon and to avert a military conflict.

What is now happening in Lebanon reminds the entire world once again that it is time, high time to settle the whole Middle East conflict.

It is said sometimes that "rivalry between two powers" is allegedly impeding a peaceful settlement. But we are not rivalling anyone and do not want to engage in rivalry. Talking about rivalry only obscures the essence of what is happening.

One power—the United States of America—would like to get its hands on that region. It is seeking to impose its will on independent states, is trying to penetrate there with its armed forces, at least to the scorching Sinai desert. This power, it seems, regards the natural wealth of the Middle East as if it were in Texas or California.

While the other power—the Soviet Union—has no such claims whatsoever. We do not think that we have any right to the natural resources of the Middle East countries. We do not present ourselves as self-styled guardians of those countries.

We want only one thing—a just and durable peace in the Middle East. And we want good relations with all the countries in that region. This concerns those of them with which we already have friendship and mutual understanding and those with which relations have not been developed fully or are so far non-existent. It also concerns Israel, if, naturally, it abandons the policy of seizing other peoples' lands and pursues a peaceful, rather than an aggressive policy.

The interested countries, primarily Arab ones, rightfully wish to exert efforts to work out accords able to bring peace and tranquillity to the Middle East. How and where is it better to pool these efforts and reduce them, so to say, to the common denominator which can only be genuine peace in that region?

The answer to this question is contained in our proposal for convening a new international conference to work out a comprehensive Middle East settlement with the participation of all the interested sides, including, naturally, the Palestine Liberation Or-

ganisation—the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

We note with satisfaction that this proposal was favourably assessed on the part of Jordan and by you personally, Your Majesty. This is of great importance, taking into account the position of Jordan in the Middle East region.

In conclusion, I would like to express once again hope for the further favourable development of relations between the Soviet Union and Jordan.

Let me propose a toast:

To a just and durable peace in the Middle East!

To the consolidation of good relations between the Soviet Union and Jordan!

To the health of our esteemed Jordanian guests!

To the health of His Majesty King Hussein of Jordan!

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT THE
PRESENTATION OF HIGH AWARDS OF THE
SOVIET UNION TO THE USSR PILOT-
COSMONAUT LEONID POPOV AND
RESEARCHER-COSMONAUT DUMITRU
PRUNARIU, CITIZEN OF THE SOCIALIST
REPUBLIC OF ROMANIA**

June 2, 1981

Dear comrades,

I am glad of this opportunity to greet personally the Soviet-Romanian space crew.

Each new flight of the cosmonauts from socialist countries is one more step ahead in science, technology and human thought. Every flight is essentially a unique one. It has its own purpose and goal. And all of them taken together made up a single carefully considered programme, the implementation of which will provide a sound foundation for the further exploration of space.

The success of the *Intercosmos* programme—and this means nine missions of international crews—is a combined achievement of fraternal socialist countries. A lot of credit goes to the cosmonauts, scientists, designers, engineers and workers. In other words, all those who are involved in the space exploration effort.

Both Comrades Popov and Prunariu have—to no little extent—contributed to this effort. Together with Comrades Kovalyonok and Savinykh, the main crew of the *Salyut-6* station, they have accomplished a lot. The Earth's natural resources, climate, biology, medicine—all these aspects were covered by the cosmonauts.

I have already said before that the joint exploration of outer space is a direct extension of fraternal relations which have taken shape among the socialist countries in their earthly affairs. Experience both on earth and in space testifies to one thing: our cooperation accords with the interests of each country, and the whole of the socialist community. It serves the interests of all the people.

When I meet with cosmonauts I always think how much man can accomplish and how important it is to direct his boundless creative capabilities toward noble and peaceful goals.

It is well known that far from all the consequences of the great scientific breakthroughs of the 20th century have become a

boon to mankind. Some of them killed hundreds of thousands of people. And it is simply necessary to make efforts in time to prevent outer space from turning into an arena of confrontation, to prevent the militarisation of space. I want to emphasise once again: space can and must be peaceful and only peaceful.

Comrades, for the successful space flight aboard the orbital scientific complex *Salyut-6—Soyuz* and their courage and heroism Leonid Ivanovich Popov is awarded the Order of Lenin and a second Gold Star Medal and researcher-cosmonaut Dumitru Prunariu, a citizen of the Socialist Republic of Romania, receives the title of Hero of the Soviet Union along with the Order of Lenin and the Gold Star Medal.

Allow me to congratulate you, dear comrades, on these high awards.

I sincerely wish you good health, happiness and new and great success.

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT A DINNER
IN HONOUR OF CHADLI BENDJEDID,
PRESIDENT OF THE DEMOCRATIC AND
POPULAR REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA, SECRETARY
GENERAL OF THE ALGERIAN NATIONAL
LIBERATION FRONT**

June 9, 1981

Dear Algerian guests, dear comrades,

I would like wholeheartedly to greet the President of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, Secretary General of the Algerian National Liberation Front, Comrade Chadli Bendjedid and the officials accompanying him.

We have a long-standing friendship with Algeria. Its foundations were laid in the difficult years of the Algerian people's heroic struggle for independence. It grew stronger each year, when free Algeria, having chosen the path of socialism, embarked on profound social transformations in the interests of the masses. We share the Algerian people's joy over its accomplishments in building up modern industry and carrying out agrarian reform, and in resolving important social and cultural problems.

Much unites us also in international policy where we take a common stand on the vital problems of the present time. This is confirmed once again by the talks which started here today.

Naturally, the talks focused attention on questions of safeguarding peace, rebuffing the encroachments of imperialist circles on the freedom, independence and security of peoples.

The unprecedented arms race, unleashed by the United States, and the Pentagon's global strategic manipulations—the entire frantic activity designed, to put it frankly, to establish the world domination of US imperialism, provokes the peoples' quite understandable protests and indignation.

In order to weaken this response, deception is practised and public opinion is deluded. The myth of the "Soviet military threat"—an old trick of the enemies of socialism—which is being persistently spread by Washington and its Peking and other yes-men is an example of this. As is known, things have gone so far that high-ranking representatives of the US Administration do not disdain to spread patent fabrications in the desire to distort and discredit the policy of the USSR.

Another example is the attempt to declare as "terrorism" the peoples' struggle for their national and social liberation. The absurdity of such allegations should be particularly clear to the Algerian people who had to wage an armed struggle for their freedom and independence for seven years.

The US Administration, which has frozen the SALT-2 treaty and has not agreed to resume a dialogue with us on problems of medium-range weapons in Europe, is now trying to lull its allies and public opinion. It is being alleged in Washington that the United States will shortly start or even has already started talks with the Soviet Union on questions of arms limitation.

Unfortunately, these are mere words. I can say quite definitely: so far since the advent to power of the present US Administration not a single real step has been taken on the part of the United States on either question, in order to continue, at least in a preliminary way, discussion of the essence of these questions. On the contrary, the Americans are delaying on various pretexts the beginning of such a discussion while we, on our part, are prepared for it at any time.

Meanwhile, the unrestrained build-up by the West of military budgets and armaments, the cult of force, diktat and threats in international relations, the whipping up of hatred for the socialist countries and liberation movements and persecution of all progressive parties are already today having grim consequences for the peoples.

One of them is the bloody wave of terrorism by right-wing extremists, which is nowadays literally sweeping many states in different parts of the world. The targets of acts of terrorism are prominent, including the highest-ranking statesmen, political and religious figures. For all the differences in the particular circumstances, the common aim can be seen quite clearly—it is to destabilise political life in the countries concerned, suppress democracy and create conditions for the coming to power of the most reactionary dictatorial regimes.

You, Algerian comrades, know from the experience of your liberation struggle what imperialist terrorism is: fresh in your memory are the atrocities perpetrated by the notorious OAS.

But the peoples of the world see other possibilities for mankind's development rather than the poisonous swamp of hatred, terrorism and military preparations. On its part, the Soviet Union put forward at the recent Congress of the CPSU a wide programme of specific measures to create a healthier international climate and to strengthen confidence between states. We shall pursue this policy persistently and consistently.

This also concerns, of course, our relations with the United States. We tell the US leaders in our contacts with them, and I am repeating it in public: we do not seek a confrontation with the US, we do not encroach upon America's lawful interests. We want

peace, cooperation and normal relations between our countries, based on mutual trust. This is precisely why we offer the United States and other Western countries fair constructive talks, a search for mutually acceptable solutions to practically all major problems existing between us. We are for a joint search for ways to a lasting peace and mutually beneficial cooperation.

Our stand on problems such as those of the Middle East and the Mediterranean regions, which are so close both to Algeria and the Soviet Union, is also determined by the striving for a just and lasting peace.

The Soviet Union has more than once specifically and explicitly stated its stand on settling the Middle East crisis. This stand meets with growing understanding and support from the Arab states, to whose contribution to ensuring a lasting peace in the Middle East we attach enormous significance.

The imperialists' crusade against detente has not bypassed the Mediterranean. Increasing pressure is brought to bear on Spain with the aim of drawing it into NATO. A clearly unequal agreement on US military bases is imposed on Greece. The campaign of enmity and hatred against the progressive countries of that region is toughening.

The Soviet Union believes that it is necessary and possible to turn the Mediterranean as an area of military-political confrontation into a zone of stable peace and cooperation.

In our view, the attainment of international agreements on the following issues could serve these aims:

- the extension to the area of the Mediterranean of confidence-building measures in the military field, which have already proved to be effective in international practice;

- a coordinated reduction of armed forces in that area;

- withdrawal from the Mediterranean of ships carrying nuclear weapons;

- renunciation of deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of Mediterranean non-nuclear countries;

- the adoption of a commitment by the nuclear powers not to use nuclear weapons against any Mediterranean country, which does not permit the deployment of such weapons on its territory.

We are also ready, of course, to examine together with all states concerned any other initiatives and ideas in this direction.

Comrades! Permit me in conclusion on behalf of the Soviet Communists and the entire Soviet people to wish our Algerian friends fresh successes in the implementation of their plans for economic and social development.

I would like to propose a toast:

To the further development and strengthening of friendly cooperation between the Soviet Union and Algeria, between the Algerian and Soviet peoples!

To the health of Comrade Chadli Bendjedid, of all our Algerian friends!

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT THE
PRESENTATION OF THE ORDER OF LENIN TO
ROMESH CHANDRA, PRESIDENT OF THE
WORLD PEACE COUNCIL**

June 18, 1981

Esteemed comrades,

First of all, I cordially congratulate our common good friend Romesh Chandra on the award of the Order of Lenin. This is a tribute to his service to the ideals of peace, his selflessness in the struggle against the forces of militarism and aggression.

A historian once said these bitter words: the history of mankind is the history of wars. Indeed, looking back on the past we see a horrible succession of bloody battles. The twentieth century broke all records in this respect: it saw two world wars and a great number of so-called local conflicts among states. Is not this enough? It is increasingly more appropriate to raise this question now that weapons have been stockpiled, which can destroy everything alive.

It is irrefutable that every nation is vitally interested in living in peace with its neighbours and in preserving and embellishing together with them mankind's common home—the planet Earth.

But one must look realistically at things. There are still obstacles standing along the road to trust and concord, such as avarice and chauvinism, fear and hatred. People hold different political and religious views. Neither are the historic traditions of separate countries identical. Class enmity and many other contradictions still exist today. That is why talks on disputed issues and the interaction of all anti-war movements are so important, just as it is important to draw all people, irrespective of their views and convictions, into the common effort for the sake of peace.

That is why one cannot but value the lofty activities of the champions of peace. This is the voice of people who are not indifferent, the voice of daring people, the voice of those who, notwithstanding persecution and threats, call for reason and conscience.

Common sense, conscience and confidence in the future is the weapon of the champions of peace, which the proponents of the arms race and confrontation lack. I am convinced that the influence of the ideas of peace on government and parliamentary circles will grow, that the stormy clouds of war will in the end be scattered through the efforts of the peoples.

We hold that lasting peace is necessarily a just peace, a peace of equals without either domination or subordination.

We hold that lasting peace is peace for all. There is no, nor can there be, tranquillity as long as the flames of war are blazing in even one part of the world.

We hold that lasting peace necessarily presupposes cooperation, meetings and contacts between statesmen and dependable ties between all countries and peoples.

We clearly and openly set forth our stand on the questions of war and peace at the 26th Congress of the CPSU. And it is gratifying that the Peace Programme which was put forward by us for the eighties meets with full understanding from such an authoritative public movement as the movement of the champions of peace.

Presenting this high award to you, Comrade Romesh Chandra, I wholeheartedly wish you sound health and new successes in your important work.

SPEECH AT THE FIFTH SESSION OF THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET

June 23, 1981

Esteemed comrade Deputies,

The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union noted: "The situation in the world today calls for new, additional efforts to eliminate the threat of war, to strengthen international security... To uphold peace—today there is no more important task in international affairs for our Party, our people and, for that matter, for all the peoples on earth."

Taking note of the gravity of the international situation, the Congress put forward a specific programme for the strengthening of peace which today is in the centre of attention of world public opinion. Our Party and the Soviet government are continuing to work hard to implement it.

International developments in the three months since the CPSU Congress have provided fresh confirmation of the correctness of the conclusions drawn by our Party.

War-minded militarist circles, headed by American imperialism, have launched an arms race of unprecedented scale. They are evading negotiations on restraining the arms build-up, on eliminating seats of conflict and on the peaceful solution of disputed international problems. They are unashamedly encouraging acts of open aggression and international gangsterism on the part of their henchmen. The situation in the world is hotting up to an ever more dangerous degree. The broad masses' awareness of this danger is also increasing and voices of protest against the activities of militarists are heard ever more strongly.

In such a situation an exceptionally great responsibility is borne by all peace-loving countries and peoples for frustrating these adventurist plans, for preventing the irreparable and maintaining peace.

We Soviet people are particularly keenly aware of the measure of this responsibility. Behind us we have the bitter experience of the war against the German-fascist aggressors, which began exactly 40 years ago with the villainous attack of nazi Germany on the Soviet Union. This was the hardest war of all that our people, or any other people on earth, ever had to wage. We waged this holy battle against the aggressor not for the sake of glory but for the sake of life on earth.

Our people will never, never forget the millions of Soviet people who fell in this struggle.

Let us rise to honour the memory of the fallen.

We all know very well that the peace forces opposing a potential aggressor today are as mighty as never before.

But we also know very well that the very nature of modern weapons has become such that, if used, the future of all mankind would be at stake.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from this: one must do one's utmost now, today to bar the road to those who like unrestricted armament and military ventures. One must do one's utmost to secure people's right to life. And in this matter no one can remain aloof or indifferent: it concerns all and each of us. It concerns governments and political parties, public organisations and, of course, the Parliaments which have been elected by the people and act on their behalf.

That is why the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR are submitting for your consideration a draft Appeal by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR "To the Parliaments and Peoples of the World". In this draft there is a call to take vigorous action for peace and international security, to use the high authority Parliaments enjoy and the possibilities they have for the benefit of peace and international cooperation.

TO THE PARLIAMENTS AND PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

An Appeal by the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Concerned by the growth of the military danger and by the unprecedented scale of the arms race, the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics appeals to the Parliaments and peoples of the world.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR is making this Appeal on the 40th anniversary of the day nazi fascism attacked our homeland. Soviet people bow their heads to the illustrious memory of 20 million fellow-countrymen who fell in the war. The Second World War brought incalculable hardship and suffering to all mankind. We deeply revere the memory of all who gave their lives in the struggle against aggression, for peace on earth.

History taught a stern lesson. The peoples paid too dear a price for their failure to prevent war, to avert in time the threat which hung over the world. We must not allow any repetition of the tragedy. Everything must and can be done to prevent another world war.

Our planet is already oversaturated with weapons of mass destruction. But their stockpiling continues, ever more sophisticated and destructive weapons are being developed. Launching pads are being prepared in Western Europe for hundreds of new nuclear missiles. Attempts are being made to condition people to the criminal idea of the permissibility of using nuclear weapons.

Political tension is being deliberately stepped up. Once again there is a calculated drive to achieve military superiority; the language of threats is being used. The right to intervene in the affairs of other countries and peoples is being openly claimed. And all this under the cover of a gross lie about a "Soviet military threat".

The USSR Supreme Soviet solemnly declares that the Soviet Union is not threatening anyone, it does not seek confrontation with any state in the West or in the East. The Soviet Union has not been and is not striving for military superiority. It has not and

will not initiate new spirals in the arms race. There is no type of weapon it would not agree to limit or to ban on a mutual basis by agreement with other states.

The safeguarding of peace has been and remains the supreme aim of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. This is the aim of the Peace Programme for the 1980's, adopted by the 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It embraces measures for reducing both nuclear missile weapons and conventional arms, it contains proposals for settling existing and preventing new conflicts and crisis situations, it is permeated with a desire to deepen detente and develop peaceful cooperation between the countries of all continents. It expresses the readiness of the Soviet Union to conduct negotiations on all the current issues of peace and security, to give close consideration to all the constructive ideas of other states.

In our nuclear age dialogue and negotiations are needed equally by all, just as all need peace, security and confidence in the future. There is now no other sensible method of solving disputed problems, no matter how acute or complex they may be, except negotiations. Not a single opportunity that exists must be missed. There is no time to lose!

Each day lost for negotiations increases the risk of a nuclear conflict. The solution of vital problems confronting each people and all peoples is being deferred. There is no time to lose!

In our time all those who by their actions are encouraging the arms race and the further stockpiling in the world of weapons of mass destruction of people, who are advocating the use of force to settle disputed issues between states or who are just turning a blind eye to the dangers now threatening the world, are in fact pushing mankind towards the abyss.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR appeals to the legislative bodies of all countries to speak out firmly in favour of negotiations leading to the prevention of another round of the nuclear missile arms race, in favour of honest and equal negotiations without any preconditions or attempts to dictate terms.

The Supreme Soviet of the USSR trusts that its Appeal will receive the full consideration and attention which this most important and most burning issue of our time deserves. It firmly believes that the Parliaments possess the necessary powers and authority to press effectively for curbing the arms race and for disarmament through negotiations. For its part the Supreme Soviet of the USSR will continue to make its contribution to creating a climate conducive to achieving positive results as the outcome of negotiations.

Peace belongs to all mankind and in our time it is also the primary condition of our existence. Only through joint efforts can and must peace be maintained and reliably safeguarded.

Moscow, Kremlin
June 23, 1981

The Supreme Soviet of the Union of
Soviet Socialist Republics

**MESSAGE TO JOSE EDUARDO DOS SANTOS,
CHAIRMAN OF THE MPLA—PARTY OF LABOUR,
PRESIDENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
OF ANGOLA, CHAIRMAN OF THE STANDING
COMMISSION OF THE PEOPLE'S ASSEMBLY**

June 26, 1981

In connection with the official visit to the People's Republic of Angola of a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Leonid Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has sent a message to Jose Eduardo dos Santos, Chairman of the MPLA—Party of Labour, President of the People's Republic of Angola, Chairman of the Standing Commission of the People's Assembly. The message was handed over by the head of the delegation, Inamzhon Usmankhodzhayev, Vice-Chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The message runs:

“Dear Comrade Jose Eduardo dos Santos,

“Availing myself of the opportunity that presented itself in connection with the trip to Angola of a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and on my own behalf I send you and all the friendly Angolan people sincere wishes for well-being, progress and successes along the lines of building a new society free from the exploitation of man by man.

“I recall with feelings of great satisfaction our conversations in Moscow. As previously, it is a pleasure for me to note that the relations of close friendship and fruitful cooperation between our countries and peoples, that were established already in the lifetime of the outstanding son of the Angolan people and true friend of the Soviet Union Antonio Agostinho Neto, and which were consolidated in the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation of 1976, continue steadily to develop. Inter-Party links are being well established. Contacts between trade union, youth and sport organisations are broadening. Cultural exchange is under way. Economic cooperation and trade play an important role, though in this respect not all the possibilities and reserves have been used.

“I would like to assure you that the Soviet Union will con-

tinue to exert efforts to see to it that our relations should grow consistently stronger and broader.

“Soviet-Angolan relations also have a significant international aspect. These relations are a convincing example of the effectiveness and mutual benefit of cooperation between socialist countries and young independent states, which have chosen the path of socialist orientation in the struggle against imperialism, neo-colonialism and racism, for a peaceful future and the social progress of the peoples.

“The need to consolidate this cooperation has increased now that the world situation has deteriorated, that aggressive imperialist forces desire to undermine detente, speed up the arms race and continue neo-colonialist exploitation of the newly-free countries. The Soviet Union will continue to give the People’s Republic of Angola the support it needs in order to withstand the pressure upon it from the imperialist powers, primarily the United States and the racist regime of the Republic of South Africa.

“Great significance is attached in the Soviet Union to establishing regular businesslike contacts between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the recently-formed People’s Assembly of the People’s Republic of Angola.

“The visit of the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet to your country is called upon to lay the beginning of such contacts.

“Let me express confidence that the meetings and conversations of the Soviet delegation with party leaders and statesmen of Angola and with deputies of the People’s Assembly will help further strengthen trust and friendship, develop all-round cooperation between the USSR and the People’s Republic of Angola in the interests of the peoples of our countries, and step up the struggle for preserving peace on earth.”

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS BY A CORRESPONDENT
OF THE FINNISH NEWSPAPER "SUOMEN
SOSIALI-DEMOKRAATTI"

June 27, 1981

Question: There has been much discussion in the North European countries of late of the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in this region. What is the Soviet Union's attitude to the possibility of creating such a zone?

Answer: We appreciate the striving of peoples in various parts of the world to create nuclear-free zones in order to consolidate their security and to some extent to protect themselves from the catastrophic consequences of a nuclear war should efforts to prevent it fail.

The Soviet Union has already stated its positive attitude, specifically, towards the proposal to turn Northern Europe into a nuclear-free zone. Unlike Western Europe, the population of which is already living literally on a nuclear volcano, that area is still without those deadly weapons. And, of course, it would be a good thing if the nuclear-free status of Northern Europe were consolidated and legalised accordingly.

The Soviet Union, for its part, is prepared to undertake the commitment not to use nuclear weapons against those countries of Northern Europe that will become participants in a nuclear-free zone, that is, refuse to manufacture, acquire and deploy nuclear weapons on their territory. This guarantee on the part of the Soviet Union could be formalised either by the conclusion of a multilateral agreement with its participation or by bilateral agreements with each of the countries participating in the zone. We, I repeat, are ready to do so at any time. Of course, the setting up of such a zone would be of greater significance to its participants if similar guarantees were also given to them by the NATO nuclear powers.

Question: In the course of discussions in the Scandinavian countries concerning their entry into a nuclear-free zone, it is said that the creation of such a zone would be promoted by the USSR's

consent to undertake a number of additional commitments with regard to the part of its territory adjacent to the zone. Can one hope for such consent?

Answer: Guarantees on not using nuclear weapons against the countries participating in the zone are the main and, undoubtedly, most important pledge the Soviet Union is prepared to give them. But this does not rule out the possibility of considering the question of some other measures with regard to our own territory in the area adjacent to the nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe. The Soviet Union is prepared to discuss this question with the countries concerned.

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT A DINNER
IN HONOUR OF WILLY BRANDT, CHAIRMAN
OF THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY
OF GERMANY**

June 30, 1981

Esteemed Chairman Willy Brandt,

I am glad to greet you again here in Moscow, where you have been more than once. I remember all of our meetings. Looking back at the past we have the right to say: these meetings have brought about considerable results, especially at the turn of the sixties and the seventies, when a changeover from the "cold war" to detente was achieved, a changeover that was of a really history-making significance.

What was done in the seventies continues working for peace now in an aggravated international situation.

But let us face up to the truth—today there is a threat of a changeover of a different kind: now from detente to a fresh edition of the "cold war".

In common with the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union is endeavouring to prevent the development of this tendency. It will bring no good to any country.

I would like to believe, Mr. Brandt, that for both of us, as it was ten years ago, peace remains the most precious thing, a lodestar in practical affairs in the international arena.

And, in our view, there is nothing more essential, more serious among these affairs than putting an end to the arms race.

It would make sense to start in the present situation with a limitation of the nuclear arms race in Europe. We are ready to sit down at the negotiating table on that issue even tomorrow, if you like. But talks have not begun yet because of the US attitude. At the same time our idea of a moratorium on the deployment in Europe of new medium-range nuclear-missile weapons of NATO member countries and the USSR has been called into question.

Consequently, if talks start at all, this will happen under conditions when both sides will continue to implement their programmes. But this is not the best way.

I can say that the USSR is ready to suspend the deployment of its medium-range missiles in the European part of the country on the day when talks open on the substance of the matter. This will happen, of course, only if the US tells us that during the talks it will not build up its medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe either.

The Soviet Union expects from these talks real weighty results. We think that it is time to start reducing nuclear-missile weapons.

Every state strives to reliably ensure its security. But this cannot be achieved in the nuclear age by gambling on a gain from the arms race. In this day and age security can be real and lasting only if it is built on the basis of approximate military parity of the confronting forces, which has taken shape, and a subsequent reduction in their level. Otherwise nobody will feel safe.

The striving of the United States for military superiority over the Soviet Union undermines stability in the international arena and makes its own security shaky.

I will observe also one more thing. Can it be that an arms build-up will for ever be the only way to ensure military parity? This aim can be achieved through a mutual reduction in the level of armaments. People would only gain from it.

The Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany belong to different alliances, and it goes without saying that each of our countries has its commitments to these alliances. But must these commitments be necessarily subordinated to the policy of military superiority and of undermining detente? Of course not. At any rate, such an approach is alien to the Warsaw Treaty member countries.

We in the Soviet Union certainly stand for peaceful good-neighbourly relations with the FRG. This is our permanent, if you wish, strategic line. I hope that the forthcoming talks with Chancellor Schmidt in your country, the Federal Republic of Germany, will be held in a constructive spirit and give a boost to cooperation between our countries.

Esteemed Mr. Chairman, we have had a fair, frank and businesslike dialogue in the interests of resolving essential international problems and countering the danger of war.

We are for a dialogue on the widest scale: both between governments and representatives of authoritative public forces, including, of course, between the Communists and Social Democrats.

We appreciate the participation of Social Democrats and Socialists in many countries in the struggle against the arms race, against the threat of nuclear war, for consolidating peace and are always ready to cooperate in this noble cause.

This is the principled line of the CPSU, reaffirmed by its 26th Congress.

Let me propose a toast:

To the health of Willy Brandt and all our guests. To the development of relations between the CPSU and the SDP in the interests of peace and detente!

To peace all over the world!

TO THE READERS OF "SOVIET LIFE" ¹

Dear American Readers,

For a quarter of a century now *Soviet Life* magazine has been telling Americans about the everyday life of our country, its successes and problems, about the hopes and expectations of the Soviet people.

It is justly said that a better knowledge of each other promotes mutual understanding. Authentic information is especially important now that the international situation has deteriorated and Soviet-American relations are being put to a severe test.

The Soviet Union and the United States of America are the two major powers of our time, and the political climate of the globe depends to a great degree on their relations. A dialogue is needed at present more than ever before. As for the Soviet side, it has always shown its willingness to work for a negotiated and peaceful settlement of all complex and disputed problems. This fundamental policy was confirmed once again at the recent 26th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, where a wide-ranging program of practical measures to improve the international situation and strengthen trust among nations was advanced. The Soviet Union will pursue this policy perseveringly and consistently.

This, of course, applies also to our relations with the United States. We have already repeatedly stressed, publicly and otherwise, that we do not seek confrontation with the United States, nor do we encroach on the legitimate interests of your country. The Soviet Union wants peace, cooperation and normal relations between our countries based on mutual trust. For this reason we offer to the United States honest and constructive talks, a search for mu-

¹ *Soviet Life* magazine has been published in the United States since 1956.

tually acceptable solutions to practically all major issues existing between us.

It is our conviction that humanity can and should live without constant anxiety, can and should be rid of the ruinous expense of armaments and—most important—preserve peace for the present and coming generations. Allow me to assure you that everything possible will be done by the Soviet side toward this and to wish the American people happiness and prosperity.

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT A DINNER
IN HONOUR OF LE DUAN, GENERAL
SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF VIETNAM**

September 7, 1981

Dear Comrade Le Duan,
Dear comrades,

It may be said that today we have a Vietnam day. In the morning we devoted several hours to talks. And now we are talking with our Vietnamese friends once again, now in a non-official atmosphere—at a dinner table.

In the first place I would like to express my satisfaction with the results of our talks. They have confirmed that our notions of the tasks of the present day and our views on the future do not diverge. They are identical.

The talks that have been held do not contain any secrets. We dealt with the long-term issues of Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation. In the coming years this will be broadened in all fields. The Soviet Union's assistance to socialist construction in Vietnam will increase. We shall help our Vietnamese friends better and more fully to use their own rich resources.

It is natural that in the present troubled times we have had to pay due attention to international problems.

The talks with Comrade Le Duan, like our recent meetings in the Crimea, clearly indicate: our common article of faith in foreign policy is peace, peace for all, a peace which is reliable, just and inviolable.

In order to achieve such a peace, what is needed is not so much fine words as real deeds, a practical readiness to take into account the rights and interests of other states. And, of course, what is called for is the ability patiently to seek solutions to contentious issues at the table of negotiations. To talk about "restraint and reciprocity" and at the same time to pursue a provocative policy of challenge, including in the field of armaments, is to breed mistrust and to cut away the foundations of peace.

Setting oneself the aim of becoming stronger than all others, laying claim to world leadership—all this has already taken place in recent history, and the outcome of such attempts is well known.

As regards the Soviet Union, we have never sought and we are not seeking military superiority. We do not go and do not intend to go further than concern for reliable protection of the security of our country and the security of our allies. The Soviet Union is constantly calling for renouncing the development of new, even more formidable types of weapons. But let me state with a full sense of responsibility: we shall not remain indifferent to the appearance of such weapons in the arsenals of the US and other NATO members. If this happens, the Soviet armed forces will be in the possession of a proper counterbalance to such weapons.

The 26th Congress of our Party has put forward a broad Peace Programme for the eighties. The Soviet proposals were addressed to all countries. They are designed to improve the situation in all the regions of the globe.

This relates in full measure to Asia. As nowhere else, the need for peace in Asia is most acute. The national per capita income in a large number of Asian states is at the lowest level. Also there, in Asia, new conflicts are being added to the old and still unextinguished ones. Ill winds are sweeping over South-East Asia. The forces of imperialism and hegemonism fear an Asia in tranquillity.

It is tragic that the leaders of Asia's biggest state—China—are wasting the forces of their country in such an unseemly cause as worsening the international climate. They strive to make the Asian countries quarrel with each other, to generate hostility to the Soviet Union, to Vietnam, to the world of socialism. I repeat that this is tragic—and above all for the Chinese people themselves.

Contrary to Peking's stand, many Asian states are speaking out in favour of lasting, good-neighbourly relations. Neither are they doing the bidding of Washington. They wish to live an independent life. Such a position can only evoke respect. Only the Asian peoples, desirous of peace and freedom, can be the masters of Asia. They have every right to reject any outside interference in their affairs, in the sphere of their vital interests.

We welcome the growth of the international influence of India, of the countries of Indochina, of other Asian states and their active participation in world politics. We welcome the desire of Vietnam together with Laos and Kampuchea to achieve a transformation of the whole of South-East Asia into an area of peace and stability.

In international politics, as in other affairs, the Communists adopt class positions. They express the interests of the working people, the interests of the peoples. That is why they are firmly working for detente, disarmament and peaceful cooperation between all states.

I propose a toast:
to our dear guest, the outstanding leader of the Vietnamese Communists, internationalist-Leninist Comrade Le Duan;
to the fraternal Vietnamese people; its noble spirit and selflessness will meet, will definitely meet with recognition all over the world;
to strong Soviet-Vietnamese friendship;
to peace on earth!

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT THE
PRESENTATION OF THE ORDER OF LENIN
TO KAYSONE PHOMVIHANE, GENERAL
SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE LAO PEOPLE'S REVOLUTIONARY
PARTY, PRIME MINISTER OF THE LAO
PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC**

September 14, 1981

Dear Comrade Kaysone,
Esteemed comrades,

Today we have been able to combine a useful with a pleasant occasion.

There have been good and fruitful talks. I think you, Comrade Kaysone, are of the same opinion. One may now say that the cooperation of our parties and countries has become close and energetic and is steadily growing stronger. We have shown by our work that distance is no obstacle to friendly relations.

Soviet people feel deep sympathy for the Laotian people who are making selfless efforts to build a truly just and democratic society. The choice has been precise—to build the foundations of socialism. Historic credit for this belongs to the Lao People's Revolutionary Party. And all of us are well aware of Comrade Kaysone's personal contribution to the revolutionary changes that have taken place in Laos.

The history of Soviet-Laotian cooperation is not as short as it may seem. Yet it was with the victory of the revolution that our countries' friendship has actually flourished and this is connected in many ways with your person.

Comrade Kaysone, your outstanding services in strengthening fraternal friendship and cooperation between our peoples are rewarded by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet by the highest Soviet award—the Order of Lenin.

In this connection allow me to congratulate you from the bottom of my heart and to wish you good health and new great success in your manifold activities for the good of Laos, for peace and socialism.

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT THE
PRESENTATION OF SOVIET ORDERS TO GDR
MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE, GENERAL
OF THE ARMY HEINZ HOFFMANN AND
MINISTER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY ARMED
FORCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA, GENERAL
OF THE ARMY RAUL CASTRO RUS**

September 15, 1981

Dear comrades,

Our guests, General of the Army Heinz Hoffmann and General of the Army Raul Castro, participated in the recent manoeuvres of the Soviet armed forces. We are satisfied with the way they were conducted. Excellent training, effective teamwork by the arms of the service and the skilful handling of modern powerful military hardware—all this has been demonstrated during the exercises. Our own impressions are confirmed by the impressions of our guests. We are glad that they were present at the manoeuvres.

We have a debt, as it were, to Comrades Hoffmann and Castro. They had earlier been awarded Soviet Orders and I am glad that today I can present them.

General of the Army Heinz Hoffmann, Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Minister of National Defence of the German Democratic Republic, has been awarded the Order of Lenin. The combat path of Communist Hoffmann began way back in the 1930s, when he, commissar of the German battalion of the International Brigade, took part in the fight against fascism in Spain. After the Hitlerites' attack on the Soviet Union he gallantly fought in the ranks of the Red Army, shoulder to shoulder with Soviet soldiers, against the fascist invaders up to their complete rout.

For more than 20 years now, Comrade Hoffmann has been Minister of National Defence and has been doing much to strengthen the combat brotherhood of the GDR People's Army with the Soviet Army, with the armed forces of other participants in the Warsaw Treaty organisation.

General of the Army Raul Castro, Member of the Political Bureau and Second Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, First Vice-Chairman of the State Council

and of the Council of Ministers, and Minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of the Republic of Cuba, has been awarded the Order of the October Revolution. You, dear Comrade Raul, the first comrade-in-arms of the leader of the Cuban revolution Fidel Castro, are well known in the Soviet Union. We highly appreciate your loyalty to the cause of Soviet-Cuban friendship and your contribution to the strengthening of cooperation between the armed forces of our countries, which stand on guard of freedom and peace.

The Cuban revolutionaries have traversed a long and difficult road. They have had and still have to meet all kinds of challenges and provocations on the part of imperialism. But Cuba has proved that it will be able to uphold its interests. I am taking this opportunity to stress that the Soviet Union was, is and will be in solidarity with socialist Cuba.

I wholeheartedly congratulate you, dear comrades, on the high awards of the Soviet Union. I wish you good health, happiness and the best success in all your deeds.

ANSWER TO A QUESTION BY A "PRAVDA" CORRESPONDENT

October 21, 1981

Question: Recently US President Ronald Reagan declared that the Soviet Union, judging by what its leaders say "among themselves", considers it possible to win a nuclear war. In this way he tried to justify his own policy of accelerated build-up of the US nuclear arsenal.

What would you, Leonid Ilyich, say as regards this statement by the American President?

Answer: Leaving to Mr. Reagan's conscience his claim to knowing what Soviet leaders say among themselves, I would like to say this as regards the substance of the question.

The thoughts and efforts of the Soviet leadership, as of the Soviet people as a whole, are directed at ruling out nuclear war altogether, at removing the very danger of its outbreak. Among ourselves we say exactly what I said for all to hear from the rostrum of the 26th Congress of the CPSU, namely, that to try to defeat each other in an arms race, to count on winning a nuclear war is dangerous madness.

Let me add that only he can start a nuclear war in hopes of emerging as the victor in it who has made up his mind to commit suicide. However strong the attacker and whatever method of unleashing nuclear war he might choose, he will not be able to achieve his ends. Retribution will inevitably follow.

This is our principled stand. It would be a good thing if the President of the United States too made a clear and unequivocal statement rejecting the very idea of nuclear attack as criminal.

Why, it may be asked, should the United States not support the proposal submitted by the Soviet Union to the current UN General Assembly session concerning renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons?

For if there is no first nuclear strike, there will be no second or third nuclear strikes. In this way disquisitions on the possibility or impossibility of winning a nuclear war will become pointless, and the question of nuclear war as such will be removed from the order of the day.

And this is precisely what all peace-loving people in the world want, this is what the Soviet Union and its leadership are consistently working for. It is now up to the United States, to its leadership, to say its word.

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT A DINNER
IN HONOUR OF ALI ABDULLAH SALEH,
PRESIDENT OF THE YEMEN ARAB REPUBLIC**

October 27, 1981

Esteemed Mr. President,
Esteemed Yemeni friends,
Dear comrades,

I am glad to welcome here in the Kremlin our distinguished guest, President Ali Abdullah Saleh, and the statesmen of the Yemen Arab Republic who have arrived together with him.

Friendship between our two countries has a history of more than half a century. The "secret" of its strength lies in the fact that our relations rest on the Leninist principles of strict regard for the right of the peoples to freedom and independence and for their sovereignty, and on the principles of peaceful and mutually beneficial cooperation.

Loyal to these principles, the Soviet people are giving the Yemeni people effective assistance in their effort to overcome age-old backwardness, to develop their economy and culture and to strengthen their political independence.

We are very glad to know that the positions of our two countries on many international questions, above all, on the question of establishing a lasting and just peace in the Middle East, are close to each other. This is especially important in present conditions.

Indeed, far from relaxing, tension in the Middle East is increasing. The reasons for this are obvious. What have been Arab lands from time immemorial continue to remain under the heel of Israeli occupation forces. The legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, who are being deprived of the opportunity to establish their own state, remain unfulfilled. The security and sovereignty of the states of the region are being increasingly jeopardized. The Israeli aggressors are growing more impudent because they are aware of the unreserved support they have from their overseas patrons.

US-Israeli "strategic cooperation" means blood, destruction and sorrow for the Arabs.

It is clear that nothing good can be expected when, instead of extinguishing the fires of a conflict, some people only think about how to satisfy the appetites of the imperialists. This policy is also aggravating tension in the Mediterranean, where sabre-rattling is being used to interfere in the internal affairs of the Egyptian people and is creating a danger to the security of Libya.

In general, I think there has never been such a period in history when the policy of states and the destinies of whole peoples on all continents were manipulated so shamelessly and cynically and with such naked egoism as is now being done by the aggressive forces of imperialism.

The stakes in this dangerous game are the threat of a world nuclear war, the prospect of the death of hundreds of millions of people. It is impossible to imagine anything more monstrous.

But the more aggressive the policy of imperialism, the more resolutely are the peoples rising against it. Protest and indignation is being expressed in Europe and Asia, Africa and America. The protesters are both peoples who only recently experienced the horrors of a world war and therefore especially cherish peace, and peoples who, having cast off the yoke of the colonialists, have known the taste of freedom and independence and are pursuing their own policy.

Dear friends, we are firmly convinced that the sinister designs of the planners of a new war can be well thwarted by the vigorous and concerted efforts of peace-loving countries and peoples, that the lovers of adventures and claimants to world supremacy can be curbed, and the rights of the peoples and world peace upheld.

From their own experience the Arab peoples have seen that side-stepping the issues and making separate deals with the aggressors do not lead to a just peace. It may be said with confidence that the more united the Arabs are in their struggle for their rights and the more active the international support for their struggle is, the sooner the hotbed of the war danger in the Middle East will be extinguished.

As for the Soviet Union, we are prepared to cooperate with all those who hold dear the ideals of justice and who want a stable peace in the Middle East. This readiness has found practical embodiment in the proposal for calling an international conference on the Middle East, put forward at the 26th Congress of the CPSU. We are glad to know that this proposal meets with understanding and support from the Arab peoples.

Therein lies a constructive alternative to Camp David: the attainment of a peaceful settlement by the collective efforts of all the sides concerned, a settlement that would be reached not at the expense of the interests of some states and to the advantage of others but for the common benefit, in the common interest.

We believe that the Palestine Liberation Organisation must take part in such a conference on an equal footing, alongside all the Arab countries, which have a common frontier with Israel, and Israel itself.

Alongside the Soviet Union and the United States, it could also be attended by other states that would, as it were, represent the regions adjacent to the Middle East, say, Western Europe, North Africa and South Asia.

Such are our proposals. They have one objective: to end, at last, the deadlock on the issue of a just and all-embracing settlement in the Middle East. The absence of such a settlement only meets the interests of the aggressors and of foreign claimants to domination of the Arab world. The reaching of a settlement will benefit all the peoples of the Middle East, as well as world peace.

We are convinced that the future belongs to those who are fighting staunchly and consistently for the triumph of the cause of peace and justice.

Allow me to propose a toast:

To our esteemed guest, President Saleh! To all our Yemeni guests!

To further development of friendly Soviet-Yemen relations!

To a just peace in the Middle East!

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN ON BEING
PRESENTED THE BADGE "50 YEARS
OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE CPSU"**

October 29, 1981

The decision of the Party Central Committee to institute the badge "50 Years of Membership in the CPSU" is a tribute of respect and esteem to the Party's merited fighters, its veterans.

All of us are sincerely happy and proud that quite a few old-time Bolsheviks who joined the Party as far back as in Lenin's days continue to be together with us in the Party ranks. They have given all their lives to Lenin's great cause. They were among those who bore the brunt of the historic battles of the Revolution and the Civil War, who took part in the heroic effort of building socialism in our country. The fine deeds of the Party veterans are a model and a source of inspiration to all of us.

As for me, I feel understandable emotion on receiving this honorary badge at the very time when I have just marked 50 years of my membership in the CPSU. And it is not just emotion, it is a feeling of profound gratitude to the great Party of Lenin. The struggle for its ideals and objectives determined the meaning of all my life.

Always and everywhere—in peacetime work or in battle, in industry or at a leading post—I have been, am, and will be first of all a Communist, one of the millions of the like-minded people rallied around the banner of Lenin. And I am going to give all my strength without any reservation to the cause of the Party and, consequently, to the happiness of the Soviet people, their peace and well-being.

INTERVIEW TO THE WEST GERMAN MAGAZINE "DER SPIEGEL"

November 2, 1981

Question: You will be going on a state visit to the FRG for the third time. Since your last visit in 1978 the situation in the world has become less stable and more dangerous in some respects. What role, in your opinion, could the Federal Republic of Germany play in the present situation, and what significance do you attach, in this connection, to your forthcoming talks in Bonn?

Answer: To begin with, I am glad that I'll visit your country again. I have been to the FRG twice. On both occasions we had useful talks and meetings. I recall them with gratification.

My forthcoming visit to the FRG at the invitation of Chancellor Schmidt is a natural continuation of the line of mutually beneficial cooperation between our countries, of constructive development of Soviet-West German relations on the basis of the treaty of 1970. This course of ours was most definitely expressed at the 24th, 25th and 26th Congresses of the CPSU. We know that in Bonn, too, relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union are regarded as an important element of world politics, on which stable peace in Europe depends in no small measure.

Of course, there will be no lack of subjects in an exchange of views with Chancellor Helmut Schmidt and other FRG leaders. As I see it, it is particularly important nowadays to determine what actions each of our countries could take for the resolution of the task that is most vital and urgent to mankind—that of preventing a nuclear catastrophe and creating a reliable prospect of durable peace.

Both our countries have repeatedly spoken in favour of establishing a military balance in Europe at the lowest possible level, including the field of nuclear arms. The question is how this should be done. Here our views noticeably diverge. But we must search for a solution. I recall that in the joint declaration, which was

signed by Chancellor Schmidt and myself in May 1978, both sides explicitly declared that nobody should seek military superiority and said that rough equality and parity were sufficient for ensuring defence. We adhere to it now, too. This in fact is the basis and starting-point for the subsequent talks.

You ask about the FRG's role in our truly complicated world. I think that at the start of the eighties, as at the start of the seventies, the FRG is faced with decisions of a fundamental nature. Will the course which has so much increased the FRG's weight in European and world politics be continued and further developed, or will the capital accumulated over these years be squandered in fruitless and dangerous confrontations? I would like to hope that as a result of our talks and conversations with Chancellor Schmidt, other statesmen and politicians of the FRG, there will be an increase in reciprocal confidence that our countries will carry on the tested line which has lived up to expectations: an ability to answer trust with trust, to safeguard what has been achieved, and to develop consistently and tirelessly bilateral cooperation in various fields. Such a line would accord well with the common efforts aimed at containing the arms race and strengthening detente and international security.

Question: Particularly great hopes were once placed on joint economic projects. What, in your view, are the prospects for economic cooperation between our two countries under present-day conditions?

Answer: In our view, economic cooperation between the USSR and the FRG is developing quite well and has a good future.

Today the FRG is one of the Soviet Union's leading trade partners among the Western countries. The efficiency and conscientiousness with which our West German partners meet their commitments under economic treaties and agreements are valued in the USSR. We, of course, answer in kind.

As far as I understand, the development of large-scale and long-term economic ties with the USSR helps the FRG resolve serious problems facing its economy. Your country, no less than other countries, needs reliable sources of energy, raw and other materials, foreign orders to ensure the employment of the population. The Soviet Union also benefits by cooperation with the FRG in a number of important areas of our economic life.

It is also essential that our economic ties not only meet the requirements of today, but are built with the future in mind. Good examples of this cooperation are, in my view, some of our joint undertakings, which are projected into the 21st century. They, certainly, are not only of economic, but also of political significance—in the best sense of this word. For orientation to long-term prospects in economic relations is also orientation to durable peaceful coexistence, to good-neighbourliness.

The recent scheduled session in Moscow of the mixed Soviet-West German commission for economic, scientific and technical

cooperation, and the talks in this connection of Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolai Tikhonov and Vice-Chairman Leonid Kostandov with Federal Minister of Economics Otto Lambsdorff and other FRG representatives were held precisely from this point of view, with an eye to the future.

Judging by the results of that session, there is a solid basis for a further development of our relations. We felt the seriousness of the FRG's approach to the planned deal on new deliveries of Soviet gas in exchange for deliveries of pipes and the construction in the Soviet Union with West German participation of a gas pipeline between Europe and Siberia. Other opportunities of mutually beneficial cooperation have also been identified.

I would like to add one more thing in connection with our economic cooperation: it is not detrimental to anybody but, in the final analysis, is beneficial to all, since it strengthens the foundations of peace in Europe and all over the world.

Question: East-West relations have now become seriously complicated. How do you evaluate the situation in the world and, in particular, the destiny of detente which seemed almost irreversible to many politicians?

Answer: The situation in the world is disquieting today. "Hot spots" are emerging in different parts of the globe. The race of death-carrying weapons is continuing. New types of weapons are created which are particularly dangerous because they, as experts say, lower the threshold of a nuclear war, i.e., make its outbreak more probable. Under such circumstances the speculations of some strategists and politicians in the West on the admissibility of a "limited" nuclear war and the possibility to win a victory in it look particularly insidious.

Maybe somebody hopes that it will be possible to confine a nuclear war to the territory of Europe, and regards it as a variant acceptable to himself. Needless to say, such a variant very little suits the Europeans. To them it would mean death, a catastrophe, which would lead to the destruction of entire nations and their centuries-old civilisation.

As a matter of fact, there can be no "limited" nuclear war at all. If a nuclear war breaks out, whether in Europe or in any other place, it would inevitably and unavoidably assume a worldwide character. Such is the logic of the war itself and the character of present-day armaments and international relations. One should clearly see and understand this.

So, those who may possibly hope to set the nuclear powder keg on fire and then sit somewhere quietly aside, should not harbour any illusions.

Recently your magazine published an interview with a scientist who is described as the "father" of the American neutron bomb. He let fall a phrase: all people are monsters. His daughter, who was present, asked: then are you a monster, too? Yes, I am, he answered, and added that making war is in man's very nature.

Here is a striking example of the human-hating psychology of those who are today zealously whipping up the nuclear arms race.

In so doing, they apparently count on being able to lull the vigilance of the Europeans, to make them accept that same neutron weapon as an ordinary thing, a means of "defence", in a word, something like a bayonet or a grenade. Meanwhile, in reality things are quite different. Indeed, experts maintain that several neutron charges are enough to destroy every living thing in such a city as Hamburg, for example.

All this is unpleasant talk, but the truth that concerns everybody should be said aloud bluntly. It should be said before it is too late, while it is still possible to prevent the calamity. To develop the neutron weapon is not a problem. The real problem is a political and humane one—how to prevent the emergence and use of such a weapon. Once the Europeans succeeded in doing this. They can cope with it now again.

It is claimed in some capitals of the NATO countries that the Soviet Union is responsible for the storm-clouds gathering over the world. But if one rejects the propagandist fabrications and turns to facts, it will become clear that this is a malicious invention.

The Soviet Union does not threaten anybody, is not planning to attack anyone. Our military doctrine is of a defensive character. It rules out preventive wars and the "first strike" concept. I can also say with all responsibility that the Soviet Union will under no circumstances use nuclear weapons against the states which have renounced their production and acquisition and do not have them on their territory. We are ready to give contractual guarantees of it to any country without a single exception.

Our striving to prevent a nuclear holocaust has been convincingly expressed at the current session of the UN General Assembly, where the USSR has put forward a new important and constructive initiative. The main point in it is to ensure that nobody should ever be the first to use nuclear weapons. And if nobody will be the first to use them this, consequently, means that they will not be used at all.

As for the Soviet Union's stand on the issues of war and peace, let me remind you of something else.

We, as is known, have signed with the United States and have been ready to implement in good faith the second Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, SALT-2.

We propose that an agreement be reached on ending not only all nuclear weapons tests, but also their further production in order to limit and then to destroy their stocks in general.

We propose the prohibition on a contractual basis of the development and creation of any new types of mass destruction weapons.

We have put forward proposals concerning specific, carefully weighed and fair measures for lessening tensions and eliminating seats of conflicts on vast expanses—from Central Europe to the

Far East, including the Middle East, the Persian Gulf zone and the Indian Ocean.

Unfortunately, the leading powers of the West, above all, the NATO bloc, have not so far shown a serious interest in talks on all these questions which are vital to mankind and its peaceful future. Some people there are far more willing to talk, not about detente, but about confrontation, not about peaceful, mutually beneficial cooperation, but about the use of trade for military-strategic purposes, not about agreements on the basis of equality and equal security, but about dictation from a position of military superiority, not about the elimination by joint efforts of seats of conflicts, but about the creation of ever new military bases, about the build-up of their military presence in various parts of the world, not about curbing the arms race, but about "additional armament", not about a limitation or prohibition of some or other types of weapons, but about the creation of ever new, even more destructive means of mass annihilation of people.

And, unfortunately, they not only talk, but also act in practice. You, of course, understand that I have in mind above all the policy of the present US Administration, the way it has been manifested both in statements by high-ranking state officials of that country, and, what is even more important, in their practical deeds.

All of this is actually the opposite of detente, a blunt disregard for the striving of all peoples for a lasting peace. And certainly it is profoundly deplorable that the leaders of one of the world's biggest powers have deemed it possible to build their policy on such a basis.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, as I have had many occasions to say, we sincerely strive for normal relations with the USA, based on mutual respect and consideration for each other's rights and interests. Moreover, we would like to have good, friendly relations with the USA and cooperate with it in the name of strengthening peace on earth.

Soviet-US talks on the limitation of nuclear weapons in Europe lie ahead; I will speak about this later. And some time after that, we hope, SALT talks will start. We will conduct both talks in good faith and constructively, striving for a fair agreement with due regard, of course, for the security interests of the Soviet people, its friends and allies.

President Reagan has recently expressed the readiness of the USA to discuss with the Soviet Union also other problems, which are a source of differences between the two countries. We welcome such readiness, as we have always considered talks to be the most appropriate method of resolving international problems. The main thing, of course, is that correct words are accompanied by corresponding practical deeds.

And it would be better to abandon dreams of ensuring military superiority over the USSR. If necessary, the Soviet people will find it possible to make any additional efforts, to do everything nec-

essary to ensure their country's reliable defence. It is far more sensible and realistic to talk about preserving the parity which already exists and which, as experience has shown, is quite a good basis for preserving peace.

Europe is of course called upon to play a special role in strengthening peace and deepening detente, if only because it is the most crowded and fragile of all of mankind's "homes" which would inevitably be a victim in a nuclear conflagration. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference is evidence of the fact that the European states realise the value of peace and the danger of military threat. Isn't this also seen from the spontaneous anti-war and anti-missile movement which has unfolded in a number of NATO countries as a response to the dangerous militaristic policy of that bloc's leaders?

But it is not only the wave of popular protest against adventurism that matters. The Europeans make an inestimable contribution to strengthening peace by their day-to-day creative activity, by constantly broadening and strengthening fruitful peaceful ties between the peoples of the continent—economic, scientific, technical and cultural ties, contacts between parliaments, public organisations, municipal bodies, etc. For in spite of the chilling winds and destructive calls which come from the camp of the enemies of detente, the material structure of peaceful cooperation in Europe continues to gain strength and to be enriched. One cannot but recall once again the words which Lenin said almost 60 years ago in connection with relations between young Soviet Russia and the capitalist states: "...We may argue, we may quarrel, we may disagree on specific combinations—it is highly probable that we shall have to disagree—this fundamental economic necessity will, nevertheless, after all is said and done, make a way for itself. ...regular trade relations between the Soviet Republic and all the capitalist countries in the world are certain to continue developing." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1966, Vol. 33, page 265.) Life has borne out and continues to bear out the wisdom of these words.

As for the role of the Federal Republic in the creation of this fabric of peaceful ties in Europe and the significance in this respect of the relations between our two countries, I have already spoken about it.

Question: A new stage in the arms race is coming. The problem of medium-range nuclear weapons, both Soviet and American ones, has become one of the most acute for Europe. Do you see any possibility to halt such a development?

Answer: As I have already said on several occasions, we feel that there is no such field of disarmament and no such type of weapon on which agreement could not be reached. The problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe can also be resolved in the interests of all European nations. It can and must be so re-

solved. But it will be possible to do so only provided all sides regard the construction of lasting peace as a common task.

What does this mean in concrete terms? Your magazine is called (in translation) *Mirror*. And may this mirror reflect the real picture.

First, let us recall how the events, which in the long run brought about the present situation with regard to nuclear weapons in Europe, unfolded. Since the fifties the USA has deployed in Europe and in the seas on which it borders nuclear weapons for delivering strikes at vital centres of the USSR and its allies. These weapons came to be called "forward-based weapons", and the doctrine which they served was once called in Washington the doctrine of "brinkmanship". Then or somewhat later, nuclear weapons also appeared in some other NATO member countries in Western Europe.

Now put yourself in our position. Could we regard with indifference how we were being surrounded on all sides with military bases, how increasing numbers of carriers of nuclear death, no matter in what form—missiles from the sea or land, air bombs, etc.—were targeted from various areas of Europe on Soviet cities and factories? The Soviet Union had to create weapons for its own defence, but not for threatening anyone, Europe least of all. It created and deployed them on its territory in numbers balancing the respective arms of those who declared themselves our potential enemies.

We did not then, nor do we now consider nuclear confrontation, especially in Europe, to be the best solution. Many times has the USSR proposed that at least a limit be put to rivalries in that field. But real talks on this subject never got started. Why? Neither in the sixties, nor in the seventies did the US Administrations wish that their medium-range systems, i.e. the so-called forward-based systems, should also be a subject of talks and that possible agreements should apply to them as well. Judging by everything, the balance of medium-range nuclear weapons which had taken shape suited the Americans then.

The subject of a "Soviet threat" to Western Europe has been whipped up in Western propaganda in recent years, and reports began to appear on "SS-20" missiles. We proposed in the autumn of 1979 that representatives of the USA and the USSR should meet without delay to examine the situation and reach an agreement on a parity even at a lower level than had taken shape by that time. An answer to the Soviet initiative was NATO's "dual" decision of December 1979 on "additional armament".

But let us see what is after all the balance of nuclear weapons in Europe.

If we included in the medium-range weapons the main missile and aircraft nuclear weapons of the NATO countries capable of reaching targets on the Soviet Union's territory from the territory of the West European countries and the water basins washing

Europe, i.e. with a range (radius) of action of 1,000 kilometres and more (but less, of course, than intercontinental range), and the respective Soviet weapons of similar range stationed in the European part of the USSR there is at present a rough parity as regards such weapons between NATO and the USSR in Europe. The NATO countries have here 986 of such delivery vehicles. Among them the USA has more than 700 (F-111, FB-111, F-4 aircraft, planes on board aircraft carriers in the seas and oceans washing Europe). In addition, the British potential includes 64 ballistic missiles and 55 bombers. France has 144 units (98 missiles and 46 bombers).

The Soviet Union has 975 similar weapons. The situation has not changed even after the USSR began replacing the "SS-4" and "SS-5" missiles, whose service life has expired, with the more advanced "SS-20". When deploying one new missile, we dismantle one or two old missiles and scrap the latter together with the launchers.

It is true that "SS-20" can carry three warheads. But their aggregate yield is less than that of one old warhead. Consequently, in the process of replacement of obsolete missiles, the total number of our delivery vehicles was decreasing with simultaneous reduction of the aggregate yield of our medium-range nuclear potential.

But the NATO medium-range weapons are being constantly improved and their number increased. In Britain, for example, modernised ballistic missiles with six warheads (instead of the three now) are being installed in Polaris submarines. In France it is planned to replace land- and sea-based missiles with a single warhead with missiles with seven warheads. The number of French missile-carrying submarines is also being increased.

And this at a time when as regards the number of nuclear charges fired against a target in one salvo, which is a highly important indicator, NATO already has a fifty per cent advantage.

The above-cited data are a reflection of reality and clearly show how far-fetched is the clamour raised by NATO about the "intolerable superiority" of the USSR as regards medium-range weapons and the "necessity of additional armament". Frankly, it is rather the Soviet Union which should be considering the question of additional armament.

If another nearly 600 new American missiles are deployed in Western Europe, NATO will have a fifty per cent advantage as regards delivery vehicles, and almost a one hundred per cent advantage as regards nuclear charges. Is it not clear that this would seriously upset the existing rough balance (considering all factors) and create a serious threat to the security of the USSR and its allies?

Remember how the United States reacted to the possibility of the development two decades ago of several dozen of Soviet missiles in Cuba at the request of the Cuban government. Washington raised a hue and cry, claiming that a mortal threat hanged over

the United States. And now some people are trying to convince us that the US forward-based nuclear weapons situated along the perimeter of our Western frontiers is a forbidden subject, a subject which is not to be discussed. Our activity to neutralise the existing threat is proclaimed to be "beyond the limits required by the USSR's defence", while the intention to deploy at our doorstep hundreds of the latest US missiles over and above the existing ones is presented as an "act of defence". What is this—cynicism or the loss of an elementary sense of proportion?

Agreement has now been reached with the United States to resume the talks on medium-range nuclear weapons. They will soon start in Geneva. The USSR welcomes this agreement, just as it is welcomed by governments and millions of people in other countries who wish to see a lessening of the threat of a new war, an easing of tensions, and the achievement of a durable peace.

But there is something which one cannot avoid mentioning. As the talks are drawing nearer, demands are being made ever more often by the US side (and at a rather high level) for a "special approach" to the United States. Rather curious preliminary conditions are being formulated: the subject of US forward-based weapons should in no case be touched on, the nuclear weapons of the United States' allies in NATO should not be included into any balance, and the scope of the talks should be limited to Soviet medium-range missiles which should be dismantled "in return" for US missiles planned to be deployed in Europe.

It is difficult to understand on what logic this attitude is based. In any case, it has nothing to do either with objectiveness, or with realism. Those in the United States who advance this kind of "proposals" apparently do not for a minute expect that the Soviet Union might agree to them. No other state that cares for the security of its people would agree to this in our place.

Most probably the authors of such "proposals" do not really want talks, let alone successful talks. What they need is a breakdown of the talks, which they can use as a sort of justification for continuing the arms race, for turning Western Europe, as planned, into a launching pad for new US missiles trained on the USSR. They are working in advance for a deadlock of the talks so as to say later: Look, the USSR has no regard for the West's opinion, and so the United States has no choice but to deploy the missiles.

This should be borne in mind by all those who are truly concerned about the present dangerous situation in Europe and the world, who are working sincerely for fruitful talks and nuclear arms limitation in Europe.

Everything in the official explanations of the plans for the deployment of new US nuclear missiles in Europe is false, from beginning to end. It is false that all this is "additional armament" in answer to the challenge of the Soviet Union, which, allegedly, refused to hold talks on medium-range weapons. It is false that the United States decided to deploy its new missiles in Western Europe

only in response to the request of its allies, being motivated exclusively by a concern for their "security".

I shall not dwell on how the Americans practically extorted the "consent" of some West Europeans to come under the "protection" of new US missiles. This is well known. It is not difficult to understand the hesitations of those who are being made the hostages of the policy of others, extras around theatre weapons, an expression now in vogue in Washington.

Who will be pushing the button to launch missiles, to which of the "two and a half" wars, at which Secretary Weinberger is playing, will they be geared? One only has to ask these and several other similar questions, to take note of the fact that strategic objects on Soviet territory are the targets for US missiles and that new US delivery vehicles can be used as first strike weapons, for the essence of what is taking place to become clear.

Western Europe is being conditioned to another aggressive turn in the United States' nuclear doctrines at the price of colossal risks to the peoples dwelling there. In order to neutralise mobile missiles it would be necessary to deal retaliatory blows of great yield at the areas where they were thought to be deployed. This is the kind of "concern" for the security of West Europeans shown on the other side of the ocean. This is a grim fact, but it is a fact.

The Soviet Union is not seeking preferential treatment. We insist on one thing only, that the United States and the NATO alliance as a whole should measure our security and the security of our allies by the same yardstick as their own. We see the aim of the coming talks to be to translate the principle of equality and equal security into the language of specific commitments by the sides. The Soviet Union would like the talks to result in a lowering of the level of confrontation, instead of a raising of this level, and in the road being opened to further steps towards military détente in Europe.

We have already said that if the United States adopts a reasonable stand in the event that NATO's plans for new missile weapons are dropped, we shall be prepared to reduce the aggregate number of Soviet missiles. I will add that we shall be prepared to agree to quite substantial reductions on both sides.

When it is a question of the need to consider the nuclear potentials of the United States' allies in NATO, we simply suggest taking into consideration what actually exists. The Soviet Union is not pressing for the reduction of precisely these potentials. It is the overall result, the overall balance that is important to us.

It is precisely with a view to making it easier to embark on a practical solution of the problem that we suggested, and we reaffirm this, that as soon as the talks start, that is to say, from November 30 of this year, a moratorium be imposed on the deployment in Europe of new medium-range nuclear missiles of NATO and the USSR, a moratorium which would be in force until the conclusion of a permanent treaty. This would mean that both

sides would quantitatively and qualitatively freeze the plans for deploying medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe including, naturally, US forward-based nuclear weapons in the area, and would cease work on preparing to implement such plans. The NATO countries would not deploy Pershing-2 missiles, Cruise missiles and other medium-range nuclear missiles. The Soviet Union would stop the deployment of "SS-20" missiles.

Thus the Soviet Union is saying a clear "yes" to any honest talks leading to the curbing of the arms race and genuine disarmament. We believe such talks are necessary and realistic and we for our part will help them to achieve success.

Question: The United States under President Reagan does not wish even to hear about the SALT-2 treaty previously drawn up by Moscow and Washington. Do you believe it is really possible to revive that treaty?

Answer: When I am asked about the SALT-2 treaty, I always recall the lengthy and far from easy talks at various levels that preceded its conclusion. The treaty that was worked out reflected the precisely verified balance of interests of the sides, everything had been weighed on very fine scales. For that very reason the treaty proved acceptable to both sides.

At the time the treaty was concluded, the Soviet Union had a greater number of delivery vehicles, while the United States had a superiority in the number of warheads. But we agreed that in the event of the treaty coming into force, we would reduce the number of strategic delivery vehicles by approximately ten per cent or by 254 units.

Establishing the parity of the USSR and the USA in the sphere of strategic offensive armaments, through bigger reductions of such armaments by the Soviet Union than by the United States, the SALT-2 treaty was laying a reliable basis for further measures in strategic arms limitation and reduction. This was promoted also by the fairly rigid framework that was introduced for the work on designing new types of missiles and perfecting old ones.

It is not our fault that the treaty—perhaps one of the most important of all the treaties on arms control—has not yet come into force.

Washington is trying to justify the refusal to ratify the SALT-2 treaty by alleging that the United States is lagging behind the USSR, which, they say, already has or is about to acquire some major advantages in strategic armaments. But the treaty would precisely preclude either side gaining an advantage.

I am stating quite definitely that from the moment when the SALT-2 treaty was signed in 1979 the Soviet Union has not done anything in the sphere of strategic armaments that would lead to a change in the approximate parity which was established.

The United States, on the contrary, is adopting ever new military programmes. Fabulous sums are being allocated for them. And all this is being done on the pretext of ending the United Sta-

tes' non-existent "lag" behind the USSR. As for the SALT process, its continuation is being linked with implementation of the programmes of increasing the United States' strategic might. It turns out that people in Washington are talking not about reducing strategic armaments but about building them up, that they are making talks depend on the speed at which the armaments conveyor belt moves.

The Soviet Union is consistently calling for the continuation of the SALT process, for genuine limitations and reductions of strategic armaments on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security. This requires that the talks should continue calmly, without cheap propaganda and attempts at exerting pressure. One must preserve everything positive that has been achieved in drawing up the SALT-2 treaty and not in any way link this top priority problem with others, no matter how important they may be.

Now a few words about control. In Washington they like to declare that agreements on arms limitation should be subject to strict control. But who is objecting to this? We, too, wish to be sure that the United States is fulfilling its obligations. We are therefore no less, and maybe more, interested in control than is the United States. For it is in the United States that all sorts of plans are being discussed in earnest as to how intercontinental missiles could be more reliably hidden and placed beyond the range of control by national technical means. It is not in the Soviet Union but in the United States that variants of the preemptive use of nuclear weapons, taking advantage of the effect of surprise, are being played out. We stand for a renunciation of being the first to use nuclear weapons. Our stand is determined by our general attitude to nuclear war as an impermissible catastrophe.

We, like the United States too, have experience of the control of the SALT-1 agreements. We are confident that national means do ensure proper control. The resolving power of these means of surveillance, in particular, space means, is constantly increasing, hence the possibilities of national means of control are also growing. The US Administration is well aware of this. Given confidence, some further forms of control might be worked out. But in all circumstances national means must have priority since they meet the interests of the security of a state better.

The development of science and technology in the sphere of armaments must not be allowed to outstrip the possibilities of control over the measures of arms limitation and reduction. This means that agreement to this effect is needed now. It is needed in order to stop the conveyor belt of the arms race, to ensure the reduction of armaments under reliable control in the interests of the security of all peoples.

Question: The idea of extending confidence-building measures further on our continent, one that you have put forward many times, has aroused interest in the West. The Soviet Union is prepared to extend these measures to the whole European part of your

country. What matching step is expected from the West in return?

Answer: The strengthening of confidence among states, particularly in the military sphere, meets the vital interests of the European peoples, of all participants in the European Conference, including the United States and Canada. It could not be otherwise, because the road to peace is not through confrontation but through the process of talks, through meetings and conferences of representatives of states and, in the last analysis, through practical steps that help bring peoples closer together, help normalise the international atmosphere and remove such obstacles as mutual distrust, prejudice and fear.

We in the Soviet Union would like to hope that the short-term propagandist considerations by which some Western delegations are guided at the Madrid meeting do not obscure the fundamental requirements of cooperation and that it will be possible to reach agreement on convening a European conference on confidence-building measures, on security and disarmament in Europe. There can be no confidence without reciprocity and equality. International security is based on the equal security of the contracting parties.

In consenting to extend confidence-building measures to the entire European part of the USSR, we, naturally, expect the West to take reciprocal steps. Military preparations in the European zone of NATO do not start from the continental edge of Europe. Everybody knows this. Consequently, island territories adjacent to Europe, respective sea and ocean areas and the air space over them must also be included. This is what we are talking about.

Question: Discussions about nuclear-free zones have again begun in Europe. What do you think about the establishment of such zones in different parts of our continent?

Answer: You ask about nuclear-free zones. The importance of establishing nuclear-free zones is obvious to those who are seriously posing the task of not proliferating nuclear weapons and of stabilising peace. The path towards agreement here is not, I think, such a thorny one.

Indeed, many states have signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, most of them having no such weapons on their territories. There can hardly be any doubt that the majority of them treasure their non-nuclear status and would like to regard it as a guarantee of not being drawn into a nuclear conflict. If the nuclear powers should undertake the commitment to respect the non-nuclear status of such states, not to deploy nuclear weapons on their territories and not to use nuclear weapons against them under any circumstances, this would immediately provide the conditions for the creation of several nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world.

Recently I was asked a question that came from Finland as to what would be the Soviet Union's attitude to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the North of Europe. Our answer was given

publicly and I shall not cite it here in full. I shall only recall that the Soviet Union expressed readiness to undertake the commitment not to use nuclear weapons against Northern Europe by concluding a multilateral agreement with countries participating in the zone or agreements with each of them separately. We are not making our commitment conditional on a positive attitude of other nuclear powers to the zone though, naturally, the participants in the zone would have greater security if guarantees of respect for the non-nuclear status are also given by NATO nuclear powers.

We do not rule out the possibility of considering, in the context of the creation of a North European nuclear-free zone, the implementation of some measures on our own territory. Without going into detail, I may note that they could be substantial measures.

The North of Europe is not the only region on our continent where the possibility of creating nuclear-free zones is being intensively discussed. This idea is very popular in the Balkans. Many Mediterranean countries are showing an interest in it. We, naturally, appreciate such ideas.

It is the Soviet Union's wish that the arsenals of all types of nuclear weapons in Europe should not be expanded, that instead the process of their reduction should be started. I shall end with what I began—if a possibility of creating a nuclear-free zone opens in one or another part of Europe, the USSR will give the most effective support to practical steps in this direction.

Question: Developments in Poland are regarded as a very serious matter in the FRG. Can it be assumed that the question of normalisation of the situation in Poland is considered in the Soviet Union in close connection with the preservation of peace in Europe?

Answer: Certainly, it is considered in close connection with the preservation of peace, and, I would add, of the place of socialist Poland in Europe.

There is much speculation about Poland in the West, all kinds of speculation aimed mostly at further destabilising the situation there, undermining the positions of socialism in that country, complicating Poland's relations with the Soviet Union and, of course, getting from all this relevant advantages for the designs of the NATO bloc.

Certain people are eager to impose on the nations the hardships of a "cold war" or some other kind of war. The Soviet Union has never been engaged, and is not going to be engaged, in such affairs. To us Poland is a friend, a good neighbour and an ally, and we regard it as an ally and a friend should be regarded. The USSR is trying to make it easier for the Poles to overcome their economic difficulties and is helping them in this, as far as our possibilities allow.

It would be a good thing if they in the West understood that peace and tranquillity are needed by all the states of Europe, and not only by countries of the socialist community.

**WORDS OF GREETING TO INDIRA GANDHI ON
THE OCCASION OF THE OPENING
OF THE TROPOSPHERIC LINK BETWEEN
THE USSR AND INDIA**

November 2, 1981

Esteemed Madame Prime Minister,

On behalf of the Soviet people, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Council of Ministers and on my own behalf I congratulate you, the government and the people of the friendly India on the inauguration of the tropospheric link between our countries.

This link constitutes yet another channel for strengthening close ties between the Soviet Union and India and is a fresh success in their dynamic and manifold cooperation, which meets the vital interests of our peoples. I express my sincere gratitude to the Indian and Soviet workers, engineers and technicians whose work has drawn Moscow and Delhi still closer together.

I am confident that relations between the USSR and India, sealed by the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation, will continue to develop successfully.

I wish you good health and success. I warmly greet the friendly Indian people.

**SPEECH AT A MEETING WITH PARTICIPANTS
IN THE CONFERENCE OF SECRETARIES
OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEES
OF FRATERNAL PARTIES OF SOCIALIST
COUNTRIES ON INTERNATIONAL
AND IDEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS ¹**

November 4, 1981

Speaking at the meeting Leonid Brezhnev dealt with problems that faced the socialist countries in connection with the continuing aggravation of the international situation.

Everything happening in the world arena today, he said, turns, in one way or another, on the crucial question—that of removing the threat of a world war and ensuring lasting peace. Mankind is going through a critical moment in its development. The question now on the agenda is not only what the 1980s will be like but how things will shape up in the more distant future too.

Noting that the aggravation of international tension is assuming a protracted character, at the same time Leonid Brezhnev pointed to the increasing concern shown by world public opinion at the dangerous arms race on which the most reactionary forces of imperialism are pinning their hopes. He expressed confidence that the policy of peace and international cooperation will prevail over the policy of the reckless building up of tension.

The process of detente largely sprang from the active common policy pursued by socialist states. Unanimous and co-ordinated efforts can give this process its second wind, fresh strength and momentum. For this it is important to develop business contacts between states, to strengthen the dialogue with realistically-minded statesmen and different schools of political thought who are ready to work for a better future.

Internationalism, Leonid Brezhnev stressed, is a major source of the strength of the socialist countries. While giving our support to one socialist country or another, whether it is Cuba or Vietnam, we thereby strengthen the socialist community and the cause of peace as a whole. This is true in respect of the support the so-

¹ Abridged.

cialist states give to our comrades in Poland in their efforts to overcome the grave political and economic crisis.

In conclusion Leonid Brezhnev expressed his belief that the meeting would assist better coordination of the actions of the fraternal parties in the international arena, contribute to their joint theoretical and ideological work and to further growth of the authority of Marxism-Leninism.

SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT A RECEPTION TO MARK THE 64th ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT OCTOBER SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

November 7, 1981

Dear comrades and friends,
Esteemed guests,

Once again the great Soviet people is marking the anniversary of its great revolution. Troops, ready for defence of the Motherland, with their mighty equipment, again marched in close formation, and a festive procession of the working people passed through historic Red Square.

In the hands of people we saw figures of labour accomplishments, figures of plans and pledges for the future. We saw slogans of friendship and solidarity with the fraternal socialist states, with the working people of all countries, calls for the struggle for peace.

All that unfolded in the main square of the Soviet Union as a bright multicolour panorama, reflecting the life, deeds and aspirations of our people.

The Soviet people are preoccupied with major deeds. They are putting into life plans of a new stage of communist construction, which were elaborated by the 26th CPSU Congress.

The solution of difficult tasks arising on this road calls for the utmost concentration of the creative forces of the people, calls for a high degree of organisation, discipline, initiative and high quality of labour.

This is what the Party calls for, and the nationwide support for its course is the guarantee that the aims set will be successfully achieved.

We are living and working in a complicated international situation. The dangerous designs and the adventurist policy of the aggressive circles of imperialism create a threat to peace and security of the peoples.

In these conditions the might of the Soviet state and its socialist allies, our steadfast, consistent policy of peace and coopera-

tion with all sober-minded, peace-loving forces increasingly clearly appear as one of the main guarantees of preservation of universal peace.

On this gala day we affirm that the Soviet Union will do its utmost to meet the hopes of the peoples, that it will firmly and steadily uphold the cause of peace, justice and freedom.

Allow me, dear friends, to raise a toast:

To the great Soviet people and its glorious Communist Party!

To a stable and indestructible peace on our planet!

To the health of the participants of today's military parade and demonstration and of all people present in this hall!

SPEECH AT THE PLENARY MEETING OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE ¹

November 16, 1981

Dear comrades,

A great amount of political, organisational and economic work has been accomplished since the 26th Congress of the CPSU. The labour and political activity of the masses has increased. The Soviet people have entered the new five-year plan period with a feeling of optimism and confidence in themselves. They are deeply convinced that the great and complex tasks of communist construction set by the Congress will be successfully carried out.

The present plenary meeting of the Central Committee can be regarded as a direct continuation of the work of the Congress. At the Congress we approved an economic policy for the eighties and endorsed the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR. Now at this plenary meeting we are taking the next step. We are to discuss a draft five-year plan specifying—relative to the first half of the eighties—the targets set by the 26th Congress of the Party.

Upon examining the materials submitted by the State Planning Committee and the Council of Ministers of the USSR the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee came to the conclusion that the plan assignments for the 1981-85 period meet in the main the requirements of the Congress. This, comrades, is the most important thing for assessing the plan.

The draft clearly outlines the ways of solving the main task of the five-year plan. The Party's line for building up the country's economic potential and enhancing the efficiency of the national economy is being consolidated. The draft directs us to the fulfilment of the Congress decisions regarding the social programme. Industry and agriculture will be developing dynamically. Measures are being

¹ Abridged.

taken to concentrate capital investments. A big new step is being made in the development of Siberia and the Far East. The economy of each Union Republic will be further developed. Our defence needs are being dependably assured.

Proceeding from this, the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee has approved, on the whole, the drafts of the 11th Five-Year Plan and of the plan and the budget for 1982 and is submitting these documents to the plenary meeting of the Party's Central Committee for consideration.

It is clear from the report of Nikolai Baibakov under what far from easy conditions the five-year plan was shaped. There are two groups of factors accounting for this.

The state of affairs in the economy is influenced by factors which are entirely or partially beyond our control. Drought has been causing great damage to agriculture, and hence to the entire economy, for three years in succession. In drawing up plans we, naturally, had also to take into account the complication of the international situation.

There are also other things which make themselves felt. We correctly assess the new requirements made by the present stage of development of the national economy. But, unfortunately, the style of our economic activity and economic thinking, methods of planning and the management system are not being restructured energetically enough.

All this could not but leave its mark on the draft five-year plan. This is a difficult and demanding plan. But what follows from this? It follows that it is necessary to redouble and treble our efforts to carry it out. It follows that it is necessary to expedite the restructuring of the style and methods of economic management.

Leonid Brezhnev then dwelt on the most urgent problems of economic development and the ways of solving them.

I shall begin with *food*, he said. The food problem is, economically and politically, the central problem of the entire five-year plan. The basis for its solution is high growth rates of agricultural production. Such rates are envisaged in the draft plan. The average annual grain harvest is to increase by almost 35 million tons during the five years and meat production by more than two million tons. It is planned considerably to increase the production of potatoes, other vegetables and fruit.

The five-year plan period began with a year of bad harvests. But this cannot and must not upset our plans for a speedy and stable growth of food production.

For that matter, the experience of many years has shown that we have weather unfavourable for agriculture almost every other year. Consequently, it should be viewed as not an exception, but quite a usual, natural phenomenon for our climate. Hence follow several practical conclusions.

Until we have learnt to control weather, work in agriculture should be more skilfully adapted to climatic adversities. This pre-

supposes a stricter specialisation by regions. This presupposes the introduction of such crops and such agrotechnical methods as ensure good crops both with a shortage and with an excess of moisture. This presupposes, finally, the manufacture and better use of the appropriate equipment. All this, along with the development of land improvement and more effective use of increasing quantities of fertilizer, will help lessen the dependence of agriculture on the weather.

In elaborating the targets, standards and indices for agriculture, it is important to take careful account of the most likely, the actual conditions for the particular region. The performance of those engaged in agriculture cannot be judged by the results of one year. People and their work should be appraised on the basis of what they achieve both in good and bad weather and how steady and stable the results of their work are.

An example of good stable work is shown by the grain growers of Kazakhstan. In the 10th Five-Year Plan period the republic overfulfilled its plan for the production and purchases of grain and has practically reached the level of selling 1,000 million poods of grain to the state annually. This year the working people of Kazakhstan, who worked under difficult weather conditions, have sold more than 960 million poods of grain. This is a great victory, comrades.

Despite the difficulties caused by the drought this year, the workers in agriculture of the Ukraine have fulfilled the task set for the sale of grain and have delivered to the state 827 million poods. The cotton growers of Uzbekistan, tea growers of Georgia, all the workers in agriculture in those republics have worked well, as usual.

Considerable successes have been scored by the working people of Byelorussia and Lithuania, as well as of the Stavropol Territory, the Kuban area, Rostov, Tyumen and several other regions of the Russian Federation. The weather did not favour them either, so the achievements of those republics and regions deserve all the greater respect.

In the course of two five-year plan periods now the working people of Azerbaijan have achieved a steady growth in the output of all farm crops. And this year, notwithstanding difficulties connected with weather, bumper crops of grain, cotton, grapes and vegetables have been harvested.

I believe the plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee is right to congratulate the Communists and all the working people, who have scored major successes in the first year of the current five-year plan period. I wish them fresh victories.

The uninterrupted supply of the population with high-quality foodstuffs requires the efficient functioning of both agriculture and many other branches. That is precisely why the 26th Congress of the Party deemed it necessary to prepare and include a *comprehensive food programme* in the five-year plan.

The drafting of such a programme is a highly creative matter and, it must be frankly admitted, a difficult one. It must combine the efforts in agriculture itself, the industries servicing it and the

systems of the procurement, storage, processing, transportation and marketing of farm produce. And it is particularly important that it should subordinate the work of the above-mentioned branches to the common ultimate goal—meeting the country's demand for food-stuffs.

In drafting the programme it is necessary thoroughly to analyse the structure of the agro-industrial complex and to remove any discrepancies from it. The plan under consideration sets aside somewhat greater resources for the development of the sectors supplying agriculture with means of production and also ensuring the more extensive processing and storage of farm produce. Further progress should be made along this road: the capacity of grain elevators and refrigerators should be more energetically increased and the bottlenecks be removed in transport, particularly specialised transport, and in the packaging and primary processing of produce.

The system of purchasing needs to be considerably improved. At present almost all the purchased grain is taken to elevators, often distant ones, although a substantial portion of that grain is shortly to be brought back. It is evidently necessary gradually to go over to building, along with large elevators, small storage facilities and mixed feed shops closer to collective and state farms. Also the construction of only large milk and meat processing enterprises and slaughterhouses is hardly justified. Livestock and milk often have to travel hundreds of kilometres to reach them, thus causing losses and non-productive expenditures. These can and must be drastically cut back.

Or take another matter. You know that considerable losses occur during the storage of potatoes and other vegetables in many cities. To rectify the situation the draft plan provides for a 60 per cent increase in capital investment in building storage facilities and a 40 per cent increase in investment in building intra-farm hard-surface roads. Moreover, it is necessary to build vegetable storage facilities both in cities and at collective and state farms. This will make it possible to take produce, as needed, directly to shops and cafeterias and considerably to cut losses.

Discussing the situation in agricultural engineering, Leonid Brezhnev set the task of raising technological standards, enhancing the dependability and increasing the service life of machinery. The problem cannot be solved only by building new plants, he said. It is therefore necessary to improve work at existing enterprises. There are possibilities for doing this. The five-year plan pursues this very aim. It is necessary that Ministers Alexander Yezhevsky, Konstantin Belyak and Leonid Khitrun, together with the USSR State Planning Committee, tackle this matter and put things in order there.

In drafting the food programme importance should be attached to such major problems as improvement of the economic mechanism and the system of management of agriculture and the agro-industrial complex as a whole, including, of course, local manage-

ment. Collective and state farms should have the final say in deciding what should be sown on each hectare and when one kind of work or another should begin. Management at district level should be enhanced in every way as well. Proper conditions should be created to stimulate the growth and intensiveness of agricultural production more energetically, to encourage the initiative of collective and state farms and all other links of the agro-industrial complex, and to make them work being guided by a high end result rather than by intermediary indices.

Considering the significance of this issue, the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee proposes that the food programme be discussed at one of the scheduled plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee. Confidence has been expressed that the Party's Central Committee will support this proposal, as there is no matter more important, more noble than meeting the most vital needs of the people.

The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers, Leonid Brezhnev went on to say, have taken urgent measures for the speediest possible elimination of hitches in supply. It is necessary, he stressed, to make even fuller use of local food resources and the potentialities of subsidiary plots. It is necessary in every way to support the initiative and enterprise in this matter of district and city Party and Soviet bodies, of industrial enterprises and amalgamations, of collective and state farms.

Generally speaking, agriculture and the branches servicing it have much work in store, much hard work. But I'm confident that our Party and our people are equal to these tasks.

Leonid Brezhnev devoted much attention in his speech to the tasks set for industry, transport and communications.

One of them, affecting the entire national economy, is successful development of the *fuel-energy complex*. The plan provides for a considerable growth in the output of energy and fuel, especially gas. But the country's requirements are also swiftly growing. Therefore the plan sets its sights on utilising all available levers and incentives to ensure the saving of fuel and energy. At the same time the targets for the production of fuel and energy should be exceeded. This is one of the main concerns of the central economic bodies. The Ministries headed by Comrades Nikolai Maltsev, Boris Bratchenko, Pyotr Naporozhny, Boris Shcherbina, and Vasili Dinkov in the first place shoulder responsibility for the uninterrupted supply to the country of oil, coal, gas and electric power, and for ensuring the necessary volume of fuel exports to fraternal countries and the world market.

The country owes a good deal to the heroic efforts of gas and oil workers and builders, who made the tapping of the riches of Western Siberia possible. Even greater tasks have been set before them in the 11th Five-Year Plan period. They are to begin developing new gas and oil fields and to build and put into operation five major trunk gas pipelines from Western Siberia to the Centre, as

well as the export-oriented Urengoi-Uzhgorod gas pipeline. These undoubtedly are the key construction projects of the five-year period, and they must by all means be completed in time. Allow me to express our general confidence that the builders will acquit themselves with honour in coping with this task.

Speaking of long-term prospects, Leonid Brezhnev said recent verification of the reserves of gas, oil and gas condensate in Western Siberia again demonstrated that nature had been generous. The resources possessed by the country enable it to be confident of the future. The important thing is to manage them thriftily and wisely. The efforts to develop the fuel and energy complex, including the development of new energy sources, must not be slackened. At the same time it is necessary to introduce energy-saving techniques and technology more speedily.

These are the key objectives in the development of the national economy. They should always be in the focus of attention of the republican, regional and city Party organisations, of all the economic management bodies and research centres. The CPSU Central Committee is convinced that this will be the case.

One more decisive area of the five-year plan is *capital construction*. A specific feature of the projects of the five-year plan and the plan for 1982 is that they provide for a considerable increase in utilising basic assets with a slower growth in capital investment. The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee has supported the government's proposal to reduce by 30,000 million roubles the volume of capital investment and of construction and assembly work that was initially planned for the five-year period. What is the reason for this?

Account was taken of the available material and labour resources, the capacity of building organisations and also the considerable scale of uncompleted construction. In fact, we now have a realistic and better-balanced plan of capital construction. This provides normal conditions for work.

There are many good work collectives in this country. There are, for instance, *Glavzapstroj* of Leningrad which, from one five-year plan to another, completes the planned projects on or ahead of schedule, the builders and assembly men of the Novolipetsk metallurgical works, the builders of non-ferrous metallurgical plants of the Ukraine, and light industry factories of Byelorussia. One can and must learn from these collectives.

But far from all are working in this manner. Leonid Brezhnev criticised a number of Ministries which lagged behind in commissioning priority projects and urged Ministers Pyotr Neporozhny, Nikolai Goldin, Georgy Karavayev and Alexander Tokarev to correct the situation quickly. It is at the priority construction projects that it is necessary to ensure maximum concentration of manpower, material and financial resources, to give them everything necessary for putting these projects into operation as soon as possible. To

achieve this the mobility of building organisations will have to be increased and plant and personnel re-distributed in good time.

No less important is the task of commissioning production capacities in time. In this connection Leonid Brezhnev called the attention of Comrades Leonid Kostandov, Vasili Isayev, Nikolai Maltsev, Vladimir Listov and Alexei Petrishchev to the need constantly to keep within their field of view projects which are being built on the basis of compensation deals.

Concluding the discussion on capital construction, Leonid Brezhnev mentioned two further matters. First, it is necessary to ensure the conservation of projects which are temporarily suspended. Second, it is equally necessary to create reserves for normal work during the 12th Five-Year Plan period, especially in branches producing raw materials.

Leonid Brezhnev then analysed how the Party's major directive for *enhancing the efficiency of the national economy and its intensification* is reflected in the draft of the new five-year plan.

With a 10 per cent increment in the overall volume of capital investment, the draft plan envisages an 18 per cent increase in national income. Of course, it will not be easy to achieve this. But the very comparison of the two figures indicates that a line for making better use of all resources is at the basis of this plan. Measures are envisaged for increasing labour productivity and improving the quality of output. The resolution adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers in June this year directs technical progress and investment policy, the enterprise of economic executives and the initiative of work collectives towards the saving of material resources.

At the same time, although the draft envisages high efficiency assignments, it has not yet overcome a tendency towards a lowering of returns on capital in a number of branches of the national economy. Consumption of materials is falling slowly and so are its production costs. On the whole, there is still a lot of work to be done to make the economy really efficient. Therefore all work collectives, economic executives and all Party committees from the lowest up to the highest level should persistently work to implement the economic policy of the Party.

According to the draft plan, the rates of modernisation of equipment will grow roughly by 50 per cent. This confronts research and design institutions with great and important tasks.

Unfortunately, far from all of them are working as is required by the present level of scientific and technological progress. The technical and technological decisions proposed do not always correspond to the necessary level. An unnecessary scattering of forces is continuing. Naturally, the competitive principle must be present in science. But is, for example, the existence of more than 200 central organisations engaged in the same type of design work justified?

The State Committee for Science and Technology, the Academy of Sciences, ministries and departments should more vigorously

implement the decisions of the 26th Party Congress on the effective use of the accumulated scientific and technological potential, and accelerate the introduction of new equipment.

The present-day demographic situation, Leonid Brezhnev stressed, necessitates better use of manpower resources. The plan provides for measures to limit the growth of the number of people employed in some non-production branches and the active drawing into production of pensioners, housewives and people living in the countryside. But this is obviously not enough. The root of the evil is the slow reduction of manual labour. Nearly 40 per cent of the labour force is engaged in manual work in industry as a whole, while in the construction industry and in the field of services the figure is even bigger. The USSR State Planning Committee and the State Committee for Science and Technology must accelerate the drafting of a target-oriented comprehensive programme for a reduction of manual, especially arduous labour.

Socialism as a social system has enormous potentialities for the rational and humane employment of the society's main productive force—the working man. And these potentialities should be used in full measure.

No small reserve for increasing the effectiveness of our economy, Leonid Brezhnev said, is a well-weighed, considered development of foreign economic ties, in the first place a deepening of cooperation with the socialist countries. Such cooperation is of paramount importance both economically and politically. Therefore, we must demand from all the economic executives that they show greater responsibility in fulfilling the decisions in that field, adopted by the Central Committee of the CPSU and the USSR Council of Ministers.

The next big problem on which Leonid Brezhnev dwelt was *the improvement of economic management, of the machinery of economic management*. The solution of these questions is an inseparable part of the Party's political and theoretical work. Quite a lot has been done to improve economic management. But our economy never stands still. The system of inter-branch and intra-branch connections is becoming increasingly complex. Therefore, co-ordinated work of all the economic sections is becoming an increasingly important condition for the effectiveness of the economy.

The Party Congress had proclaimed the slogan: "An economy must be economical." The whole of the economic machinery must be brought into line with this demand. But it should be admitted that this has not so far been done to the required degree. That is precisely why we still encounter situations where it is economically disadvantageous for enterprises and associations to adopt demanding plans, to speed up scientific and technological progress and improve the quality of products. That is precisely why indices which in fact stimulate wastefulness (I have in mind the notorious "gross output" counted in tons or roubles when the point at issue is, for example, the manufacture of machine-tools or the baking of bread,

or ton-kilometres—when it is a matter of evaluating the operation of transport) have not yet been done away with.

It is well known that in our conditions the main production units are enterprises and associations. This means that all the bodies of management and the entire economic mechanism are called upon to promote their better operation. In practice, however, identical conditions are sometimes created for enterprises working well and those performing poorly. Failure to meet plan targets is sometimes camouflaged by a downward revision of these targets. At the same time the savings made by advanced enterprises are taken from them on one pretext or another. Enterprises are frequently denied the right to manage their development funds independently.

The system of material and technical supply needs to be substantially improved: failures, even short-term ones, in supply literally disorganise the work of many enterprises and construction sites. Solution of these problems does not require additional investment but can produce tangible results for the national economy.

Some might say that many of the questions raised are to one extent or another reflected in the well-known resolution on improving the economic mechanism. And so they are. But more than two years have passed and the resolution is being put into effect slowly, by half measures.

All this prompts one conclusion: while working to fulfil the five-year plan we should at the same time improve the economic mechanism, the system of economic management. The Political Bureau has arrived at the conclusion that one of the forthcoming plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee should be devoted to this question. I hope, comrades, that you members of the Central Committee will agree to this.

The growing relationship between economic and social progress that is characteristic of developed socialist society, Leonid Brezhnev continued, has brought priority to the *social programme* in our plans. In the draft submitted for consideration the share of the national income used for consumption has been increased. The consumption fund itself will grow by 73,000 million roubles in 1985, as compared with 1980. The requirement of the Congress for the priority growth of the "B" group industries is being met.

The production of fabrics, footwear and knitwear will grow by a far larger amount than during the previous five-year period. The output of cultural and household goods will grow by 40 per cent. The range of goods will increase and their quality will improve. The products of quite a few enterprises are already in great and well-deserved demand. These include the *Sokol* and *Moskva* clothes-making associations in Moscow, the Lomonosov Chinaware Factory in Leningrad, the *Kiyevlyanka* Knitwear Association in Kiev, the *Masis* Shoemaking Association in Yerevan, etc. The goods produced by the enterprises of the Ministries headed by Erlen Pervyshin and Alexander Shokin deserve praise.

The line for boosting the incomes of the people is continued. Major countrywide measures to raise wages and salaries and improve the system of payment have been launched. For instance, pay rates and salaries in the coal industry will be raised at the beginning of 1982 with simultaneous acceleration of retooling operations.

Government aid to families with children, to working mothers and to young families, and also the practice of a shortened work-day for women, are growing. The building of child-care establishments is being accelerated. Minimal pensions are being raised and other measures taken to improve pension schemes.

As before, considerable resources have been allocated to promote health care and public education.

Altogether 93,000 million roubles have been allocated for housing construction. The layout of flats is becoming more convenient. Particular attention is being attached to Siberia and the Far East. It is planned to build 30 million square metres more housing in the countryside than was built during the 10th Five-Year Plan period.

At the same time the Party also sees the difficulties that exist. In connection with the above-mentioned causes, there will still be hitches in the supply of meat, dairy produce, cotton fabrics and several other products. There is only one way to resolve these and other problems. It is through a growth of production, an increase in labour productivity and the effectiveness of the economy. This was repeatedly pointed out by the Party and this is precisely what the draft five-year plan aims at.

We know from our history that there were difficulties also in the past. They are possible in the future too. This is natural when something new is being born and progress is being made. The main point, as Lenin taught, is not to close one's eyes to the difficulties, to find correct ways to overcome them and to be able to mobilise the masses to combat them. This remarkable tradition of the Bolsheviks lives on now in the endeavours of the Communists, of all Soviet people.

We have everything needed for successful work: highly developed productive forces, the social-political and moral unity of the Soviet people, and a clear strategy for advancement, which is embodied in the Congress decisions. The task now is for the whole Party to raise even higher the level of organisational work in the field of economic development.

The 11th Five-Year Plan must become—and will become—a glorious landmark along the path of the Soviet people's historic accomplishments. There is no doubt that our country's working people will devote all their strength and energies, creative work and initiative to gaining ever new successes along this path.

Speaking of the plan for 1982, Leonid Brezhnev pointed out that it provides for moderate growth rates. In adopting the plan we proceeded strictly from actual possibilities. And we will equally strictly demand its unconditional fulfilment. I will say this, com-

rades: the Council of Ministers is resolutely opposed to the practices allowed in the past of correcting plans at the end of a year. Let us support this attitude. After endorsement a plan becomes the law of our life and activities, and it is precisely as a law, as a most important Party and state document that we all—from worker to minister—must treat it.

The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee sets the task: the plan for 1982 must not only be fulfilled, but overfulfilled. What has to be done to this end?

First, to ensure the most stringent conditions for savings in the utilisation of all kinds of resources, speedily and drastically to put a stop to mismanagement and wastefulness.

Second, to achieve real fundamental changes in capital construction, to put into operation production units at all projects without exception envisaged by the plan.

Third, to ensure the wintering of cattle in a well-organised manner and without losses; to carry out in time and with good quality the whole package of work to ensure bumper crops in 1982.

And lastly, in the course of implementing the plan it is necessary to accelerate the development of the "B" group industries and thus improve the supply of consumer goods and foodstuffs.

These are not simple tasks, they are ones of great magnitude requiring efficient joint action of all sectors of the national economy. To cope with them successfully it is necessary to support the plan's tasks with economic, organisational and political measures that will guarantee their implementation. Organisation, efficiency and discipline are a must both in the centre of the country and in the provinces. It is from this point of view that the activities of all Party, state and economic bodies should be conducted.

We have every right to expect that the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics, territorial, regional, city and district committees of the Party will considerably increase their influence on economic life by relying on the great and multifaceted experience that exists in running the economy. What I am talking of here is not petty tutelage or the supplanting of local government and economic management bodies. What I mean is a well-considered and exacting personnel policy, persistence and a sense of purpose in upholding the interests of the state and resolute combatting every violation of decisions taken, especially of Soviet laws, every breach of Party and Communist ethics.

The Central Committee attaches great importance to the active work of local Party organisations. The situation and moods in work collectives, and hence their production performance, depend in many ways on how well Communists work. It is necessary that every Communist—and there are almost eighteen million of us—should devote, each at his job, all his energies, all his experience and knowledge to looking for new reserves and to raising labour efficiency and set a worthy example of dedication to his work.

The year 1982 will be rich in major political events. There will be congresses of the trade unions and of the Young Communist League. There will be elections to local Soviets of People's Deputies. The sixtieth anniversary of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will be observed. Each of these events has its own specific features and its political meaning. At the same time all of them are called upon to give a new powerful impetus to further consolidation of the unity of the Party and the people, to still closer cohesion of all the nations and nationalities of this country, to an upsurge in the political and creative activity of the masses.

In conclusion I should like to underline one simple idea, Leonid Brezhnev said. It applies to all people, no matter what posts they hold and where they work. One must work better. One must draw up better plans and carry them out better. One must organise better production and produce better, in short, work more efficiently. This, comrades, in the final count, is the main, decisive thing.

**SPEECH IN BONN (FRG) AT A DINNER GIVEN
IN THE GOVERNMENT RECEPTION
HOUSE REDOUTE**

November 23, 1981

Dear Mr. Federal Chancellor!
Ladies and gentlemen!
Comrades!

Thank you, Mr. Federal Chancellor, for the warm words of greeting. I would like to express our gratitude for the invitation to visit the Federal Republic. The Soviet leadership always highly value an opportunity to have a serious, constructive exchange of views with you and your colleagues.

The last time I was in Bonn it was spring. I remember the rays of the May sun playing even on the faces of people. Now it is autumn, the season of falling leaves, and it seems that even people's faces have become more serious. The reason for this, apparently, lies not only in the change of seasons. Everywhere alarm has grown over the destinies of peace.

People want to have greater confidence in the morrow. We know this both from meetings with our compatriots and with foreign representatives. People want to work peacefully and bring up their children, and peace is necessary for this.

You, Mr. Federal Chancellor, probably cherish these sentiments as well. This is understandable. The people of our states went through such terrible sufferings during the years of the Second World War that it is not surprising that the very idea of a new war, the more so of a nuclear war, seems criminal to them.

There are situations in politics in which a single wrong step may become a fatal one. This holds true now. The question is in which direction events on the European continent will develop in the near future: towards a strengthening of the foundations of peace, as was decided at Helsinki, or their destruction.

We have discussed this subject in great detail with the Federal Chancellor today, including, of course, the question of medium-range

nuclear weapons in Europe. And I put the Soviet viewpoint quite frankly.

We consider the situation to be alarming. The biggest power in the West is trying further to intensify the arms race. This includes the adoption of new gigantic programmes for the deployment of strategic and other weapons; it also includes the start of production of neutron weapons. But use of such weapons would mean leaving Europe without human beings, turning it into a tombstone to itself.

It has even come to statements about the possibility and all but the expediency of "limited nuclear wars". Does not the stubborn reluctance to assume on a reciprocal basis a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, as is proposed by the Soviet Union, speak for itself?

It turns out that the possibility to use nuclear weapons in the "European theatre of war" is being elevated to the status of a military doctrine. As if Europe, where hundreds of millions of people live, were already doomed to becoming a theatre of war. As if it were a box of little tin figures which do not deserve a better fate than being melted in the flames of nuclear explosions.

It is bitter and painful to speak of such things. But it is our duty, especially before young people, to tell the whole truth about war. And not only about the tragedy of the past, but also about what a nuclear war may mean.

Whatever may divide us, Europe is our common home. Common fate has linked us through centuries, and it links us today, too.

We are deeply convinced that the plans to deploy in Western Europe, above all on FRG territory, new US nuclear-missile weapons targeted on the USSR, are creating for the whole continent such a great danger as has never before existed. People are keenly aware of this danger and, of course, expect that everything will be done to eliminate it.

The question of nuclear weapons in Europe will be, as is known, the subject of Soviet-US talks, which are to start in Geneva soon.

It would, of course, be naive to think that the very fact that the talks will start is enough to resolve a problem causing such concern to the peoples of Europe. The outcome of the talks will depend on both sides. The Soviet Union is going to the talks with a firm intention to achieve positive results. As regards the other side, however, we believe that there are more than enough signs to put one on one's guard.

In the US, as well as in some other NATO countries, one frequently hears statements attesting to a desire to spare no effort to deploy new US missiles in Europe, rather than to a desire to seek a balanced agreement.

The contents of the recently published US Administration's proposal on how to solve the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe only increase these fears.

How do we assess this proposal? If one is to speak frankly, then, in our opinion, its authors turn upside down the very notion of fairness and reciprocity with regard to a question affecting the security interests and the very life of hundreds of millions of people. And, of course, there is no question whatsoever of any "zero option" in it.

It is being demanded of us that we should unilaterally disarm, while hundreds of land-based and sea-based missiles aimed at our country and our allies, hundreds of aircraft with nuclear bombs, all this formidable arsenal now in the possession of the United States and other NATO countries in the region of Europe is to remain intact. In other words, if at present the ratio between the medium-range nuclear systems of the two sides in Europe is expressed quite accurately by the figure of one to one, the US would like to change it to about two to one in favour of NATO.

It is clear that the Soviet Union will never agree to such a variant. We call on our partners in the coming talks to adopt a more objective approach to the question and to seek, together with us, a solution which is really acceptable to both sides and which benefits the cause of peace and universal security.

To facilitate the dialogue and to create a favourable atmosphere for it, we have put forward this proposal: while the talks continue, both sides should abstain from deploying new and modernizing existing medium-range nuclear systems in Europe. As you can see, there is no question here of any perpetuation forever of the present level of medium-range nuclear systems.

Moreover, as we have said to the Federal Chancellor today, should the other side agree to the moratorium I have just spoken about, the Soviet Union would be prepared not only to discontinue the further deployment of its "SS-20" missiles. We would go even further.

As an act of goodwill, we could unilaterally reduce a part of our medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the USSR. In other words, we could carry out some reductions in advance, as it were, thus moving towards a lower level which could be agreed upon by the USSR and the US as a result of their talks. This is a new, substantive element in our position.

In the course of the talks with the United States we will resolutely advocate radical reductions in the medium-range nuclear weapons by each side in Europe. Of course, specific figures should be worked out in the course of the talks. But as for us, we would be prepared to effect reductions not by dozens but by hundreds of units of weaponry of that class. I repeat, by hundreds of units. This is our approach.

If our partners in the talks display readiness to reach an agreement on the complete renunciation by both sides, the West and the East, of all types of medium-range nuclear weapons aimed at targets in Europe, we are for this.

Generally speaking, we are for Europe becoming eventually

free of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical ones. That would be a genuine "zero option", which would be just for all the sides.

Mr. Chancellor!

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen!

Comrades!

The Soviet Union and the FRG have different social systems. Each of us has its own allies and friends. We have dissimilar political views in many respects, and we have our differences. But we believe that they should recede into the background as we face our common main task, that of safeguarding peace, this supreme treasure of mankind.

The 1970s, the decade of detente, did not pass without a trace. They have made a deep impact on the consciousness of the nations, on the minds of people. Detente has demonstrated that peaceful and mutually beneficial cooperation among nations is a real possibility. Moreover, it is an imperative need.

Much that is useful has been gained in this respect in relations between the Soviet Union and the FRG. The historical role of the Moscow Treaty has made itself felt here. This treaty and the commitments of the sides written into it reflected a new character of relations between our states and a new approach to the problems of ensuring peace in Europe. I think each of us can say with satisfaction that mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and the FRG has become a notable factor of stability in the European continent and in international life as a whole.

You will probably agree with me that our contacts in various fields are developing favourably. Trade turnover between our countries is steadily growing and increasing in importance. A number of large-scale projects are in the offing, and some of them are projected into the next century. Contacts in the cultural field and between youth, trade union and other public organisations have become more vigorous and more varied.

In short, our joint and purposeful work is bringing much benefit to our peoples. So let us cherish and multiply what we have achieved and to this end do everything within our power to safeguard and strengthen peace.

I would like to conclude my speech by expressing our friendly feelings for the citizens of the Federal Republic of Germany and wishing them peace and well-being.

I would like to propose a toast to the health of the Federal Chancellor and Mrs. Schmidt!

To the health of all those present!

To good-neighbourliness and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany!

To peace in Europe and all over the world!

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS MADE IN BONN

November 24, 1981

Our talks with the Federal Chancellor and other statesmen and political figures of the FRG have just been concluded.

This visit was marked by the special intensiveness of meetings as regards both their number and the range of subjects which were discussed. I think I am expressing a joint opinion in noting that the meetings were held in a spirit of mutual respect and a striving to know each other better. We do, of course, have differences. We did not bypass them, but we tried not to deepen the ditches, rather, on the contrary, to build bridges.

The main conclusion I draw from the talks with the Chancellor can be expressed as follows: every effort must be made and joint work must be continued to strengthen peace, to restore the climate of detente and trust. This is a very important guideline for practical politics.

We too, like the federal government, consider the continuation of top-level contacts to be desirable, and I have given Federal Chancellor Helmut Schmidt an invitation to visit the Soviet Union. An invitation to visit our country has been given by me also to Federal President Karl Carstens.

My colleagues and I once again express our warm thanks and gratitude for the invitation to visit your republic and for the useful talks we have had and work we have done during these days.

I wish you good health, Herr Schmidt, and success in your work.

SINCERE GRATITUDE

December 5, 1981

During my visit to the Federal Republic of Germany many letters and telegrams were addressed to me by citizens of the Federal Republic, in which they wished success to my talks with Federal Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, spoke in favour of further development of relations between the USSR and the FRG, and expressed support for the initiatives of the Soviet Union aimed at averting the threat of nuclear war and at promoting disarmament and detente.

Being unable to answer all the letters and telegrams individually, I would like here to express my sincere gratitude for the good wishes and to say that the Soviet Union will continue to do all within its power to resolve the most important problem—the ensuring of a durable peace on our planet.

**SPEECH UPON RECEIVING THE SUN
OF FREEDOM ORDER, THE HIGHEST AWARD
OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC
OF AFGHANISTAN**

December 16, 1981

Dear Comrade Karmal,

I am sincerely moved by the decision of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the Revolutionary Council and the government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan to award me the Sun of Freedom Order. I thank you with all my heart for this award.

The Sun of Freedom Order, the highest Afghan decoration, sounds beautiful and politically meaningful. This name, I would say, symbolises the radiant future for which the Afghan people fought and continue to fight and for the sake of which the April Revolution was made. Social progress, national independence and a just peace are all inseparably linked with the notion of freedom.

The friends of democratic Afghanistan sincerely rejoice in the successes achieved by the young republic in improving the life of the people and in eliminating age-old backwardness. The policy pursued by the People's Democratic Party and the government is supported by increasingly broad sections of the population—workers, handicraftsmen, peasants, intellectuals and the clergy, numerous tribes and nationalities. Therein lies an earnest of the invincibility of the Afghan revolution.

Our southern neighbour, Afghanistan, was the first country with which the young Soviet republic established relations on an equal footing. How ties between them have expanded and how much stronger Soviet-Afghan friendship, at the cradle of which stood Lenin, has grown!

Our friendship and cooperation are being further strengthened in the present conditions when the Afghan people have to overcome no easy ordeals and to solve complicated domestic and external problems.

Interference by the imperialist reactionary forces in Afghanistan's internal affairs has not ceased to this day. It is high time for those who are weaving a web of intrigues against the Afghan people to understand that however hard they may try to prevent Afghanistan from following the road of independence and progress, these attempts are doomed to failure. The sun of freedom has risen over Afghanistan and no one will be able to extinguish it!

To those who are artificially making a hullabaloo over the "Afghan problem" we would like to say that if they really want to do away with this problem they should stop interference from outside in Afghan affairs and join seriously in the efforts to achieve a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan.

For this there is a good basis. It is the proposals made by the government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. They contain truly realistic and flexible possibilities for reaching solutions which do not infringe on anybody's interests and which will assure the Afghan people tranquillity and the neighbouring countries—stable relations and mutually beneficial cooperation with an independent, non-aligned Afghanistan.

That is what I wanted to say in connection with today's meeting. I should like to add that as the Soviet Union gave assistance to the Afghan people in defending their revolutionary gains so our country is prepared to continue helping Afghanistan secure a just political settlement in the interests of international peace and stability.

I again thank you, Comrade Karmal, and all the Afghan leadership for the honoured award and wish the friendly people of Afghanistan peace, well-being and happiness!

SPEECH UPON RECEIVING AWARDS OF SOCIALIST COUNTRIES ON THE 75th BIRTHDAY

December 18, 1981

Esteemed comrades, friends,

I hope you understand the emotion I feel. A jubilee means not only giving an account to myself and to my people but also to my like-minded friends. It means, as it were, reviewing the path that has been traversed.

I am sincerely grateful to Comrades Zhivkov, Kadar, Honecker, Tsedenbal, Ceausescu and Husak for being here in Moscow today. I thank you, friends, for the high awards, for the warm words you have just said about myself and my work.

It is difficult and embarrassing for a man to speak about himself. Therefore I just want to underline from the very beginning that my work is a particle of the gigantic work of the Leninist Party with which my life has been inseparably linked for over fifty years.

No few trials fell to the lot of our country and our people. We have known hardships, we have known setbacks, but these were far outnumbered by joys. And, certainly, the main joy for us, Communists, has always been and remains the joy of creative work, the joy of creating the new.

It has been our good fortune to participate in establishing and developing the world community of socialist countries. For nearly four decades now we have been working hand in hand with our class comrades from socialist countries. We are building together—and in no easy conditions—truly fraternal relations between peoples. This is, without exaggeration, one of the most noble directions of activity in man's history.

All our political and moral aspirations are subordinated to peaceful work. They are always in the forefront for us. We want peace for ourselves, for the peoples who are seeking their own ways to progress, we want peace for all mankind. Statesmen should

understand that for the cause of peace to triumph it is necessary not only to uphold one's own interests but also to respect the interests of others.

Peace and justice are two indivisible notions. And, of course, real concern for peace is incompatible with national egoism, with claims to world leadership.

In politics it is not just useful but also necessary to look beyond the horizons of today. I do not doubt that the light of peace will dispel the spectre of war. The years to come can and must be peaceful ones. They will still further reveal the humanism of our ideals, the greatness of our friendship.

As for myself, I want to assure you that, as before, I will spare no effort to strengthen the friendship of the socialist countries, to achieve new successes of the immortal Leninist cause.

Those, dear comrades, are some of the thoughts and feelings I wanted to share with you on this day, a memorable one for me.

TO THE VIETNAMESE READER

Foreword to the Collection "Following Lenin's Course" ¹

Dear friends,

I highly appreciate this opportunity to make this contribution to the newspaper *Nhan Dan* in connection with the publication in the Vietnamese language of a collection of my speeches, greetings and articles.

The reader acquainting himself with them will see that they cover a rather considerable period in the life of the CPSU and the Soviet state and concern both the home and foreign policies of our Party. At the same time there is a subject in my articles and speeches to which I return practically all along—Party work.

The range of activities of a party in power is very, very wide. The Party determines the strategy of the country's development. At the same time, without supplanting government bodies, trade unions or other public organisations, the Party is involved in deciding all the key problems, whether it be the economy, the development of culture and public education, the country's defence or safeguarding peace.

Marxism-Leninism has been and remains a compass for all the Party's activities. The new tasks that have arisen and are arising in the course of development continue to demand from us new answers and solutions. And it is Leninist methodology, the Leninist revolutionary teachings that help us find those answers and solutions. It is gratifying to see that thanks to the major work done by Soviet and Vietnamese specialists readers in Vietnam can now acquaint themselves with the *Collected Works* of Lenin in their own language.

¹ The collection "Following Lenin's Course" was published in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in 1981.

World revolutionary experience has revealed a number of general law-governed patterns of socialist construction. But this does not mean, of course, that the tasks of Communists can now be carried out in a simple way, that there is a general scheme, as it were, and all you have to do is to embody it in life as fully and exactly as possible.

Every Marxist-Leninist Party now takes part in the development of revolutionary practice and theory. It simply cannot be otherwise. The pace and methods of socialist changes are bound to bear the imprint of the specific national and historical features of the particular country. And, of course, who if not the Communists of the ruling party, who know the thoughts and aspirations of their own people, should have the final say in how this or that problem should be solved and within what period of time.

I realise perfectly well that the revolution in Vietnam has specific features of its own and that Vietnamese Communists and working people in the Republic are solving the problems of socialist transformation in conditions which in many ways differ from ours. We have common objectives and ideals, common aspirations, however, and that is why one can only welcome the fact that we are beginning to know each other better and better. This makes us spiritually richer and wiser.

Some of the issues of international politics I touch upon have become a thing of the past. This is natural: the world is changing. We, for our part, are seeking to do all we can so that it should change for the better. The struggle for a lasting peace, the defence of the interests of socialism, the defence of the nations' rights to free and independent development, a firm rebuff to the forces of imperialism and hegemonism—these are some of the key principles of our socialist foreign policy.

The present-day world situation is far from calm. Our enemies are seeking to build up tension. They are engaged in an unbridled arms race, creating more and more refined military hardware and resorting to crude blackmail and pressure against independent states. And it is this that creates a serious threat to international security.

As often as not the forces of militarism and aggression act recklessly. Yet when they are opposed by the firm will of nations they are compelled to retreat. That is why it is so important that the might of the world socialist community is continuing to grow stronger. This is a factor of the first magnitude in international affairs. The developing countries are more and more resolutely pressing for restructuring international relations along democratic lines. In the NATO countries a broad movement of the popular masses has emerged demanding that the whipping up of the arms race be ended and the threat of nuclear war averted. And no one can ignore their voice any longer. And there are also quarters within the ruling set of the capitalist world—and influential ones at that—which stand for relations of peaceful coexistence between countries

with different social systems, realising that this is demanded by the interests of preserving the human race.

There is no doubt that the creative possibilities of all nations will immeasurably increase in the life-giving climate of peace and freedom. This certainly applies to the peoples of Asia with their extremely rich spiritual culture and unique natural resources. Within a relatively short space of time they can achieve the level of the more advanced countries.

We Soviet people are very gratified by the fact that we are working hand in hand with the fraternal Vietnamese people. Our friendship tested in the years of the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people against foreign aggressors is now being filled with new substance.

Dear Vietnamese friends, we take your concerns very much to heart, we are aware of your considerable achievements, we also know the serious difficulties your country has to overcome. I am convinced that a united socialist Vietnam will become both strong and prosperous. You have everything needed for that: a rich land and rich mineral resources, true friends, and, of course, a people's government and people who are staunch and industrious and who are genuine patriots.

The Communist Party of Vietnam, founded and fostered by the great revolutionary, Comrade Ho Chi Minh, is now preparing for its 5th Congress. There is no doubt that the Congress will open up new horizons in the socialist transformation of your beautiful country. I should like to underline that our country and our Party have been, are and will be together with the Vietnamese Communists, with the Vietnamese people.

All the best to you, dear comrades.

TO THE BRITISH READER

Preface to the Book "L. I. Brezhnev. Pages From His Life" ¹

The time when the shaping of world politics was the exclusive domain of politicians has passed. The peoples living ever closer together on this planet want to assume responsibility for its future. It is therefore a matter of special urgency for us to know each other better and to be able to judge matters in an objective, unprejudiced way on the basis of first-hand information.

This book is about my life. But since my life is a part of the life of the Soviet people, I hope this biography will help British readers to gain a truer picture of Soviet realities and a better understanding of the Soviet people's views and aspirations.

Despite the differences in their histories and present social systems, our two countries have for long been linked by traditions of exchange and intercourse. With the development of these traditions one naturally associates such great names as Shakespeare, Newton, Dickens, Faraday, Rutherford, Lomonosov, Tolstoy, Chekhov, Mendeleyev, Pavlov and many others.

Today also, the Soviet and British peoples have a deep respect for and interest in the contribution that each country has made to the spiritual wealth of humankind.

We remember the time when our countries were allies in the struggle against the common enemy, when they fought shoulder to shoulder to rid Europe of fascism. People of my generation who took part in the Second World War recall the sword that was forged in war-ravaged Coventry and presented to the heroes of the Battle of Stalingrad. We fully acknowledge the bravery of the British sailors who manned the convoys that broke through to Murmansk, defying the Nazi submarine blockade.

¹ Published by Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1981.

In those days the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom were linked not only by a state treaty. This was a fighting alliance of the peoples. It was an historical example of their ability to unite their efforts in the face of great peril.

This example has lost none of its significance. On the contrary. Just think how much good could be done today if Britain and the Soviet Union were more often able to find a common language, especially over the problem of armaments. It is vitally important to stop the arms race in order to relax tensions and avert the grave danger that threatens all countries.

The USSR has always duly appreciated Great Britain's role and place in world affairs and regarded relations with her as an important component of world politics.

At one time Britain was our leading trade partner. A higher degree of cooperation between the USSR and the United Kingdom in the political, economic, scientific, technological and cultural fields would undoubtedly benefit both countries.

For this it is essential to overcome prejudice and achieve mutual understanding and trust.

Of all the reflections that this book may evoke, it seems to me that the subject of peace is of particular importance. Thoughts of peace are always uppermost with the Soviet people. It could not be otherwise in a country where there is virtually no family that did not lose close relatives in the past war. That is why our people can feel only indignation and bitterness when they hear talk of the "Soviet military threat".

As Chairman of the Defence Council of the USSR, I know, perhaps better than anyone else, our military strategic doctrine and actual military potential.

And I can affirm with full responsibility that both are designed exclusively for defence. Our permanent aim is to stop preparations for war and achieve lasting peace. We hold out the hand of friendship to all those who are ready to work for peace. I am convinced that the common sense inherent in the British people must suggest that, in this age of nuclear missiles, peace, detente and curbing the arms race are the primary and common concern of both our countries.

**SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN UPON RECEIVING
THE HIGHEST AWARD OF THE COUNTRY—THE
ORDER OF LENIN AND THE GOLD STAR
MEDAL OF THE HERO OF THE SOVIET UNION**

December 19, 1981

Dear comrades and friends,

I cordially thank you for the high award and kind words. This attention and regard for my work moves me to the bottom of my heart. It reinforces the confidence that during long years of work I have been able to do something useful for the Party, for the people. All this gives me new strength and vigour.

In the award with which I have been honoured I see not only a recognition of what I have been able to do personally, holding the responsible Party and state posts entrusted to me. First and foremost, I see in it a recognition of the correctness and effectiveness of the course we have taken, of the correctness of the policy which was clearly defined by the decisions of the latest congresses of our Party, and to the implementation of which we are devoting all our energies.

In this connection I would like to say the following, comrades.

One of the key conditions for the successful work of the Party as the leading, guiding force of our entire society is the unity, cohesion and teamwork of its leading core—the Central Committee, the Political Bureau and the Secretariat of the Central Committee. It can be said with great satisfaction that we have all this.

First, and this is the main thing, there is genuine mutual understanding in the leadership, unity of opinion on the aims of our home and foreign policy and on the ways of attaining these aims. All of us together and every one in particular have no other concern than peace and the prosperity of our socialist Motherland, the well-being of the Soviet people.

Second, there is a leading collective, that is, the practice of joint study and serious discussion of the tasks and problems that arise, and joint decision making.

Finally, there is sincere respect for each other, a genuinely comradely spirit and good human friendship. All this ensures a creative atmosphere and the effectiveness of work.

This spirit of comradeship in the leading Party core, coupled with high principles and businesslike exactingness, helps maintain a healthy moral and political climate in the entire Party and country, helps a better knowledge and heeding of the thoughts, aspirations and initiatives of millions of Soviet people. And this means to direct the efforts of the Party and the whole people more successfully towards fulfilment of the great and complex tasks of the country's development.

In this situation it is easier to overcome the difficulties we have to contend with, it is easier to concentrate efforts on the truly great deeds being accomplished by the Soviet people—the heroic people, history's first builders of communist society.

I want sincerely to thank you—my comrades, members and alternate members of the Political Bureau and secretaries of the Central Committee—for the support you invariably give me as General Secretary of the Central Committee, for our concerted joint work.

I receive this award with a feeling of profound gratitude and a sense of great responsibility to the Party and the state.

SPEECH IN THE KREMLIN AT THE RECEPTION ON THE OCCASION OF THE 75th BIRTHDAY

December 19, 1981

Dear comrades and friends,

Many kind, warm words have been said here today both by my comrades from the Central Committee leadership and representatives from the Union Republics, the trade unions, the Komsomol, scientists, the armed forces and by our guests from abroad. My cordial thanks to them.

Maybe someone has overdone the praising, because our jubilees rarely take place without it. Even Lenin spoke about this, warning that we Communists should not get conceited, should not forget the work in hand. Let us follow this behest of Lenin as well.

Everything I have managed to achieve in life—in production, in battle, in political and state work—was all done at the call of our Leninist Party, whose loyal son I have now been for 50 years and will remain as long as I live. The Party is the source of our strength, it is a searchlight which illuminates our road forward. It is the collective mind of the best sons and daughters of a great people. It is, as is often and correctly said in our country, the inspirer and organiser of all our victories.

The Party subordinates its entire activities to the interests of the people, to their well-being and, because of this, it meets with the understanding and support of the entire people. Therein lies the source of its strength, the guarantee of the successful implementation of all its plans.

In all the places where I had a chance to work there were ultimately three main tasks in the focus of attention—raising the economy, ideological-educational work and, lastly, strengthening our defences and waging a struggle for lasting peace. These are the “three whales” of the activities of our Party whose supreme goal is the people’s happiness. One is only too eager to devote one’s entire life to such a great cause. I am proud that I became one of those to whose lot this fell.

There is something else I would like to mention. Probably the whole of our work would have been left suspended in mid-air if we did not have everyday support in the colossal, indefatigable work being done by local Party leaders everywhere in our huge country. First of all, we must speak here about the work done by the secretaries of the Central Committees of the Union Republics' Communist Parties, and the secretaries of the territorial and regional, city and district Party committees. They shoulder a huge burden of work. They are responsible for organising the work in literally all spheres of the people's life. I know from my own experience how difficult, and how tremendously interesting, it is. Therefore, I would like, in this festive hour, to express feelings of gratitude to all of them, fittingly to appraise the work done by these comrades—loyal and reliable conductors of the Party's policy.

Dear friends, when the time comes to pass another landmark in one's road through life, one cannot help thinking about what has been and what will be.

There is no need to talk much about the past because it is well known. And as I see it, we don't have to blush for it. One thinks more of what the Party and the people have yet to accomplish in the years to come. And in which, frankly speaking, I would like to be involved while I have the strength. And there is a great deal to do, comrades!

We have built up a mighty, technically well-equipped socialist economic organism. We have trained a huge army of specialists in all branches of the economy, management and public life. But we must not rest on our laurels.

The task now is to ensure the smooth, uninterrupted operation of this mechanism and of all the people involved in it.

It will be necessary—and this is of paramount importance—considerably to increase labour productivity throughout our economy on the basis of advanced technology and the scientific organisation of labour. We must raise it to such a level that it will not be lower but, in fact, higher than that of the most developed capitalist countries. The socialist system provides all the opportunities for this. It is only necessary to be able to use them correctly and to learn how to manage the economy rationally and thriftily.

We will have considerably to improve economic management, taking into account the know-how and creative initiative of our people, and also taking into account the best of the know-how of the fraternal socialist countries and of the developed capitalist states.

We will have to elaborate and introduce everywhere a faultlessly operating system of incentives — both moral and material — which will urge people to work to the maximum of their ability and constantly to improve the quality of their output.

We will have to raise to a new level all the Soviet people's civic consciousness, their approach to labour and socialist property,

their discipline and overall standards in work, public and everyday life.

We must do all this, comrades, if we wish to ensure ourselves against the difficulties which we have encountered to date in developing our country. I'll say even more: to do all this is absolutely necessary in order to cope successfully with the main task of our Party and people—the task of building a communist society. And the 26th CPSU Congress decisions are aimed precisely at achieving this task.

All this offers a tremendous field of activities for the Party, for the Soviets at all levels, the trade unions, the Komsomol and for our entire people.

And, of course, everything within our power must be done to guarantee the country's security and a durable, reliable peace. This is by no means an easy task considering the acute and tense international situation of today.

During conversations with foreign statesmen I sometimes hear words to the effect that they believe in Brezhnev's love for peace, but are unsure about others in our country.

I wish to tell the gentlemen who go in for such discourses—little do you know about the Soviet Union! Brezhnev's adherence to the cause of peace is explained precisely by the fact that he reflects the thoughts and feelings of the entire Soviet people and, of course, of the entire Soviet leadership, he expresses the firm and undeviating line of our Party and state in foreign policy. This line has been consistently implemented since Lenin's time to this day. The very nature of our society determines adherence to the cause of peace and peaceful cooperation with other countries. That is precisely why we do not, nor will we ever, have advocates of war, aggression and adventurism in politics. That is how it now is and will be in the future.

Concluding my speech, I would like to raise a toast:

To our great Soviet people!

To the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Party of Lenin, the architect of communist construction!

To the community of the socialist states, one of the chief motive forces in the history of our time!

To lasting world peace!

To your health and success, dear comrades!

INTERVIEW TO THE AMERICAN NBC TV NETWORK

December 22, 1981

Question: Is there a possibility that the Geneva talks will in 1982 find a basis for an agreement on concluding an arms control treaty?

Answer: Yes, there is. As far as the USSR is concerned, it is striving for an agreement. But this does not, of course, depend only on us. The stand taken by the US will be of no less importance.

The key to the success of the talks is in both sides abiding by the principle of equality and equal security. There must be no violation of this principle. The accord must take into account the special features of the weapons systems, which are not identical on both sides, the differences in the geographical situation of the Soviet Union and the US and several other factors. The scales must be well and truly balanced on both sides.

There is no need to speak at length of the importance of the current talks: on their outcome depends whether the risk of an outbreak of nuclear war will lessen or increase.

Question: Do you expect and favour a summit meeting between Reagan and Brezhnev in 1982? If so, then why?

Answer: We favour an active dialogue with the US, including also a summit meeting. This was clearly stated back in February this year at the Congress of our Party. And that is my present view too. Experience shows that summit meetings are more useful than any other form of interstate relations for a better understanding of each other's positions and intentions and for taking serious political decisions. The appropriate preparatory work must, of course, be done for the success of such a meeting.

Question: There seems to be growing concern over the fact that East and West are sliding into confrontation which poses a great threat, including even the possibility of war. Do you share this concern?

Answer: I do. But I myself would put the question differently: what must be done so there will be no confrontation? And this is my answer: what is important is that governments and statesmen should realise to the full that the main thing for all the peoples of our planet is peace and confidence in the morrow. And, of course, what is even more important is that this should be embodied in the practical policies states pursue. The dangerous fervour in whipping up the arms race must be curbed. The high degree of tension must be reduced, the dangerous hotbeds of crisis situations be extinguished, the policy of the senseless arms race be rejected and a return made to the path of normal relations between states, of mutual respect, understanding and heeding each other's legitimate interests. The questions of arms limitation and reduction must be taken up in a serious and businesslike way. All this taken together will indeed help to remove the threat of nuclear war.

Question: What specific steps do you recommend both superpowers should take in order to prevent the threat of growing confrontation?

Answer: I assume you mean the USSR and the US, even though we do not consider "superpowers" to be an appropriate term.

Of course, the prime field for the application of the efforts of our two states, considering their weight in the international arena, is the problem of disarmament. Besides the talks on the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons in Europe, which I have already mentioned, the task of limiting and reducing strategic arms, as the most powerful and dangerous ones, is figuring large on the agenda, and the American side probably sees this, too. We are willing to resume talks. It is now up to Washington.

A number of other extremely important problems in this field could also be mentioned—such as the banning of chemical weapons and the complete and universal banning of nuclear weapon tests. Headway in solving them is feasible provided an active role is played by and sufficient mutual understanding exists between, above all, the USSR and the US.

Now as regards bilateral Soviet-American relations as such. Lately artificial obstacles to their normal, mutually beneficial development, be it in trade, cultural, scientific or other fields, have frequently appeared. It would be much better for the peoples of our two countries if such obstacles were removed and in general never arose again.

This is, to speak, a minimum. But it is a minimum which can become the beginning of the road to the rebirth of confidence and to better relations between our two countries, and this would undoubtedly be reflected in an improvement of the world situation as a whole. I think Americans are no less interested in this than we are.

Question: You obviously support the role of West Germany as an intermediary between Moscow and Washington. Do you think this role may grow in the future?

Answer: We naturally welcome the trends in FRG policy which promote detente and international cooperation, about which, in particular, we talked during my recent visit to Bonn. The USSR takes a good view of the efforts of any other country too—large, medium-sized or small—if these efforts are aimed at improving the political climate and reducing the level of military confrontation. We ourselves are doing and are willing to do a great deal in this direction. There must be no doubt that corresponding actions by the US or by any other state will meet with our understanding and response. Nobody's hand, when honestly extended to us for a handshake, will be left hanging in mid-air.

Since my interview coincides with the eve of the New Year of 1982, I would like to wish all Americans well-being, personal happiness and, of course, peace—and peace again.

FOREWORD TO THE COLLECTION "ON LENIN AND LENINISM"¹

The subject of this collection issued by the Political Literature Publishing House is statements about Lenin and Leninism. Of course, this is essentially such a vast subject that it would be possible to bring under this category everything concerning our Party's home and foreign policies. Indeed, everything we Soviet Communists are now doing for the improvement of our socialist society, its advance along the path of communist construction, for strengthening the alliance of the fraternal socialist countries and the development of cooperation with the world progressive forces, for preventing the danger of war and strengthening world peace—all that is the furtherance of Lenin's cause, a practical implementation of Lenin's behests in present-day conditions.

However, we feel that the subject of this collection in its narrower sense, that is to say, pronouncements about Lenin himself, about the specific application and development of the various principles of Lenin's immortal teachings, and Lenin's ideas with regard to the Party's activities in our time, is also a matter of no small importance. The great teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, Lenin's thought, the depth and farsightedness of Lenin's analysis of social development, Lenin's method, his work style have been, are and will always be an unfading beacon, a reliable guide and a solid adviser for all who are carrying on his great cause in understanding modern life and solving problems facing fighters for socialism and the builders of socialism and communism in our time. That is why a closer look at how Lenin's ideas are used and how the CPSU is putting Lenin's behests into practice can, I believe, be of no small interest and benefit both to the Soviet people, active participants in communist construction, especially the younger generation, and to readers abroad.

¹ The collection "On Lenin and Leninism" was issued by the Political Literature Publishing House in 1981.

TO EDITORS OF "PRAVDA"

December 24, 1981

On the occasion of my 75th birthday the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the newspaper *Pravda*, other newspapers and magazines, and the television and radio have received numerous messages of congratulations and greetings addressed to me, expressing good wishes from Party and local government bodies, public organisations, republics, territories and regions, from factories, plants, building and transport enterprises, state and collective farms, institutions and educational establishments, military units, workers, collective farmers, representatives of the intelligentsia, and veterans of the Leninist Party and the Great Patriotic War—comrades-in-arms. Congratulatory messages and letters have also been received from the leaders of fraternal socialist countries, Communist and Workers' Parties, and from statesmen and public leaders of many countries of the world.

May I express through *Pravda* my heartfelt and sincere gratitude to all those who have addressed friendly greetings and congratulations to me.

On the jubilee day I felt once again the inseparable link between my life and the destinies of the country, the events of our age. In the messages of congratulations addressed to me I see not only acknowledgement of my personal services but also support for all the activities of the CPSU and for its lofty policy aims, and expression of the unbreakable unity of the Communist Party and the Soviet people, approval of and support for consistent peaceful course of our Party and the Soviet state on the international scene, for our solidarity and cooperation with all freedom-loving, progressive forces on earth, for our untiring efforts to save mankind from the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, and to ensure peaceful skies over our planet.

The messages of congratulations, letters and telegrams of the working people, which I cherish, strikingly express their hopes and aspirations for a bright future and the prosperity of our socialist homeland. They contain wishes for fresh victories in building communism. These inspiring thoughts and good wishes instil optimism, give one fresh energy and resolve to realise the tasks outlined by our Party.

Everything that has been said about me during these days I take as referring to the whole of our dear Party, which indeed embodies the mind, the honour and conscience of our epoch.

