



Mikhail Gorbachyov replies to *L'Humanité*

MOSCOW, February 8, TASS:

L'Humanité, the leading newspaper of the French Communist Party, asked Mikhail Gorbachyov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to answer a number of questions. On February 4 Mikhail Gorbachyov received Roland Leroy, a member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of France and *L'Humanité* political director, Gerard Streiff, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France and *L'Humanité's* resident Moscow correspondent, and José Fort, chief of the newspaper's international desk.

Here follows the text of the replies of Mikhail Gorbachyov to the questions from *L'Humanité*:

QUESTION: Mikhail Sergeyeovich, I thank you for your consent to answer the questions of the newspaper *L'Humanité*. You are the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This lends special authority to your answers to the questions about life in the Soviet Union which are asked by the French, who are under the permanent impact of hostile attacks against your country. Thus, the first question. There is much talk that the USSR is entering now as important a stage in its development as the one which was ushered in by the Great October Revolution. Does that mean that the point at issue is a new revolution?

ANSWER: Certainly not. Such a statement of the question, I believe, would be wrong. It would be more correct, in my view, to say that today, in the 1980s, we are putting forward the task of powerfully accelerating the cause started by the Bolshevik Party almost 70 years ago.

The October Revolution was a crucial event in the millennial history of our state, and in its significance and consequences for the development of the whole of mankind it has no match in the past. But yet it is not enough to accomplish a revolution—it is necessary to uphold it, to translate into life the working man's ideas of equality and justice, his social and moral ideas. In other words, to build a new society, capable of ensuring a life worthy of the human being.

All this has required from our people, from the Party enormous work, a real heroic deed, and sometimes, sacrifices. Civil war and war against Hitlerite Germany, the deepest-going transformations in the countryside, the creation of powerful industry, elimination of illiteracy among the majority of the population, a fundamental social and cultural restructuring of the society and formation of fundamentally new international relations are only some of the pages of our history, which is, in general, still quite

short. We are proud of it, and this pride underlies Soviet patriotism. Had we not been able to hold out, had we suffered a defeat at least in one of the above-mentioned endeavours, everything would be called in question. And each of these endeavours can by right be called a truly revolutionary accomplishment.

The same concerns the tasks which are resolved today. They are complex and, at the same time, very important. If we do not cope with their resolution, we will depreciate everything that we achieved at the price of enormous efforts in the past, and will complicate our future. And possibly the most difficult thing, but the most indispensable one for each Soviet communist and for the whole Party, is to understand in full measure, to the end, to feel the challenge thrown by the epoch and answer it in a worthy manner.

This is a double-pronged challenge. On the one hand, Soviet society has entered a new stage of its history. Its essence is that the requirements of the development of the productive forces, the requirements of the people, the requirements of individuals place on the order of the day the question of a very serious restructuring and perfecting of many aspects of production relations, methods of economic management, modes, forms, style of Party and state leadership, that is politics. The point at issue is also the drawing of ever broader sections of the people into the resolution of social affairs, mobilising its creative abilities and experience for resolving the complicating tasks, that is a further development and enrichment of our socialist democracy.

We have for quite long now felt the need for all that. The essence of what is under way in the country and, above all, in the Party now, is to accelerate resolutely the socio-economic and cultural development of Soviet society, making use to this end of all the available opportunities. This is, certainly, a revolutionary task.

On the other hand, the challenge of our epoch stems from the fact that human civilisation has

created, unfortunately, highly effective means of self-destruction. For the worst thing to happen it does not even take unprecedented foolishness or crime. It is enough to act as people used to act for millennia—rely on weapons and military force to resolve international issues, and, in case of need, use them. All of these traditions of millennia should be ruthlessly broken now, they should be given up totally. Otherwise, the problem of mankind's survival may prove to be insoluble. In this nuclear age one cannot live, at any rate live long, with the psychology, habits and rules of conduct of the Stone Age. Is not such a sharp turn in international relations, in foreign policy mentality and practices a profoundly revolutionary task? To my mind, this is precisely so. And we, as a country to have been the first to accomplish the socialist revolution, see our greatest responsibility, our duty in helping in every way possible towards resolving that task.

In general, we view our programme for practical action, which is to be discussed and adopted by the 27th Congress of the CPSU, from all standpoints as a programme of a truly revolutionary character and scale.

QUESTION: What are the most important prospects for the development of the Soviet economy for the next ten-fifteen years? How will this tell on the well-being of the people?

ANSWER: The prospects will depend on how well we cope with the problems that have arisen, in other words, on how well and how skilfully we will work. I will tell you frankly these are no simple problems. We are faced with objective difficulties (the unfavourable demographic situation, the arms race forced on us, being the biggest of them). And there are also the ones which have arisen through our own fault. And since their resolution has been protracted, they have been sharpening.

Now we have to do a lot of work within the shortest period—to improve planning, management and material incentives radically, and accelerate progress in science and technology. And on this basis—to increase the output and qualitative efficiency of the economy, improve the quality of products. Within the next fifteen years we are planning to double the country's production potential, to change considerably the very character of our economy, the character of labour and restructure the way of life of people.

Mikhail Gorbachyov's congratulations to Fidel Castro

MOSCOW, February 8, TASS:

MIKHAIL GORBACHYOV, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has cordially congratulated Fidel Castro on his reelection to the post of First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba.

In his telegram to Fidel Castro, published here today, Mikhail Gorbachyov writes that the Soviet Communists and all Soviet people have been following with profound friendly interest the work of the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba. "Its decisions open new prospects to the Cuban people, who are the first in the Western hemisphere to be building socialism while courageously upholding their revolutionary

gains from the encroachments of imperialism," Mikhail Gorbachyov stressed.

"The Cuban brothers can be confident of the Soviet Union's invariable solidarity with the Island of Freedom. Soviet-Cuban friendship is inviolable. The fruitful co-operation of our parties and countries on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism is growing and strengthening to the benefit of the cause of peace and socialism," Mikhail Gorbachyov stressed.

Mikhail Gorbachyov wished Fidel Castro, his associates, all Cuban Communists and the people of fraternal Cuba great success in their work to implement the decisions of the Third Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba. □

IN THIS ISSUE

Mikhail Gorbachyov replies to <i>L'Humanité</i>	p. 53
Mikhail Gorbachyov meets Edward Kennedy	p. 54
Mikhail Gorbachyov's reply to Swedish peace campaigners	p. 57
Nikolai Ryzhkov addresses Symposium in Davos	p. 58
Yegor Ligachyov's speech at Cuban Party Congress	p. 60

You ask: How will this tell on the well-being of the people. My answer is—it is for the benefit of the people that we are doing it, properly speaking. I mean both the quantitative and qualitative aspects, that is consumption and consumer services, housing, medical attendance and education, social security, access to cultural benefits, environmental protection, improvement in cities and villages, rest and recreation and many other things. I will not conceal the fact that in many of these fields things stand not as we would like. This happened because our difficult history for a long time did not let us devote due attention to these fields of life. And this also happened through our fault—because of inertness, inability, and at times simply irresponsibility of some or other officials, whole departments and organisations. If you read our newspapers, you know how many officials, including ranking officials, are sharply criticised for this. Now we have resolutely taken up to improve the situation. This will, certainly, take time and considerable efforts. But I am sure that we will achieve serious progress in all of these affairs. Certainly, we all would like to do this faster.

Among the most urgent matters is to satiate the market with good quality products and in a broad assortment. The products must be different: new and traditional, expensive and cheap ones, for young people and for people of advanced age—in a word, to meet all tastes and requirements, within the limits of common sense, of course. We believe this problem to be exceptionally important.

QUESTION: Are there still queues?

ANSWER: Yes, especially for high quality goods, demand for which is not yet met.

I wish to note that not all ways to resolve the problem are open to us. If in the West demand for some kinds of products exceeds supply, the price is increased. We do not do so or almost do not do so, at any rate when it comes to consumer goods.

As a result, there is a shortage, which generates queues.

I am saying all this to explain the problem, and not to justify the shortcomings. We firmly insist that shortcomings should be eliminated rather than justified. For the sake of this we have started now a serious restructuring of the economy, of all economic mechanisms.

QUESTION: Have the Soviet citizens the right and opportunity to 'object' to actions of the 'patrons' of their plants? And not only 'object' to them, but also change their decisions?

ANSWER: If by 'patrons' you imply directors, the administration, we have neither private owners, nor relations of private ownership. Already during the first years of Soviet power a whole mechanism to protect the rights of working people was created: strict labour legislation, broad trade union rights, Party and soviet control. In recent years, the rights of the working people and work collectives have been seriously broadened. Practically all major decisions are prepared and adopted with the participation of workers and after due discussion. This concerns, for example, the draft plans of economic and social development of plants.

Now specifically about the trade unions. They sign collective agreements with the administration and exercise control over compliance with labour legislation. And if they think something is done wrongly, including worker dismissals, the pay issue, the provision of housing and so on and so forth, they can very effectively, to use your expression, 'object' to the wrongs, up to demanding that this or that administrator be fired. From time to time this happens.

But there is also another aspect of the matter. It is not only the administration and the trade union but also the work collective as a whole that should make certain demands also on the workers, their discipline, conscientiousness and on-the-job conduct. And, as a rule, they do this, with the complete support of the workers. The

collective itself is interested in the good work of each member. This is also an interest of all workers, as their wages, working conditions and social benefits depend on this.

QUESTION: Isn't unemployment an inevitable price for production modernisation?

ANSWER: In a plan-based economy geared to meeting social needs as fully as possible such a connection does not exist. Even if some fundamental technology improvements make whole trades no longer necessary, we can and should in advance not only foresee this but also take measures to retrain workers and, if need be, to set up new production units. And this is just what we do in practice. Incidentally, since the reconstruction of enterprises is, as a rule, accompanied by their enlargement, the issue of new jobs is solved right at these same enterprises. But this question as yet is for us almost an academic one. Primarily because the problem for us is not a surplus but a shortage of manpower. At the same time, let me tell you frankly, there is also another reason. We are still slow in carrying out modernisation, including in the sectors where it is overdue. Be that as it may, the Party takes account of the social aspect of modernisation and considers it exceptionally important to do that in drafting plans for the country's economic development.

QUESTION: Is the Communist Party in the USSR 'the driving belt' in relation to the state? What meaning is put today in your country in the expression 'to make policy'?

ANSWER: In our society the Communist Party is the guiding and directing force. This status of the Party is sealed in the Constitution. What is meant is the Party not as a symbol but as a real, continuously functioning political organisation which numbers nearly twenty million of the more active representatives of the workers, farmers and intellectuals, as a democratic organisation that elects its bodies and its leaders and holds them strictly accountable. Now we are seeking to enhance these democratic principles of Party life and work and make all Party collectives more active. This is, as we see it, one of the efficient tools for extending democracy and involving millions of people in deciding production, social and political affairs. I think that the issues of the Party's work in present-day conditions will hold a central place at the forthcoming congress.

The Party is responsible for working out the strategy and tactics for building a new society, executing personnel policy and conducting the ideological education of the people. The Party committees at all levels, including the Central Committee, act as bodies for political guidance. The Party has a vital interest in our political system working actively at all levels. It supports and gives assistance to the soviets of people's deputies, trade unions, the Young Communist League and other mass organisations, and presses for each of them to perform its functions in full.

You ask about the meaning put in the expression 'to make policy'. We, I should say, do not use this expression. We say 'to elaborate policy, to formulate policy, to pursue policy'. This, in my opinion, conveys the substance of the matter more accurately, at least in our understanding.

The work of elaborating policy, which is as I said a responsibility primarily of the Party, begins with studying the objective situation, these or other needs of society and the sentiments of the masses (our Party, as a matter of fact, carefully studies public opinion and takes full account of it). It is on this basis, after a proper

Mikhail Gorbachyov meets Edward Kennedy

MOSCOW, February 6, TASS:

MIKHAIL GORBACHYOV, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received in the Kremlin today American politician Senator Edward Kennedy, currently in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

"After the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva," said Mikhail Gorbachyov, "conditions were created for rectifying relations between our two countries, and many leading politicians in the United States came out in favour of their realisation. But verbal tribute alone to the understanding of the danger of the present-day situation is no longer enough."

Mikhail Gorbachyov stressed that the next Soviet-American summit meeting should yield practical results, produce serious shifts in the directions that are of greatest importance for the cause of peace—otherwise, it would make no sense. The Soviet Union is doing everything to ensure that. Yet another proof of that is our programme for the total elimination of nuclear weapons before the year 2000, provided there is a ban on strike space armaments. It contains concrete and realistic formulas for reaching accords in all spheres, embracing nuclear, chemical and conventional armaments, and provides for reliable and strict verification.

The Soviet programme would enable humanity to avoid the vast dangers that are in store for the international community if it is drawn in to new ventures. We propose to rid the world of nuclear arms in the 15 years that the authors of the US "Star Wars" programme set aside for the

experiments aimed, allegedly, at trying out the recipes of 'nuclear disarmament' through space arms.

"And though nuclear test ranges continue operating in the United States, and not there alone, the Soviet Union has extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions for another three months. We regard the ending of all nuclear testing as extremely important," Mikhail Gorbachyov said.

The Soviet Union's proposal on the elimination of all Soviet and US medium-range missiles in the European zone was thoroughly discussed during the conversation. Answering Senator Kennedy's questions, Mikhail Gorbachyov explained that this proposal, just as the proposal to end nuclear explosions, is unaccompanied by any terms, except for Britain's and France's pledge not to build up their respective nuclear arms and not to transfer such weapons to other countries.

The Soviet programme of nuclear disarmament offers a unique chance not only to change radically the Soviet-American relations for the better, but also to realise the most cherished dream of peoples about a durable peace. This chance should not be let slip.

Senator Edward Kennedy expressed a number of considerations which, in his opinion, might promote the advance along the road of arms reductions. There was an exchange of opinions also on other matters connected with the need for a better mutual understanding based on the recognition of the principle of non-interference in each other's internal affairs. Edward Kennedy thanked the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee for an opportunity to have a conversation which was sincere and rich in content. □

GENEVA
The Soviet-US Summit
November 1985
Documents and Materials

Available from Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens,
LONDON, SW7 4NW. Price 35p.

discussion, that political decisions are made. This process is, of course, not a simple one and it proceeds in different ways, depending on the nature of the problems tackled. Not infrequently decision-making is preceded by an extensive, sometimes nationwide, discussion and hence a comparison and clashing of points of view on these or other issues. This is the case with discussing draft five-year plans. This has been the case with the Constitution, labour and housing legislation, the educational reform and, more recently, the law on combatting drunkenness and alcoholism.

The main thing in the entire political process is translating the decisions made into reality. There is no policy without this. And if you have followed the discussion which has unfolded in this country after the April 1985 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, you could not have failed to notice that we attach special significance to the unity of words and deeds.

For the words to be matched by the deeds we wage a determined struggle, by using the weapons of criticism and also by using the weapon of publicity and the weapon of discipline.

QUESTION: Not infrequently one hears that the Soviet young people are not interested in politics and are socially inert. Is this true?

ANSWER: Such claims are made in the West by ill-wishers to us. But let me tell you bluntly: they engage in wishful thinking. We have no reason to complain about our youth. They are distinguished by what on the whole is high civic awareness and a deep interest in the affairs of society and in home and foreign policies. The young people are acquitting themselves quite well, at factories, on collective farms, at colleges and in the army. And they go readily, of their own free will and, I will even say, with enthusiasm to work where it is more difficult, at the major construction projects in Siberia, in the country's north and in the far east. There are now half a million young volunteers working at these projects. In short, I can by no means agree that the Soviet young people are inert and passive. We have complete political trust in our relay.

This does not mean, of course, that there are no problems and questions in this matter. There certainly are. We are seriously worried, for instance, that some young people have become infected with alcoholism. There are also instances of parasitist and consumerist sentiments, bad taste, narrow cultural and intellectual interests and inadequate cultural standards. We are well aware of these phenomena and, naturally, do not leave them unattended. There is much room here for the efforts of the Komsomol. Generally speaking, it has long been known that the force of example has a far greater educational potential than a most eloquent sermon. I think that everything that is being done in the country and the Party at present will be very useful from the point of view of education of young people.

QUESTION: There is talk about persecution of Jews in the USSR, political prisoners and censorship. Some names, such as Sakharov, are mentioned. What can you say on this score?

ANSWER: To begin with, on Soviet Jews. This matter has become a part of a vociferous anti-Soviet campaign, of a veritable act of psychological warfare against the USSR. Propaganda of anti-semitism, as of other forms of racial discrimination, is prohibited by law in the Soviet Union and constitutes a crime. What is commonplace in the USA, as also in France and other Western countries—desecration of Jewish graves and the activities of the neo-Nazi organisations preaching hatred for Jews in newspapers and radio programmes—is impossible in the USSR. Jews in our country are free and have equal rights, like all the other nationalities. They are active in the public life and state affairs of the country. We publish books, magazines and newspapers in Yiddish and synagogues are opened. I think that the insistent 'attention' of anti-communist and Zionist propaganda to the

fate of Jews in the USSR is nothing short of hypocrisy which pursues far-reaching political goals, moreover, goals which have nothing to do with the genuine interests of Soviet Jews.

I believe that in a civilised society there must be no room at all for anti-semitism, Zionism or any other manifestation of nationalism, chauvinism or racism. And the problem of eradicating these evils on a global scale is very urgent. In South Africa the racists have launched gory repressions against the black majority. Pogroms and acts of violence against African blacks, Indians, Turks and immigrants from other Asian countries have become more frequent in West European countries. Racism has obviously launched a counter-offensive in the United States in the past few years. And the Arab people of Palestine have been locked out of their lands for many years—for commonly known reasons.

Now for political prisoners. We have none, just as we do not have persecution of people for their convictions. We do not put people on trial for their convictions.

But any state must protect itself against those who try to subvert it, who call for undermining or destroying it, who, lastly, spy for foreign intelligence services. These actions are qualified by our laws as crimes against the state. In the recent period, according to my information, a little more than 200 people have been serving sentences for all crimes of such a kind in the USSR.

Now Sakharov. I have already had a chance to answer this question so I will be brief. As is common knowledge, actions punishable by law were committed by him. The press reported them on more than one occasion. Measures were taken with regard to him in accordance with our legislation.

The actual state of affairs now is as follows. Sakharov lives in Gorky in normal conditions, conducts research, and remains an Academician of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He is in normal health, as far as I know.

His wife recently left the country for medical treatment abroad. As for Sakharov himself, he still has knowledge of secrets of special importance to the state and for this reason cannot go abroad.

And on censorship. We do have censorship. Its task is to prevent state and military secrets from being made public by the press and also to prevent propaganda of war, violence, savagery, humiliation of the individual and pornography. It is up to the mass media and book publishers themselves, up to their editorial boards and councils, to select works for publication, to edit and compress them, and so on. I can only add that such censorship, in one form or another, exists in every country. In your country, for instance, owners of newspapers and publishing businesses or editors employed by them decide what should be published and what withheld. And slander or publication of state secrets are punishable by law. Moreover, there is a widespread practice, for instance, in the USA, under which books are

banished from school libraries under the pressure of reactionary groups, including, as was reported at the latest congress of the Pen Club, books by such authors as Dostoyevsky, Hemingway and even Dickens, let alone the diary of Anna Frank. These are facts and facts speak for themselves.

It is a pity that the Soviet press, television and radio are known so little in France and in the West in general. The freedom of speech, the freedom of criticism are rather extensive here. Open, sometimes very keen discussions are conducted in the country. Now, on the eve of the congress, this is especially evident. Truth to tell, I view as pharisaism and hypocrisy the vociferous campaign whose purpose is to 'prove' that the USSR (meaning socialism in general) is a society reigned by uniformity, officially-imposed like-mindedness, and so on, and so forth.

An active stand in life and struggle against injustice and offences against law or social morality in our society are a norm of conduct recorded in the Constitution, which qualifies criticism as a right of every citizen. More than that. Those who interfere with it—they are often referred to, and to my mind, too mildly, as "suppressors of criticism"—come into conflict with law. Officials of any rank can even be taken to court for such actions. Our press, radio and television are probably not yet perfect but on the whole they offer a free and broad rostrum to give vent to public opinion, the opinion of the people.

QUESTION: It is often asked in various circles in the West if vestiges of Stalinism have been overcome in the Soviet Union.

ANSWER: 'Stalinism' is a concept made up by opponents of communism and used on a large-scale to smear the Soviet Union and socialism as a whole.

Thirty years have passed since the question of overcoming Stalin's personality cult was raised at the 20th Party Congress and since the CPSU Central Committee passed a resolution on that question. Truth to tell, those decisions did not come easy to our Party. It was a test of Party principledness and of loyalty to Leninism.

I think that we have withstood the test with honour and drawn proper conclusions from the past. This applies to the life of the Party and of Soviet society as a whole. Our major task is to further develop inner-party democracy, and socialist democracy in general, to strengthen the principles of collective leadership in work, to broaden publicity. The Party, its Central Committee demand modesty from people elected to leading posts, inculcate in the communists intolerance towards adulation and toadying. We attach and will continue to attach immense importance to the protection and consolidation of socialist legality, to constantly keep under strict control law-enforcement bodies. These are all important directions in political work currently carried out by our Party. And it, this work, the whole of our life today give a convincing reply to the question you have raised.

AT THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE

MOSCOW, February 6, TASS:

THE Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee has considered at its meeting a number of questions linked with taking measures within the preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress and the activities of central and local Party bodies in this direction.

The Political Bureau discussed the results of the work of the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee over the previous year. It was noted that, guided by the directives of the April (1985) plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, the Party Control Committee had intensified control over implementation of the Party's and government's important

decisions, strengthening of discipline, enhancing of personal responsibility of managers, and communists' compliance with the requirements of the CPSU Rules.

The Political Bureau at its meeting heard Vasilii Kuznetsov's account of the visit of a delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet to India. Profound satisfaction was expressed with the high level of friendly Soviet-Indian relations, and the striving for their further deepening and development was emphasised.

The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee also discussed a number of other questions of home and foreign policy and took decisions on those questions. □

QUESTION: In what way will the processes currently taking place in your country affect the state of cultural life in the USSR, which, by the way, is poorly known in the West?

ANSWER: Our cultural life is known very poorly indeed in the West. And speaking quite frankly, some in the West, taking advantage of that, simply cram people with fabrications, distort the true state of affairs.

The Soviet Union is living through a period of a noticeable upsurge in culture. Among our contemporaries are many outstanding writers, poets, composers, artists, actors and directors of opera, ballet, drama and cinema. They are outstanding not only according to our standards, but also according to world standards. Literature and arts have become in our country property of the large popular masses, rather than of a handful of connoisseurs and patrons.

The Soviet Union brings out classical and contemporary poetry and prose—both Soviet and foreign, including, of course, French—in print runs that are unmatched in the world. But the most remarkable phenomenon in our cultural life is, probably, the broad development of artistic activity of the people.

In this respect, I think that the changes that are taking place in the life of our society will, undoubtedly, affect Soviet culture, will influence it favourably.

We have everything necessary for its further rapid development, for its all-round flourishing: erudition of the broad masses, the remarkable traditions of profound interest in, respect and craving for spiritual values, access to the entire wealth of diversity of our country's multi-national culture and, finally, the policy of the Party which regards the development of spiritual life of society as one of the top-priority tasks. We also think now about strengthening considerably the material base of culture, of the entire spiritual sphere.

QUESTION: Now let us turn to international issues. Can the American 'Star Wars' plans lead to a war? Do you observe new signs of the restoration of detente in international relations following the Geneva summit meeting?

ANSWER: You have asked two questions at once.

The first one is related to the American 'Star Wars' programme. This programme, in our deep conviction, really increases the threat of war, and may, at a certain stage, make it probable. The basis for this conclusion has been mentioned more than once, and in sufficient detail at that. I would like to draw attention only to one aspect of the problem. Although the realisation of the 'Star Wars' undertaking is slated for completion after decades, and only a handful of 'enthusiasts'

believe in its feasibility, it will bring very grave consequences, should the United States persist in this work, even in the nearest future. The point at issue is that, in implementing the 'Star Wars' programme, Washington, in fact, deliberately aims to thwart the current talks and erase all the existing arms control agreements. In this case, the USSR and the United States, their allies, the entire world would already find themselves in the forthcoming years in a situation of a totally uncontrolled arms race, strategic chaos, the most dangerous disruption of stability, general uncertainty and fear, and the enhanced risk of catastrophe linked to all this. This danger, I repeat, threatens not our grandchildren, but ourselves, all of us, the whole of mankind.

Why take the risk? I admit that personally President Reagan believes in the "life-saving" mission of the 'Star Wars'. But if the entire matter concerns the elimination of the nuclear menace, why wouldn't the United States agree in principle to the Soviet Union's latest proposals? They provide for a far shorter, cheaper, more direct and, what is important, safer way of averting the nuclear threat—a total elimination of nuclear weapons. I stress: a safer way. For the way towards this objective now proposed by the United States is futile. Despite assertions by 'Star Wars' advocates, there will simply be no time for nuclear weapons to become 'obsolete'. On the contrary, they will be perfected. As a result, they might become so sophisticated that decision-making will have to be handed over to computers, to automatics. The human race would thus become a hostage of the machines and, therefore, of technical breakdowns and faults. How far this is dangerous has been shown by the recent tragedy of the American spacecraft *Challenger* which was reliable, tested many times and within the scope that is altogether possible at present.

I'm convinced that they in Washington also realise that well, and that there are at least ten cynics there per one 'believer' in this surrealistic plan of eliminating the nuclear threat, and that they mean something different from what President Reagan, probably, talks and dreams about. Some, for instance, who understand that it is impossible to create an 'impenetrable shield', are ready for less—a limited anti-missile defence which, combined with the means of a pre-emptive strike at the retaliatory forces of the other side, would create an opportunity for launching nuclear aggression with impunity. Others simply want to get rich. The third would like to undermine the USSR's economy by involving it in the space race. The fourth seek to broaden the technological gap between the United States and Western Europe and thus secure the latter's dependency... and so on.

So the 'Star Wars' question is a very broad issue. Not only two opinions on the concrete programme, but also two approaches, two concepts of security have clashed here.

The American concept is the one of ensuring security first of all by military-technical means, in this instance, by the new 'super-weapon', a technical trick that could help break the nuclear deadlock. At that, despite the rather vague, ridiculously improbable talk about the readiness to share "at some future date" the "wonder technology" with the other countries (including the USSR), the United States wants to break the deadlock for itself: in order to ensure absolute security for itself and place all the rest in the position of 'absolute danger'.

The Soviet concept is that of ensuring equal security for all by reducing armaments and achieving disarmament, down to the total elimination of all types of weapons of mass annihilation. Nowadays, there can be no security for the USSR without security for the United States, and no security for the Warsaw Treaty countries without security for the NATO states. Without their mutual security, there can be no universal security.

In responding to your question, I want to underline the problem of ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, above all medium-range missiles which seriously undermine European security. Here, too, we have a right to count on realism and prudence of British and, naturally, French politics.

Advocates of the nuclear armament set in train the argument to the effect that, as they say, its elimination will leave the West "defenceless" in the face of Soviet "superiority" in so-called conventional armaments. I won't argue now whether such "superiority" exists or not. The important thing is that our proposals provide for the reduction of these armaments as well, just as for enhanced confidence-building measures. When we advanced the proposals to get rid of nuclear weapons it was not our purpose simply to transfer the arms race to other spheres which will become equally dangerous with the passage of time.

We are well aware that the realisation of our concept of security requires enormous effort, work, consistent struggle, break-up of thousand-year-old traditions which I have already mentioned. But the world simply cannot continue living and acting the old way at the time when the threat of nuclear war is real.

Is a world without weapons, a world without wars possible at all? I would like to reply to that question with another question: is it possible to safeguard the human civilisation while carrying on with the constantly accelerating arms race, working up tensions, and balancing on the brink of war which, so to say, is permanently becoming more precarious?

Are there any indicators of the revival of detente in international relations after the Geneva summit meeting? Here, in my opinion, one has to be cautious in one's assessment. Yes, certain indicators are appearing. And the reason lies not only and not so much in separate shifts in the field of Soviet-American relations: they are too limited, peripheral, they have no bearing on the vital issues. But a certain change in the political atmosphere has already made itself felt. And this has revived in the peoples of many countries the hope and belief in the possibility of returning to detente, terminating the mad arms race and developing normal peaceful international co-operation. Now, this is something real, politically substantial.

The changing political atmosphere helps us as well, it helps the Soviet Union to approach more boldly, more decisively, the drafting of new proposals, new initiatives. Sometimes I am asked: can the Soviet Union believe that the present administration of the USA and also the governments of certain of its allies accept the new Soviet proposals? Such, for example, as the

Eduard Shevardnadze receives Edward Kennedy

MOSCOW, February 5, TASS:

EDUARD SHEVARDNADZE, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Foreign Minister of the USSR, today received the prominent American politician, Senator Edward Kennedy, who is currently in Moscow.

During the conversation the sides discussed in general terms the present state of and prospects for Soviet-American relations, in the light of the accords reached at the Geneva meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States.

Eduard Shevardnadze drew the senator's attention to the historic initiative of the Soviet Union—the programme for a complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere given a ban on strike space armaments, set forth in Mikhail Gorbachyov's statement of January 15.

Soviet-American co-operation in implementing this bold and carefully calculated plan would

bring about not only a sharp turn in mankind's struggle against the nuclear menace, but also a radical improvement in relations between the two countries.

The latest Soviet initiatives, backed up by such a major unilateral step as the extension of the nuclear test moratorium, create the necessary conditions for advancement towards the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, towards reaching accords at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments. In this connection, it is necessary that the American side, including the US Congress, also display a responsible and constructive approach so as not to lose the chance for peace.

Edward Kennedy came out in favour of progress in the cause of the real reduction of armaments and the normalisation and advancement of Soviet-American relations in general. □

complete prohibition of nuclear explosions, step-by-step elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe and everywhere in the world, prevention of an arms race in space, and so on.

This is a justified question. But then policy, and especially so in a nuclear age, cannot be built on the principle of whether you believe a partner at all or not. Policy should be built on realistic foundations taking due account of the correlation of forces on the international scene, the requirements of time, the interests of one's own people, of other peoples, of universal peace. That being so, the Soviet Union as a socialist state simply must offer the world a radical and at the same time realistic alternative to nuclear war—an alternative taking into consideration the interests of all peoples—a programme for resolving the problems facing humankind. Such proposals are a kind of 'moment of truth'. They make our partners in the talks uncover their face, show which aims their policy is pursuing in reality. When we proposed a moratorium on nuclear explosions we were told—the slyboots, they staged more tests that year (this, by the way, was not true even back then) and now suggest that the USA stop. We have staged no tests for the seventh month now. So the USA can no longer use that pretext. Then they began this talk about control and verification. We voiced our preparedness for any verification measures. This pretext, too, no longer stands. So what remains? Can it be that it is only the determination of the USA to continue the arms race at any cost?

The Decree on Peace written by V. I. Lenin (this, by the way, was the very first decree of the just-established Soviet Government) expressed the firm determination of the first socialist state in history to pursue its policy and to act "... openly in full view of the whole people" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 250); to address its proposals "both to the governments and to the peoples," "... help the peoples to intervene in questions of war and peace".... "We," Lenin said, introducing the draft decree to the Congress of the Soviets, "are combatting the deception practised by governments which pay lip-service to peace and justice, but in fact wage annexationist and predatory wars." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 252) And at the same time he said, having in mind the relations of the Soviet state with capitalist powers: "We should not and must not give the governments an opportunity of taking refuge behind our uncompromising attitude and of concealing from the peoples the reason why they are being sent to the shambles... An ultimatum would make the position of our opponents easier. But we shall make all the terms known to the people. We shall confront all the governments with our terms, and let them give an answer to their people." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 255).

Such is the principled, communist way to formulate the question. It is not accidental that I have recalled Lenin's words, Lenin's principles. There is a rich similarity between the situation of that time and the present one. In 1917, when the First World War was raging, the principal question was: how to stop as soon as possible the blood-shed imposed upon the peoples by imperialist governments. And so, V. I. Lenin and the Party decided that the most efficient way to do that was to address not only the governments, but the peoples as well. At present the peoples of the world are drawn into the arms race, into nuclear competition which threatens even more fearful shambles. And it is only natural that, working consistently and painstakingly with the governments of the West in a bid to resolve these problems, we constantly turn to the peoples as well, address our policy to them.

QUESTION: Are there any grounds to hope for an end to the war in Afghanistan in the near future and, hence, for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country?

ANSWER: We would want that very much and will, within our capabilities, work toward that.

The Government of Afghanistan, as we know, holds the same position. It is prepared to go far along the road of solving the complex problems of internal development of the country, and is actively bringing different political forces both in the centre and in the provinces, including representatives of the tribes, clergy, intelligentsia and business circles, to participate in returning life to normal.

At the same time far from everything here depends on the Government of Afghanistan. There are external forces in that conflict, which broke out in the first place because of interference from outside, who are interested in continuing and expanding it—these are Pakistan and the USA. Western Europe can influence the course of events as well. I think that if the situation in and around Afghanistan were soberly evaluated there and, of course, if their own interests and the interest of universal peace were weighed up, the ways to assist the solution of the problem would be found.

QUESTION: Can Soviet-French relations be improved and what is to be done towards this end?

ANSWER: Of course, they can. I would even say they should. The Soviet Union stands for broad co-operation with France, for friendship between the Soviet and French peoples. The differences between the USSR and France do not at all pose any obstacles to concord and co-operation between them. This is our firm, long-term and principled position. We consider improving mutual understanding and promoting co-operation between the USSR and France to be important to furthering a fundamental interest of our countries, that of consolidating peace in Europe and throughout the world and putting the international situation right.

Giving a fresh impetus to Soviet-French relations was also the purpose of the summit meeting in Paris last autumn. It has been possible to achieve something of late. But, from our standpoint, there still remain large untapped possibilities. We would like to hope that our countries will be active partners in solving such historic problems as bridling the arms race, completely eliminating nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and preventing the development of space strike weaponry.

The Soviet Union and France with their appreciable scientific and technological and intellectual potential and with their experience of good relations could set a good example of co-

operation in science and engineering. Together with a further development of trade and economic relations it could, incidentally, in some measure help solve the problem of employment in France.

Historically, Soviet-French relations have traditionally rested on the two peoples' mutual sympathy and respect. This makes it all the more difficult for us to understand the stubborn striving by certain quarters in your country, which has made itself manifest now, to instil enmity and distrust towards the Soviet Union in the French people and create a false image of our country and its policies. We are grateful to the French Communists and the newspaper *L'Humanité* for countering anti-Sovietism and telling the truth about the Soviet Union, the truth about socialism. We see this as one of the important forms of the French Communist Party's solidarity with our Party.

The communist movement is strong for precisely such solidarity, solidarity in practice, between all parties that make it up, equal and independent parties working in different conditions and accomplishing different tasks, but united by common struggle for the interests of the working masses, for peace and socialism.

In conclusion I would like to convey heartfelt greetings and good wishes to the readers of *L'Humanité*, the French Communists and all working people of France.

As the text of the replies was handed to the French comrades, a conversation took place between Mikhail Gorbachyov and Roland Leroy, which passed in a cordial comradely atmosphere.

Leroy. I want to thank you especially for answering our questions with directness and candour. The matters you touch upon are of much interest to the French and they lack unbiased information. I must say that, regrettably, most of the French mass media are now pursuing a strongly anti-Soviet line.

Gorbachyov. As they come into contact with us, representatives of various circles of France, including the President, point out the traditionally friendly relations between us and say that they are rooted in history. In so doing, they stress the desire to maintain these relations and to impart new content to them. This is our attitude

(Continued on Page 63)

Mikhail Gorbachyov's reply to Swedish peace campaigners

STOCKHOLM, February 11, TASS:

A GROUP of activists of Swedish anti-war organisations and groups which had been set up on a professional basis visited the Embassy of the USSR in Sweden today. Their visit was made in connection with a significant event.

Boris Pankin, the Ambassador of the USSR to Sweden, acquainted the peace campaigners with a reply from Mikhail Gorbachyov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to their letter which had expressed the profound concern of the Swedish professional groups, which come out in favour of peace and against nuclear weapons, over the mounting nuclear arms race, and which had drawn special attention to the disastrous consequences which the use of nuclear weapons would bring to world civilisation.

On behalf of 21 Swedish professional groups the letter emphasised the urgent necessity of concluding a treaty on a total ban on nuclear weapons testing, a step which would represent

substantial headway on the way to the establishment of peace and security throughout the world.

During the meeting the Soviet Ambassador informed the representatives of the Swedish peace-loving public that it was with interest that Mikhail Gorbachyov had acquainted himself with the letter, and had requested to convey the following to its authors:

Removal of the threat of nuclear war is a task facing the entire population of the globe. The problem of banning nuclear arms must now be resolved thoroughly, in a fundamental way. This is why the Soviet Union proposes a concrete programme for the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere with the simultaneous establishment of an international ban on the development, testing and deployment of space strike arms. If nuclear weapons are eliminated and a universal agreement is achieved that they will not re-emerge, the material base for nuclear war will thus be destroyed.

The ending of nuclear weapon tests is the key that opens the door to a world free from the most

(Continued on Page 64)

Nikolai Ryzhkov addresses symposium in Davos

MOSCOW, February 5, TASS:

A MOSCOW—DAVOS television bridge was arranged on February 5.

The Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Nikolai Ryzhkov, used it to address the participants in the symposium held in that Swiss city by the World Economic Forum.

The programme was broadcast by Soviet radio and television as well as by Intervision and Eurovision.

Here follows the text of Nikolai Ryzhkov's statement and his answers to questions put by participants in the symposium:

The organisers of the World Economic Forum have shown interest in the subject of the Soviet leadership's attitude to the development of international economic co-operation. It appears that this choice is connected one way or another with the striving of Western business circles to expand trade and economic relations with the Soviet Union. On our part we share this striving.

As you know, the Soviet Union is a country with a plan economy. And the following should be borne in mind to understand correctly the essence of our plans in the field of external economic ties at the present stage. The acceleration of the country's social and economic development has now been made the top priority of the Soviet Union's economic strategy and this acceleration should be ensured on a qualitatively new basis—on the basis of increasing the efficiency of production and on the basis of scientific and technological progress. This, accordingly, will make itself felt in the content of our external economic ties as well.

Questions of these ties will hold a worthy place during the study of the plans of the country's social and economic development at the forthcoming 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Such extremely important documents for the life of the country and its future are going to be submitted for discussion at the congress as the drafts of the new edition of the CPSU Programme and the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986-1990 and in the Period to the Year 2000. Much attention is being given in them to the further expansion of trade, economic scientific and technical ties with other countries.

The prospects for co-operation with socialist countries have already been defined in the main. As in the past, our relations with them will rest on a long-term, plan basis. The process of deepening integration will be accelerated and we will jointly carry out a number of major economic projects. We are beginning the fulfilment of the comprehensive programme of the scientific and technological progress of member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. It encompasses the period to the year 2000.

Along with this, active co-operation with developing countries and the expansion of trade and economic relations with Western states, at least with those of them that are prepared for such co-operation on an equal and mutually advantageous basis, remains an aim of the Soviet foreign economic strategy in the forthcoming period.

Such, in brief, is the general picture.

I think, however, that it would be more correct to expand on the themes of interest to us by starting not with economic but with political issues. And not only because the atmosphere of tension that has appeared in the world creates

unfavourable conditions for the whole of international intercourse, including for business co-operation. And no matter how important this is, today the attention of the whole world is riveted to the fate of far more important values. The world has closely approached the line that one should not cross. Because this would bring with it the danger of human civilisation's destruction.

A quarter of a century ago man made his first ever appearance in outer space. Now we have started the mastering of space and pin great hopes on this. But are all the tremendous efforts in this field, the brilliant fruit of reason and, finally, the losses that have been sustained designed to serve the purpose of threatening each other with incinerating 'Star' weapons? Is it not better to give thought to ways of how the development of outer space could be made a field of international co-operation?

The Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva opened the road to a more constructive East-West dialogue. But neither can one fail to say that in this evaluation there is more hope than statement of what has already been accomplished.

In order to implement the favourable possibilities created by the meeting in Geneva the Soviet Union proposed a concrete and detailed programme for complete nuclear disarmament. It was outlined in the January 15 statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachyov.

This programme takes into consideration the wishes of many governments and public forces in the West. Within the framework of the programme and along with it the Soviet Union tabled new proposals on medium-range missiles in the European zone, on tactical nuclear arms, conventional arms, chemical weapons, confidence-building measures and effective verification, including on-site inspections. That is why the attitude of the United States and its allies to the Soviet Union's proposals will show whether they are prepared to advance along the road started in Geneva or not.

The approach to questions of international security outlined in the Soviet proposals stems from the Soviet concept of peaceful coexistence. And this concept, as is known, includes extensive economic co-operation between states irrespective of their belonging to this or that social system.

In this connection I will mention yet another new Soviet document—the memorandum of the Soviet Government on questions of international economic security.

It has a direct bearing on the theme of our discussion. For it is obvious that the striving to utilise the possibilities inherent in the development of East-West economic ties enters into a profound contradiction with all sorts of discriminations, embargoes, trade and credit restrictions that are being extensively practised today by the governments of the United States and some other Western states. All these are means of waging 'trade wars'.

They disorganise international co-operation and poison the atmosphere.

In practical terms the COCOM instructions mean that only outdated products and technologies can be sold to socialist countries. But we will never accept such a 'division of labour', so to speak. This is absolutely unacceptable in relations between sovereign states. Evidently this does not suit Western firms very well either because the lost opportunities can be very substantial.

It is a possibility that deep inside them some

politicians and maybe some representatives of the business community as well combine worship of Mercury, the god of trade, with worship of Mars, the god of war. It seems to some that the arms race is a sort of generator of growth and technological progress. In reality, however, it is such a generator that increasingly exacerbates the numerous economic and social problems of the West itself.

Not to mention the fact that it generates profound mistrust, growing tension in East-West relations and renders futile the search for a solution to the problems of developing countries.

But an alternative exists. And this alternative is to stop the arms race and to achieve disarmament, to establish large-scale economic ties between all countries: capitalist, socialist and countries that have embarked on the road of independent development. The policy of peace and detente, the growth of trust between states is conducive to external economic ties while their expansion, in turn, strengthens the material basis of detente.

We proceed from the premise that external economic ties should be advantageous not only to us but also to our partners. A similar approach is expected, naturally, on their part as well. Its essence is that healthy economic ties can be based only on principles of full equality, mutual advantage, strict observance of existing accords and non interference in internal affairs. All this is incompatible with attempts to use economic ties for purposes of putting political pressure on other countries and inflicting any damage whatsoever on them.

As to the specific problems of developing countries, their solution could be seriously helped if the vitally important requirements of these countries were taken into account in the course of the present structural reorganisation that is being conducted in the economy of the West. It can be said that this is impeded by the problem of debt. But given a more profound and fair approach to this problem it is possible to create conditions for its gradual solution.

I do not know to what extent I have succeeded, but I have tried to present to you the crux of the Soviet approach to the development of international economic relations. And within the framework of this approach we see possibilities for a considerable development of our external economic ties.

It might seem at first glance that these possibilities are not that big. Indeed, in practical terms the Soviet Union is provided with all types of natural resources. It holds first place in the world in the extraction and production of oil, gas, steel, mineral fertilisers and many other products. In the course of the past ten years our import of machinery and equipment from developed capitalist countries has not exceeded 3-4 per cent of the volume of our machine-building industry's output.

Since lately there has again been talk in some Western circles about an alleged decline in our export potential, I would like to say the following.

Major changes in the structure of the Soviet economy will be a specificity of the new, twelfth five-year-plan period. The fixed assets will be modernised and renovated. The withdrawal from operation of obsolete production assets as compared to the previous five-year-plan period will be doubled. The development of machine-building will be accelerated. The rates of scientific and technological progress will grow.

All this, along with the utilisation of my country's huge scientific, production and intellectual potential, will make it possible to accomplish major qualitative changes in the

output of modern industrial products, including those supplied to the foreign market.

So it can be said that the structural policy inherent in the draft guidelines that will be studied by our Party Congress creates additional favourable possibilities for developing Soviet foreign trade.

By the year 2000 we intend to double the country's national income. Our 12th five-year-plan period, which has just begun, holds a special place in the attainment of this aim. Very big tasks have been set along all the directions of the country's social and economic development. And, of course, in attaining them we will rely mainly on our own resources. At the same time we do not intend to overlook the possibilities of utilising mutually advantageous economic co-operation first of all in the field of scientific and technological progress.

The pace of the Soviet economy's development, its scale and our consistent course of developing international economic co-operation allow for the conclusion that the prospects of business co-operation with the Soviet Union during the new five-year-plan period can be very promising.

It is said sometimes that the differences in the organisation of the economy of our countries, the limited possibilities of using new forms of economic ties might turn out to be a stumbling block. One should not forget, however, that not only the dynamics of economic co-operation but also the experience of business ties with foreign firms shows that one can work with the Soviet Union with confidence and effectively. Besides, much work is now being done in my country to perfect the economic mechanism. Much will be done also in the field of perfecting foreign trade, making it more efficient, imparting to it promptness and flexibility. This, no doubt, will bring with it the appearance of new forms of mutually advantageous co-operation.

Now I am prepared to reply to questions.

QUESTION: The tasks set by the new five-year plan provide for a drastic growth of labour productivity. But how do you think it will be achieved? In particular, how will labour and management be stimulated, will there be changes in the system of wages, in setting prices, in the

Nikolai Ryzhkov receives Kuwait's oil minister

MOSCOW, February 7, TASS:

NIKOLAI RYZHKOV, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received in the Kremlin today Kuwait's Minister of Oil and Industry, Ali al-Khalifa al-Sabah.

It was noted with satisfaction that relations between the USSR and Kuwait are based on the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs, and the striving was expressed for the continued development of Soviet-Kuwaiti co-operation in the political, economic and cultural spheres.

Ryzhkov drew the Kuwaiti minister's attention to the Soviet programme for a total elimination of all nuclear weapons advanced by Mikhail Gorbachyov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his January 15 statement. The Kuwaiti side expressed support for the USSR's peaceful foreign policy course directed at averting a nuclear catastrophe, improving the international climate and strengthening peace.

While discussing the Middle East situation, the sides resolutely denounced Israel's expansionist course, backed by US imperialist circles and directed at imposing its military-political *diktat* on the Arabs, involving them in dangerous separate deals, burying the idea of establishing an independent Palestinian state and blocking the attainment of a fair all-embracing Middle East settlement.

The Kuwait side highly assessed the Soviet Union's invariable line towards backing the just cause of the Arabs and its principled, constructive stand on Middle East affairs. □

order of decision-making by enterprises concerning co-operation with foreign companies?

ANSWER: In the new five-year-plan period we plan a four per cent annual average increase in labour productivity. Virtually the entire increment of industrial output will be achieved by higher labour productivity. This is one of the fundamental specificities of the new five-year-plan period. In future the rates of growth of labour productivity are to grow still higher.

Now concerning ways of achieving this.

In solving this task we intend to rely first of all on our own production potential. We have drawn up an action programme specially directed at the attainment of this aim.

The renovation of the production apparatus on the basis of new equipment and progressive technologies will be the main source of the growth of labour productivity. Electronics, robots, membrane, laser and other new technologies will be used extensively in the country's economy. The number of workers engaged in manual labour requiring little skills will be reduced over the five years by 5-6 million. They will be switched to jobs requiring greater skill.

The measures to improve the economic mechanism provide for a close interconnection between the economic interest of enterprises and individual employees in rapidly switching to the output of technical advanced products and in raising labour productivity.

We count on a qualitative growth in the performance of the working class and the scientific-technical intelligentsia. They are vigorous promoters of the course of accelerating scientific and technological progress and, on this basis, of increasing labour productivity, because both workers and specialists know well that in Soviet society scientific and technological progress does not spell unemployment.

It is intended to do everything necessary for the training of workers and specialists to meet the highest demands made by scientific and technological progress.

At the same time measures are being taken to increase the moral and material interest of workers, engineers and scientists in the efficiency of their work.

We will accomplish all this within the framework of our system of plan economy. While perfecting the principle of centralism in the management of our economy we intend at the same time to further expand the economic independence of amalgamations and enterprises. This combination will enable us to make maximum use of the advantages of the socialist system of economy.

In the field of international economic ties we will also devote attention to new forms of co-operation. There will be direct production ties between Soviet enterprises and enterprises in CMEA member-states. Neither do we rule out the possibility of the establishment of close scientific-technical ties with firms and enterprises in capitalist countries.

QUESTION: Technology transfer will be a key aspect of co-operation with foreign enterprises. What is your reaction to increased restrictions and controls, for instance along the lines of COMCOM, and how could the situation be improved?

ANSWER: Speaking of our reaction, it is, as you well realise, very negative. I believe many of those present have a similar reaction. This is natural. As to the other part of your question we believe that we should speak of a mutual exchange of new technologies and other research-intensive products and not of their transfer. The view is totally groundless that the flow of technology is only in one direction, from the West to the Soviet Union, and that without outside technological assistance we would give up the fulfilment of our programmes. This is totally groundless.

The business circles in Western countries have

had the chance to see for themselves that the Soviet Union has a tremendous scientific-technical and industrial potential. There are quite a number of fields in which the USSR holds advanced positions in the world and in which other countries make extensive use of our technological developments.

The achievements of Soviet scientists and engineers create a good basis for developing mutually advantageous co-operation in many fields. The fusing of our technology with the experience of leading Western firms can lead in many instances to the development of technologies and equipment of a fundamentally new type.

Today the exchange of new technologies is becoming one of the main directions in the development of world trade and we are taking this into consideration.

So the question about how to improve the situation is definitely an important one. But this question should be addressed not to us. It should be put to those political leaders in the United States and some other Western countries who are seeking a further toughening of export controls. The reasons why such restrictions are spreading are to be found not so much in the economic sphere as in the political one.

I have already spoken about our attitude to these measures. I can only add that whenever attempts were made by way of discrimination and restrictions to impede for the Soviet Union the solution of one problem or another, such attempts invariably failed. Precisely this happened when the United States used an embargo in an attempt to block the construction of a gas pipeline in the Soviet Union. The result was just the opposite. We speeded up the construction and at the same time launched the production of equipment for gas pipelines not only for ourselves but also for deliveries to the foreign market.

As to the Soviet Union, we are doing everything to improve international relations and create conditions for their development. This is served first of all by our political initiatives directed at strengthening trust. This is served also by the practical steps taken by us to establish extensive business contacts with the West.

(Continued on Page 63)

Andrei Gromyko confers with Ferenc Karpati

MOSCOW, February 5, TASS:

ANDREI GROMYKO, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, today received in the Kremlin Colonel-General Ferenc Karpati, a member of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party Central Committee and Defence Minister of the Hungarian People's Republic, who is now on an official friendly visit in the USSR.

Andrei Gromyko and Ferenc Karpati emphasised the topicality of the statement 'For Removing the Nuclear Threat and a Turn for the Better in European and World Affairs', which was adopted at the Conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states in Sofia in October 1985.

"The set of initiatives which have been set out recently in the statement by Mikhail Gorbachyov, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and which are historic in their significance, are evidence of the USSR's unflinching intention to bridle the arms race, block the way to the militarisation of outer space and return the development of international relations onto the tracks of detente. The Hungarian People's Republic fully supports these new proposals, which meet the aspirations not only of the Hungarian and Soviet peoples, but also of the whole of humanity," Ferenc Karpati said. □

Yegor Ligachyov's speech at Cuban Party Congress

HAVANA, February 5, TASS:

THE THIRD CONGRESS of the Communist Party of Cuba is being held in the Havana Palace of Congresses in a business-like, constructive atmosphere. Its delegates have started discussing the report which was delivered on the first day of the congress by Fidel Castro, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba and Chairman of the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the republic. Addressing the congress, the delegates speak with pride of the big and undeniable achievements of the Cuban people, who under the leadership of the Communist Party are confidently solving the tasks of socialist construction.

Foreign guests have also been addressing the Congress. The speech by the head of the CPSU delegation, Yegor Ligachyov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was received with stormy applause. Here follows the full text of his speech:

First of all permit me on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on behalf of all Soviet Communists, to extend most heartfelt greetings to your Party Congress. The country of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the homeland of the October Revolution, sends

Meetings with Ethiopian Workers' Party delegation

MOSCOW, February 5, TASS:

GEIDAR ALIYEV, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Boris Ponomarev, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had meetings on Monday and today (Wednesday) with a visiting delegation from the Ethiopian Workers' Party.

The delegation handed over a message from Mengistu Haile Mariam, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Ethiopian Workers' Party, Chairman of the Provisional Military Administrative Council, to Mikhail Gorbachyov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The meetings' participants noted with satisfaction the successful development and fruitful character of the friendly co-operation between the CPSU and the Ethiopian Workers' Party, between the Soviet Union and Socialist Ethiopia, and came out in favour of its further expansion. The Ethiopian delegation stated Socialist Ethiopia's full support for the Soviet Union's latest peace initiatives advanced in Mikhail Gorbachyov's statement of January 15, 1986.

The discussion of topical problems of the present-day international situation, including in the Middle East, in southern Africa, in the Indian Ocean, in the Persian Gulf and other regions, reaffirmed the community of views and mutual understanding by which Soviet-Ethiopian relations are invariably characterised.

During an exchange of views on questions related to the situation in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the importance of the earliest normalisation of the situation in that country and the inadmissibility of any outside interference in its internal affairs was emphasised. □

its fraternal greetings to the Island of Freedom.

It is with much attention and friendly interest that we listened to Comrade Fidel Castro's report to the highest forum of Cuban Communists. His report is a major political document and the implementation of its provisions will serve the cause of the Cuban Revolution, the cause of socialism.

The high prestige enjoyed by socialist Cuba among the peoples of Latin America and the whole world is the strongest evidence that the Cuban Communists, all working people of your remarkable country are coping with honour with the tasks in the name of which the victorious Cuban Revolution was accomplished 27 years ago.

During one of his conversations with Cuban comrades Mikhail Gorbachyov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed: "You had to begin virtually from scratch. While now Cuba has a planned economy, an excellent system of education, a streamlined system of state bodies and a militant Marxist-Leninist party. Cuban society is a mature society."

Your example has shown the whole world that even a small people, on throwing off the fetters of imperialist oppression and relying on the fraternal assistance of socialist countries, of all progressive forces, is capable of defending its independence, the sacred right to shape its destiny itself, without outside interference.

Cuba has demonstrated that the most acute social problems can be successfully solved, even in a country that is not rich in resources, if its development is subordinated to the interests of the working people and is inspired by the idea of justice.

Cuba is the first state in the Americas where working people rule, where citizens are guaranteed the right to work, to rest and leisure, where access to culture, to a worthy and free life is open to all.

At the same time, listening to the speeches at this congress, we note with satisfaction that Cuban Communists are not resting on their laurels. They view all the accomplishments of people's power first of all as the basis for further work, and speak with openness both about successes and about the shortcomings and problems that are still awaiting solution. This approach is close and understandable to us, Soviet Communists. It fully accords with the behests of Marx and Lenin who insisted that a revolutionary party is duty bound to approach its entire activity critically. This enables it to avoid stagnation and routine, to move constantly onward.

The economy, as is known, is of key importance for the development of every socialist country. The socialist system opens new prospects for raising the material and cultural standard of the life of people, prospects that are beyond the reach of the former economic formations. An effective use of socialism's huge economic potential can be made only if the Communist Party successfully plays its guiding role in society. The Third Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba convincingly shows that you have a realistic economic strategy, and we wish the Cuban Communists success in implementing it.

The development of socialist economic integration and participation in the work of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance offer important reserves of the social and economic

development of each socialist country. For many years now my country has been Cuba's biggest economic partner. During the past five-year period Soviet-Cuban trade turnover approached the quite impressive figure of 34 billion roubles. Our economic ties will become even broader during the current five-year period.

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee I want to state with all responsibility that we have fulfilled and will fulfil meticulously and undeviatingly our commitment to Cuba. You can rely on the Soviet Union.

And now, comrades, permit me to inform you briefly about the present-day life of the Soviet people.

Not so long ago the world marked the 40th anniversary of victory over fascism. During the past world war Soviet people, guided by the Communist Party, displayed unprecedented heroism and made the decisive contribution to the rout of the Hitlerite invaders who wanted to enslave the whole of mankind. In the post-war years, in conditions of the arms race launched by the imperialists, we had to divert considerable resources to defend the socialist gains and uphold peace. Judge for yourselves, comrades. But even in that situation, a situation that frankly is not conducive to peaceful construction, my country advanced far along the road of all-round progress. The national income in the USSR has grown almost four-fold during the past 25 years. Socialist democracy has been further developed and socialist law and order have been strengthened. It is impossible to underestimate the fact that we have succeeded in preserving peace during the past decade. We regard as a historic accomplishment the strategic military parity that has been established between the Soviet Union and the United States.

As you know, comrades, the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will soon be convened in Moscow. With what are we approaching the Congress? What is characteristic of the political atmosphere in my country?

What matters most, I believe, is the strengthening unity of the Party and the people, the spirited, enthusiastic mood of the working masses, the intensive, imaginative work of labour collectives, of all Party organisations to fulfil the plans for the country's social and economic progress and of qualitatively renovating all aspects of society's life.

Soviet society's economic, scientific and spiritual potential has grown substantially during the past five-year-plan period, in the years between the 26th and 27th Party Congresses.

Yet I will tell you frankly that not everything went smoothly. The process of intensifying production was implemented slowly and lagged behind the planned schedule. Neither could we be satisfied with the rates of economic growth and the state of discipline. Weaknesses in the style and methods of Party and state work had surfaced. The solution of a number of ripe problems was drawn out and the study of pressing issues was put off for 'afterwards'. In short, we could not lull ourselves with achievements, we had no right to do that.

A barrier to these negative trends was put up by the April 1985 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. It worked out a concept of accelerating the country's social and economic development on the basis of scientific and technological progress and the broad initiative of working people; it formulated the Party's truly innovative and, I would say, non-standard approaches to the solution of key questions of home and foreign policy. This strategic course was made the bedrock of the pre-congress

(Continued on Page 64)

PRAVDA EDITORIAL:

Reagan's State of the Union Address

MOSCOW, February 7, TASS: The newspaper Pravda today published an editorial commenting on the US President's State of the Union Address. The editorial says:

UNITED STATES President Ronald Reagan made his State of the Union Address to Congress on February 4. According to tradition the statement was planned for late January but was postponed due to the *Challenger* crash.

The State of the Union Address is a traditional analysis of the state of affairs in the United States and on the world arena, a review of the state's foreign and domestic policy. Proposing to speak "about our deepest longing for the future—to leave our children a land that is free and just in a world at peace," Reagan declared: "It is my hope that our fireside summit in Geneva and Mr Gorbachyov's upcoming visit to America can lead to a more stable relationship." He said that the American people hate war and are longing for peace.

In the following paragraph, however, the President noted the existence of "deep and abiding differences" with the Soviet Union, repeating the set of trite anti-Soviet stereotypes, and returning, in fact, to the discredited, bankrupt ideas of a 'crusade' against socialism. Yet another claim about "the threat from Soviet forces, conventional and strategic, from the Soviet drive for domination" was a tribute to the outdated mode of thinking of the times of the cold war.

The reality is such, however, that the American leader needed the false, totally groundless accusations against the Soviet Union in order to provide a propaganda justification for the course towards a further unrestricted escalation of the arms race (allocations for specific military programmes, above all the modernisation of strategic strike forces in the new financial year, are planned to grow by 12 per cent, and by 42 per cent before 1991). One of the chief theses of the address is that America should and will arm itself, and that its course is the position-of-strength policy. In other words, the United States intends following the path which has already led mankind to an unprecedented arms race, to great disasters.

"Never has there been a more exciting time to be alive—a time of rousing wonder and heroic achievement," the US head of state said in his address. "Today, physicists peering into the infinitely small realms of sub-atomic particles . . . astronomers build a space telescope that can see to the edge of the universe and, possibly, back to the moment of creation."

But it is the 'Star Wars' programme, which the President praised with enthusiasm in his address, that is a real step towards a catastrophe. The "security shield", as Reagan describes the 'Strategic Defense Initiative' in his address, is, above all, a 'nuclear sword', a 'super-weapon' of the Pentagon which banks on achieving military superiority over the USSR by deploying strike weapons in outer space. As a matter of fact, in Washington they do not conceal that they have not abandoned the claims to victory in a nuclear conflict, endorsed in the programme for the 1984-1988 financial years.

In the State of the Union Address, Reagan mentions only in passing the major issue—the Soviet-American talks on the vital problem of our time, that of ridding mankind of the threat of nuclear annihilation. The head of the White House does not even mention the accord, endorsed in the joint Soviet-American statement in Geneva, obliging the two sides to seek to attain the historic goal of preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on Earth, limiting and reducing nuclear armaments and strengthening strategic stability.

The US President deliberately avoids even mentioning in his State of the Union message the Soviet proposals advanced in Mikhail Gorbachov's January 15 statement, which sets out a concrete stage-by-stage programme for a total elimination of nuclear weapons in the world, a programme of implementing the accords that emerged as a result of the Geneva summit meeting.

The State of the Union Address is permeated from beginning to end with demagogic rhetoric. The President calls, "go forward America, reach for the stars", speaks about "a rising America—firm of heart, united in spirit"; he insists, nearly incantations, "America believes, America is ready, America can win the race to the future—and we shall", and so forth and so on.

But this rhetoric is called upon just to camouflage the tough fact of US reality—the inability of the authorities to rid the country of the unprecedented deficit in the federal budget, which will be paid by America's working people, and the fact that the social programmes, substantially curtailed as they are, will be subjected to further deep cuts. The President actually accused the millions of 'welfare' Americans of "dependency", he did not conceal his contempt towards the problems that worry millions of people in the United States. The militarist budget, however, the rapid growth of which has become the chief reason why America does not "live within its means", which the President acknowledged and which follows from the address, will not only be left intact but will continue to grow.

The US President failed to mention that it is under his administration that out of each dollar deducted from Americans as federal income tax, 51 per cent is spent to pay for the militarist programmes. Allocations for the 'Star Wars' programme will grow by 75 per cent in the new financial year. Expenditures on the first stages in the implementation of the programme, first fixed at 26 billion dollars, are now estimated at about 50 billion.

This is the major cause of the deprivations and hardships besetting millions upon millions of Americans, referring to whom the President observes, gabbling away, that the "government must provide shelter and nourishment for those who cannot provide for themselves." The assurances of economic "achievements", that "family and community remain the moral core of our society, guardians of our values and hopes for the future", that "family and community are the co-stars of this great American comeback", tally badly with the forced admissions, contained in the State of the Union Address, that US society is being eroded by social evils—"the breakdown of the family . . . has reached crisis proportions—in female and child poverty, child abandonment, horrible crimes and deteriorating schools."

The resounding phrases in the address about the "flourishing" America and "new jobs" are refuted by the real statistics provided by American labour unions: today, about 15 million Americans are denied the right to work. And, as the head of the American Administration says in his address, "how often we read of a husband and wife—both working, struggling from paycheck to paycheck to raise a family, meet a mortgage, pay their taxes and bills." The President is compelled to admit that "the plight of the poor grows more painful." This is only a small part of the truth. The message does not reveal that, according to the labour unions, up to 40 per cent of the US population live in poverty or on the brink of it, that it is under this presidency that one out of four children in the richest capitalist country goes to

bed hungry, and that more children died from poverty in that country during the past five years than the number of American casualties during the years of the 'dirty war' in Indochina.

The State of the Union Address unequivocally promises the US people and the world new 'dirty wars'. The President says, "we must prepare for peace . . . by bolstering . . . liberty and democracy however and wherever we can." At that, the statement by the head of the administration categorically affirms that "the world's hopes rest with America's future." The message advertises the 'new globalism' of the United States whose orientation is frankly defined—Afghanistan, Angola, Kampuchea and Nicaragua. Preparing an assault on Nicaragua is advanced as one of Washington's top-priority tasks. Destroyed schoolhouses, murdered women and children, burnt crops—by American hirelings and with American money—this is the practical implementation of the policy for today and the years to come, set forth with such fervour.

The section dealing with foreign economic matters is not free of declarative statements either. The United States will redouble its "efforts for freer and fairer trade"—this is what was said. In fact, however, it is Washington which made boycotts, embargoes, and economic blockade a norm of its daily policy with regard to other states.

Ronald Reagan's calls for free trade, just as his assurances about the striving for peace, would be perceived with trust only if they were backed by concrete deeds. A constructive response to the Soviet peace proposals, advanced in Mikhail Gorbachyov's statement of January 15, placing before mankind the historic task of eliminating all nuclear weapons throughout the world by the year 2000 in the condition of the non-militarisation of outer space, would be a tangible proof of these assurances. This would constitute a true guarantee of security for all peoples.

The address by the US President on the State of the Union was apparently devised as a blueprint through to the year 2000 in domestic and foreign policy. In fact, it was a manifestation of the rapacious, egoistic ideology of the most conservative, right-wing groupings in the country. The US President concludes his message with the words "so let us go forward to create our world of tomorrow—in faith, in unity, and in love." In reality, it is hard to find in that document anything but the building up of fear, hostility and hatred under the disguise of high-sounding and fanciful phrases. □

On Soviet foreign policy

The following booklets are available at the prices indicated:

- The Soviet delegation at the 40th UN General Assembly Session (includes proposals and draft resolution from USSR on peaceful use of space) .40p
- East-West Business Ties: two approaches40p
- Soviet foreign policy: questions and answers50p

Please tick the appropriate box(es) and send cheque/PO to: Soviet Booklets (SN), 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW.

Name

Address

Consultations on nuclear-free zone in South Pacific

MOSCOW, February 4, TASS:

CONSULTATIONS with a delegation of the South Pacific Forum on questions of a treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific and protocols to it were held in the USSR Foreign Ministry on February 3-4.

The Soviet side explained the concept of a nuclear-free world advanced in the statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachyov, on January 15. It was stressed that the implementation of the programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere with the prevention of the emergence of space strike arms would lead to a radical improvement in the international situation on a long-term and stable basis. Attention was also called to the Soviet Union's decision to extend till March 31 its earlier-announced unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions.

Thus, a favourable opportunity has been created to stop nuclear tests and to advance without delay to the conclusion of an international treaty on a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests.

The delegation of the South Pacific Forum highly assessed the complex of important initiatives set out in Mikhail Gorbachyov's statement, which evoked much interest from countries of the South Pacific region. The delegation welcomed the extension of the Soviet unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions and noted that the countries of the South Pacific Forum firmly declared for a complete cessation of nuclear tests by all nuclear states.

The Soviet side noted that the USSR viewed the creation of nuclear-free zones in various areas of the world as an important measure in the struggle to narrow the sphere of nuclear preparations. In its attitude to nuclear-free zones the Soviet Union does not make exception for any states, be they participants or non-participants in military alliances: if some or other country renounces the acquisition of nuclear weapons and does not have them on its territory, it gets firm and effective guarantees from the USSR. Proceeding from this principled stand, the Soviet Union has expressed from the outset its possible attitude to the efforts of the states of the South Pacific to create a nuclear-free zone.

During the consultations the Soviet side said that the establishment of a zone free from nuclear weapons in the South Pacific was an important contribution to fashioning a reliable security system in Asia and the Pacific, narrowed the geographical bounds of the spread of nuclear weapons and facilitated the fulfilment of the task of doing away with nuclear weapons on Earth once and for all and preventing an arms race in space. The treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific together with the protocols to it in their present form basically correspond to the criteria suggested by the Soviet Union for nuclear-free zones.

It was noted with satisfaction that the treaty provided for a commitment to support efforts to preserve the effectiveness of the international regime for the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, based on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the safeguards systems of the International Atomic Energy Agency. At the same time the Soviet side pointed out the importance of making certain that the agreement

creating the nuclear-free zone really ensured that the territories of the signatory states became a zone completely free from nuclear weapons. This presupposes, in particular, a ban on the transit through the nuclear-free zone's territory of nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices, including visits to ports and air fields there by foreign warships and aircraft with nuclear weapons aboard. The delegation from the South Pacific Forum was also told of a number of other considerations and was asked questions concerning individual provisions of the treaty and the accompanying protocols.

The delegation from the South Pacific Forum expressed gratitude for the Soviet Union's support for the decisions taken by the SPF countries to declare the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone, took note of the considerations voiced by the Soviet side and gave corresponding explanations.

The consultations involved on the Soviet side: V F Petrovsky, a member of the Collegium of the Foreign Ministry of the USSR; other senior officials from the Foreign Ministry of the USSR; a representative of the Defence Ministry of the USSR; and on the side of the South Pacific Forum: SPF delegation leader David Saldier of Australia; Christopher Beeby of New Zealand; Gracie Fong of Fiji; Joseph Gabut of Papua New Guinea; Levi Laka of the Solomon Islands; Anthony Manaranji of Cook Island; also Allison Stokes, Ambassador of New Zealand to the USSR, and Robert Tyson, Chargé d'Affaires Ad Interim of Australia to the USSR.

The members of the SPF delegation were received by Mikhail Kapitsa, a Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR, who had a conversation with them on issues of mutual interest. □

TASS statement on 'Team Spirit-86'

THE decision of the Washington Administration and the South Korean authorities has been announced in Seoul to hold joint military exercises, code-named 'Team Spirit-86', in South Korea from February 10 this year. More than 200 thousand servicemen of the Seoul Army and of the United States troops will take part in these large-scale exercises, which are to last till mid-April this year. It is planned to use a large number of aircraft, ships and other latest weapons including nuclear-powered submarines.

The US-South Korean 'Team Spirit-86' exercises create a direct threat to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, aggravated by the fact that considerable reserves of US nuclear weapons are stockpiled in the south of the Korean peninsula.

The people and the Government of the DPRK are determined to work for detente and reducing the level of military confrontation in Korea's territory, thus ensuring conditions for a peaceful democratic reunification of their homeland. The DPRK Government has recently put forward a proposal that no big military exercises be held on the Korean peninsula or around it.

This proposal, supported by many countries, is designed to contribute to a considerable lessening of tensions and strengthening of security in the far eastern region and the Asian continent as a whole. At the same time, it contains

a just warning that it is impossible to continue north-south talks if Washington and Seoul do not give up holding military exercises in the south of the peninsula.

The Soviet Union resolutely condemns the provocative military games of the American and South Korean military in the south of the Korean peninsula, which undermine the fundamentals of security in the Asian-Pacific region and are fraught with a threat to the DPRK and other peaceable states and universal peace.

It is also noteworthy that these demonstrative military actions are held in close proximity to the Soviet Far Eastern borders and concern the security interests of the USSR.

It is hoped in the USSR that the United States and its partners will be able to evaluate realistically the serious consequences of the further build-up of the atmosphere of military hysteria in the south of the Korean peninsula, heed the voice of the peaceful forces and give up the attempts at blackmailing anybody by the demonstration of military power. Humanity feels increasingly in favour of detente, disarmament, and the total elimination within this century of nuclear and chemical weapons. An essential step on the way towards achieving that global aim could be the implementation of the DPRK's proposal on the withdrawal of all types of nuclear weapons from South Korea and the turning of the Korean peninsula into a zone of peace, a nuclear-free zone. It is precisely such an approach that would accord with the interests of a practical consolidation of the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, and would contribute to a general improvement of the international situation. □

STATEMENT BY ANTI-ZIONIST COMMITTEE

MOSCOW, February 5, TASS:

THE Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public has expressed its resolute protest "against the arbitrariness of the Israeli occupation authorities which connive at inhuman actions—the desecration of Al-Aqsa Mosque and other Islamic shrines", and demanded an end to such actions.

"Al-Aqsa Mosque, a Moslem shrine in Israeli-occupied East Jerusalem, was desecrated recently yet again," says the organisation's statement. About twenty members of the Israeli Knesset (Parliament), members of the Internal Affairs Commission, entered the mosque area with apparently provocative intentions. After the Moslems evicted the uninvited visitors, an Israeli police unit swooped down on the believers and civilian guards at the mosque.

"The desecration of the mosque is not accidental," the statement points out. "Increasingly more attempts are being undertaken both in the occupied Arab territories and in Israel itself to damage Islamic shrines. This cannot be viewed otherwise than as a result of the mounting wave of fascism embodied in the racist movement of Rabbi Kahane. He sticks to an openly inhuman slogan of expelling all Arabs from the West Bank of the Jordan and other Arab territories occupied by Israel in 1967."

"By conniving with the fascist-tinged thugs from the Kahane Movement and giving the green light to the desecrators of Al-Aqsa Mosque, the Israeli Government assumes the gravest responsibility for the incident for which there is no justification, and nor can there be." □

MIKHAIL GORBACHYOV REPLIES TO L'HUMANITÉ

(Continued from Page 57)

as well. We stand for maintaining the traditionally friendly contacts with France and are doing whatever we can to develop good Soviet-French relations. In this context we find it hard to understand why a campaign of hostility towards the USSR has grown to such large proportions in France.

Or take, for instance, such a recent fact as the expulsion from France of several officials of the Soviet Embassy under the pretext that they had been engaged in activities incompatible with their status. The spectre of 'Soviet spies' is again haunting France. Of course, this is a totally groundless action taken under a far-fetched

pretext. Suffice it to say, for instance, that one of those charged with "unauthorised contacts" is a technician who worked exclusively on the Embassy premises, had no contact with foreigners and even does not speak any foreign language. All this is really puzzling. What political scheme is there behind all this? What are the reasons, domestic politics or something else?

As I said in conversation with President Mitterrand, we are sincerely striving really to impart a greater dynamism to Soviet-French relations, to co-operate with France, with the French people and with their political forces, on questions of mutual interest. But this does not mean that we will not respond to unfriendly

actions towards our country. So in this case, too, we had to take adequate measures in response.

It would be wrong to think that the Soviet Union has a greater stake in good relations with France than France has in good relations with the Soviet Union. To my mind, both countries have a mutual interest in maintaining and developing good bilateral relations.

Leroy. Obviously, the people of France have a special interest in rapprochement and co-operation with the Soviet Union.

Gorbachyov. In pursuing our foreign policy, we always reckon with the interests of France and its people. This is also evident in our latest proposals, formulated in my statement of January 15 this year.

Incidentally, in formulating our proposals, we think it natural to reckon with the legitimate interests of not only France but also, say, of such a partner of ours as the United States. Otherwise such proposals would not be realistic.

I told President Mitterrand in conversations with him and want to repeat now that we do not have the slightest intention of doing damage to the security of France. We proceed in our latest proposals from the assumption that France, like Britain, will join in the process of nuclear disarmament only after the United States and the Soviet Union have carried out substantial cuts in their nuclear armaments. At present we would like to hope that France and Britain will not continue to build up their nuclear potentials at the time when the American and Soviet arms arsenals are being reduced.

Leroy. We follow with interest preparations for the 27th Congress of your Party.

Gorbachyov. We will demonstrate in detail at our Congress how the opportunities offered by socialism are going to be used to a fuller extent in our country and how its potentialities are going to be realised. I think it will be our contribution to the common struggle of the Communists for a better and fairer society. In foreign policy we will continue to work energetically for a stronger peace and for the elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. This, of course, is also very important in a sense that it characterises the firm commitment of socialism to the cause of peace. □

TASS statement on Israeli air piracy

ON February 4 Israel staged a new blatant act of state terrorism. Its military aviation intercepted in international air space a Libyan passenger plane on a flight to Damascus and forced it to land in the north of Israel. Passengers of the plane were then subjected to a humiliating search.

Such actions of Tel Aviv are nothing less than air piracy, a cynical encroachment on the elementary norms of international law, the principles of freedom and safety of international air travel enshrined in the relevant inter-state conventions to which, by the way, Israel is a party.

Facts demonstrate that banditry with respect to civil aviation has become something habitual for Tel Aviv—once before the Israeli air force downed a Libyan civilian plane, on another occasion it intercepted an aircraft of the Lebanese airline and forced it to land on Israeli territory. Although those actions have been resolutely condemned the world over, Israel is clearly unwilling to draw the appropriate conclusions from that.

Israel's bandit-like actions are explained away

by the hypocritical pretext of 'fight on terrorism'. However, the true cause of the vicious circle of violence, in which the Middle East has been plunged for over several decades now, is the banditry and terror practised by Israel as state policy. The latest criminal action of the Israeli military is fraught with fresh complications in the situation in that region, explosive as it is.

Licentiousness and the cult of force, flaunted by the Israeli leaders, are explained first and foremost by the connivance of those who stand behind Tel Aviv's flagrantly anti-Arab line. What strikes the eye is that the act of piracy against the Libyan civilian plane was perpetrated after the USA had blocked UN Security Council resolutions which denounced Israel's aggressive policy towards Lebanon and in the Israeli-occupied lands.

The Soviet Union strongly denounces the terrorist action of Tel Aviv, which is at odds with the basic norms of international relations. An end must be put to acts of piracy. The time has come for the UN Security Council to act in accordance with its mandate under the UN Charter to take effective measures to put an end to Israeli crimes, which constitute an immediate threat to peace and security in the Middle East and elsewhere. □

NIKOLAI RYZHKOV ADDRESSES SYMPOSIUM IN DAVOS

(Continued from Page 59)

QUESTION: The invigoration of the economy in the USSR will require the mobilisation of big financial resources. Will these resources be obtained by redistributing means between branches of the economy or by attracting means from abroad?

ANSWER: Just as in the past the Soviet Union will continue relying on internal financial sources of growth. Their scope is sufficient for ensuring an accelerated social and economic development of the country. In the new five-year plan period it is intended to increase capital investments in the national economy by about 20 per cent as compared to the previous five-year period.

The economic strategy formulated by our Party provides for a substantial internal redistribution in the overall volume of capital investments directed at production aims. Firstly, there will be a considerable rise in the share of funds directed at the retooling of existing enterprises. This will take place in all industries and help raise the efficiency of social production. Secondly, there will be a rise in the share of capital investments to develop machine-building, first of all its basic branches.

There will also be a substantial growth of investments in the other branches of the economy

that directly influence the acceleration of scientific and technological progress.

At the same time we will not be against drawing Western firms or credits into the fulfilment of our investment projects. The countries and firms that will be ready to base their economic relations with the USSR on mutual advantage and equality will always find in the Soviet Union a reliable and serious partner in trade and economic co-operation.

QUESTION: What advice would the Prime Minister give to the chief executive of a foreign enterprise that would like to establish or expand business co-operation with your country in 1986?

ANSWER: The Soviet market does not make any unusual demands. This can be confirmed by many foreign companies that have been maintaining business ties with Soviet organisations for decades. Just as for any other country, it is important for us that the wares offered to us be of a good quality and that the prices and other terms of contracts be fair. And of course the mutual relations should be proper in everything.

Western firms do not encounter any difficulties in establishing contacts with Soviet organisations and familiarising themselves with the Soviet market. Those who are interested in this will find it easy to obtain the necessary information at Soviet trade missions. We have these virtually in

all the countries of the world.

It would be advisable now to make a closer study of the directions of our development in the five-year plan period that has just begun. This will help you form a correct picture of the Soviet market's requirements.

Another piece of advice would be to pay more attention to questions of the participation of Western firms in the reconstruction and modernisation of Soviet enterprises. As I have already said, this is an important direction in the new five-year plan period. Of course, this requires a more thorough discussion of such matters with Soviet partners—from foreign trade organisations to industrial enterprises. Conditions for this exist.

In my country there is a well-wishing attitude to businessmen who come to us with concrete proposals. For instance, about 500 representatives of American business came to Moscow to attend the latest meeting of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council. Madame Cresson, Minister of Industrial Reconstruction and Foreign Trade of France, came to us accompanied by a representative group of managers of firms and specialists.

Soviet organisations are prepared to establish new contacts with firms from any country—both big and small. □

MIKHAIL GORBACHYOV'S REPLY TO SWEDISH PEACE CAMPAIGNERS

(Continued from Page 57)

horrible weapons of mass destruction, for without tests the arsenals of nuclear weapons will not be upgraded and will soon start deactivating. The time factor is very important in this now, as in no other matter. The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions has been in effect for over six months now. The participants in the 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly and millions of people the world over welcomed that step of the Soviet Union as a bold undertaking, a good example for practical transition to the ending of nuclear tests everywhere and by all nuclear powers, starting, naturally, with the USSR and the USA.

The turning of the moratorium into a bilateral, Soviet-American one would mean implementing the arrangements reached during the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachyov and President Ronald Reagan. The Soviet Union cannot endlessly show unilateral restraint in the matter, particularly in conditions when the United States, which has undertaken a much greater number of nuclear explosions than the USSR as it is, continues undertaking them even after the Soviet Union disrupted its programme of nuclear testing. The present situation requires insistently that representatives of the USSR, the USA, and Great Britain get down to the negotiating table to conclude the tripartite talks disrupted by Washington, that is, talks to draft the next treaty on a total ban on nuclear tests in all media. The Soviet Union is also prepared to

(Continued from Page 60)

documents: the new edition of the Party Programme, changes in the CPSU Rules, the Guidelines for the Social and Economic Development of the USSR to the end of this Century. I would like to stress that all our plans, prospects and targets rest on our society's achievements in all the years of Soviet government, on what has been accomplished by generations of Soviet people. The work to fulfil the current CPSU programme, adopted in 1961, was also of much importance in this respect.

In order to fulfil the plans mapped out by the Party it is necessary to switch the entire economy to the path of intensification within a short period of time. The measures taken by our Party are subordinated to this aim: the restructuring of planning and management, the cadres policy, the strengthening of discipline and the development of the initiative of working people.

In its work the Party attaches much importance to scientific and technological progress. The shortest road by which socialist countries are to reach the peaks of science and technology was outlined in the comprehensive programme of scientific and technological co-operation in the period to the year 2000, which was recently adopted by the CMEA countries. The Soviet Union will take part in the fulfilment of this programme with all its resources. And here we firmly intend to abide by the rule: our achievements must be available to our friends.

In the years that have passed, the Soviet Union, Cuba and other socialist countries had to solve their creative tasks in a complex, one could even say very tense international atmosphere that originated through the fault of reactionary imperialist forces. In that situation the countries of the socialist community pursued a firm and constructive course that accorded with the interests of all peoples. The concerted efforts of the peace forces did not fail to produce results. The summit meeting in Geneva was a major event in international life. Although the cardinal question of stopping the arms race on Earth and preventing it in outer space was not resolved at the meeting, the joint statement of the leaders of the two world powers that nuclear war should never be unleashed and that neither side will

embark on such talks in the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament in which all the five nuclear powers would take part.

People in the USSR share the view held by the Swedish professional groups that reliable means already exist today to ensure verification of the termination of nuclear tests. At the same time, in order to remove all grounds for the allegations on the existing difficulties of verification, the USSR agrees to employing, along with national technical means, international procedures—including on-site inspections whenever necessary. The USSR has expressed, in particular, its readiness to make use of the proposal by the leaders of six states of various continents, including Sweden, to set up in their territories special stations to monitor the fulfilment of the accord on halting nuclear tests. In a word, verification cannot be an obstacle to the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapon tests.

The anti-war and anti-nuclear movements and organisations are called upon to play a major role in mobilising public opinion against the nuclear arms race and for a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests.

"Mikhail Gorbachyov," the Soviet Ambassador said, "wishes the participants in the Swedish professional groups great success in their noble activity for the benefit of peace and disarmament."

The activists of the Swedish groups, uniting physicians, engineers, lawyers, scientists,

journalists, actors, writers and representatives of other professions, expressed gratitude and deep satisfaction with the fact that the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachyov, had responded to their letter. They stressed that the content of the response by the Soviet leader coincided in many respects with those thoughts and views by which the Swedish professional groups were guided in their activity.

They expressed the conviction that, despite the complex international situation, there existed opportunities for preventing nuclear war. In this connection the representatives of the public emphasised the special importance of Mikhail Gorbachyov's statement dated January 15, this year. The document, which contains a programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons before the year 2000 and other peaceful initiatives, accorded with the aspirations and interests of all the peoples and therefore was highly appreciated in all countries of the world, including Sweden. They pointed out that Mikhail Gorbachyov's reply to their letter was yet another convincing illustration that the USSR highly values the movement of the peace and anti-war forces of various states, including the activities of Swedish professional groups.

During the conversation the activists said that they had sent similar letters to the leaders of the other nuclear powers from whom they likewise hoped to get replies. □

strive to achieve military superiority is of great importance.

I must say with regret that the American Administration is continuing to intensify its efforts to fulfil the aggressive plans of the so-called 'Star Wars'. The politicians in Washington, who talk so much about a clear sky for mankind, in reality want to literally cram the sky over our Earth with offensive arms.

Washington's actions in respect of regional conflicts are acquiring an increasingly dangerous, risky nature. The United States arbitrarily interferes in the internal affairs of sovereign states, builds up its direct and indirect military presence there. Yesterday the United States tried to deprive Vietnam of freedom and carried out an intervention against Grenada, while today it wants to stifle Nicaragua, it co-operates with the apartheid regime in South Africa, encouraging it to make military sallies against its neighbours, sustains tension around Afghanistan and threatens sovereign Libya.

It is against the nature of socialist countries to want to appear in the role of unmasked or benefactors of other countries. It is our belief that every people has the right to choose its own road of development. But we have never been indifferent to the plight of others nor will we ever be.

Soviet people have been and remain loyal to the principles of internationalism. We solidarise with the peoples of Nicaragua, Angola and other countries upholding their independence in the struggle against imperialist aggression. The Soviet people, just as all those who cherish the cause of freedom and independence, pay tribute to the internationalism of our Cuban brothers who are helping the working people of many countries in arranging and conducting their matters as they themselves see fit.

The Soviet Union's sympathies are entirely on the side of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America which for various reasons, primarily because of plunder by colonialism and neo-colonialism, have lagged in their economic development and are now trying to overcome this lag.

The question of war and peace is the main, fundamental problem of our time. The Soviet

Union holds that inter-state relations should be strictly based on the principle of peaceful coexistence, on unconditional respect for the security interests of all states—big, medium and small. This historic task is served by the comprehensive Soviet plan of peace and disarmament set forth in the statement by Comrade Mikhail Gorbachyov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. To approach by the year 2000 a world free of nuclear, chemical and all other types of weapons of mass annihilation, to rid mankind of the constant fear of its future, to switch to peaceful, needs the tremendous resources that are now being squandered on the arms race—such is the noble, truly humane aim of these new Soviet initiatives.

Being guided by the interests of improving international relations, the Soviet Union extended to March 31 the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests that we introduced in August of last year. To this day the American Administration has not responded to this example of political will. The time for words is passing. The world expects actions.

Practical measures to stop the arms race would create new opportunities for overcoming the economic backwardness of Asian, African and Latin American countries. We vigorously support Cuba's principled statements against the fettering of developing countries by the usury capital of the United States, other imperialist countries and transnational corporations. This is a new channel of international plunder, one could call it 'financial colonialism'. The Soviet Union resolutely comes out for restructuring international relations on just principles.

The Cuban Revolution raised the banner of socialism in the western hemisphere. You have confidently carried this banner through all trials. We are convinced that the decision of the Third Congress of Cuban Communists will open broad new prospects before the country. In your noble struggle for the bright future of your country you can count, as always, on the Soviet people's fraternal support.

Long live the Communist Party of Cuba!

Long live the cause of peace and social progress! □