

## Mikhail Gorbachev presents the Order of Lenin to Murmansk

*Here follows the speech made by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at a meeting in Murmansk on October 1 on the occasion of the presentation to the city of the Order of Lenin and the "Gold Star" medal:*

MURMANSK is as old as the October Revolution. Murmansk's glorious history is a bright mirror reflection of the destiny of our country. Soviet power was proclaimed here on the second day after the armed uprising in Petrograd. Today, recalling those days, we admire the heroism and selflessness displayed by the working people in the extreme north in those legendary days, those legendary years.

At a hard time during the Civil war when the very existence of the Soviet Republic was at stake, Murmansk's workers together with revolutionary soldiers and seamen intrepidly fought against interventionists and white guards. They prevented the transformation of the Kola peninsula into a staging area for an offensive on red Petrograd.

Large-scale construction in keeping with industrialisation plans began in the years of the first five-year plans.

The Great Patriotic War was a stern test for city residents as it was for all Soviet people. The defence of the Soviet Arctic lasted 40 months. The plans of the German fascist command to seize Murmansk failed. The city not only held out, it paralysed the enemy's strike forces and steadfastly and securely defended the state border.

Communists and Komsomol members were the first to have taken up arms. Troops of the Karelian Front (which included the "Polar Division", set up in Murmansk) played a decisive role in defeating the Alpine regiments of the fascists on the Bolshaya Zapadnaya Litsa River. Marines and guerilla units carried out devastating raids behind the enemy lines. Men, fighting at the front, were replaced at machine-tools by women and teenagers. Murmansk fishermen were catching fish under enemy fire.

Murmansk was during the war a major port of co-operation of the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition. At that time Murmansk again saw people in American and British uniform, although in a different quality than twenty years before — this time as allies.

We have not forgotten, nor shall ever forget how allied convoys with weapons and equipment for the Soviet Army broke their way here through the Hitlerite blockade.

The courage of Soviet, British and American sailors who secured their passage and remains a vivid symbol of co-operation between our peoples in the period of the Second World War.

The events of those years sear us with the burning truth of selfless heroism. The

tremendous grit of Soviet troops and workers on the home front was readily manifest here on the Kola peninsula, in the rigorous conditions of the extreme north. The profound feeling of civic responsibility for the fate of the socialist homeland gave the Murmansk people the strength to surpass the limits of human possibilities. The patriots of the fatherland will never be forgotten. The former "valley of death" will remain in popular memory forever as a valley of glory.

The heroic defenders of Murmansk had absorbed the fortitude and gallantry as well as the experience of life by many generations of northerners, starting from the ancient Russian Pomors. Let us recall, for example, that it is here at Murman, in the arduous fishing trade, that a great son of the Russian land, a scientist of genius and an ardent patriot, Mikhail Vasilyevich Lomonosov, matured in his youth. It is to these parts, to the Kola peninsula, that Pugachyov's men were sent to eternal exile. It is here that the families of many political exiles, revolutionaries, chose to stay put in the years of the czarist autocracy.

### Dependable outpost

The October Revolution turned over a new leaf in the history of this region and created favourable conditions for tapping its natural wealth. Inspired by the ideas of social progress, the people enthusiastically embarked on sweeping change to advance along the path of building socialism.

Murmansk today is among the biggest ports in the USSR. It has become a base for Arctic development, pioneering a northern sea route, exploring the Kola peninsula and surrounding seas and exploiting their riches. New cities have sprung up in the region. A number of major scientific centres and industrial projects such as the Severonikel Combine and the Apatit Amalgamation have been built. It is here that the red-bannered Northern Fleet does its naval duty. It is here that our nuclear-powered ice-breakers have their main base. Murmansk fishermen are making a weighty contribution to the country's food resources.

The soldierly and labour exploits by the region and the city have won them high awards. Murmansk is a city with a heroic past and a radiant future, a city of fine revolutionary traditions and labour accomplishments continued today. It was, is and, we are positive, will remain the nation's dependable outpost in the Arctic.

Comrades,

It is a great honour to be a citizen of and to live in a hero city. It means, I think, first of all to be keenly aware of one's responsibility for the state of affairs and order not only in this city, but also in the country as a whole, to be a citizen in the loftiest sense of the word, and set an example of vigorous patriotism, real service to the interests of the people and fidelity to the cause of socialism.

To live and work in a hero city means not only

to develop production. It means to build not only high-rises, but also social relations of a new kind. It means to fight shortcomings, break inertia, and initiate everything new and progressive that are associated today with perestroika and renewal, democratisation and glasnost.

To be an inhabitant of a hero city, in short, means to enhance its honour and glory everywhere and in everything, the honour and glory of every factory and organisation, of every work collective.

I have had a lot of meetings and conversations with the working people these days. They were businesslike and open. The talk was about perestroika, its successes and difficulties, about problems and ways to resolve these problems, and about work aimed into the future. We discussed our current affairs and long-term tasks.

It was very important for me, for the Political Bureau of the Central Committee to get convinced again and again that Soviet people realise the necessity and urgency of the changes that were started. The spirit of renewal is manifested ever more clearly in the life of your city and this is the main thing now.

Our meeting is held not long before a great national day, the anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution.

The road we covered over seven decades was far from easy. It was truly heroic. The Soviet people proved equal to resolving huge tasks of restructuring society on new socialist principles.

The creation of a mighty power, our common home, in which scores of nations and peoples live and work shoulder-to-shoulder, is the crowning result of the work and struggle of all generations of Soviet people.

We take pride in the achievements of our revolution. It is not for nothing that it is called great. But the more we are obliged therefore to see the problems that accumulated in society, to see the new demands made by life.

It is precisely the lofty responsibility of the Party for the destinies of the people, for the destinies of socialism, that suggested the need for perestroika, for speeding up the country's social and economic development.

We now have to do many things at once, to make up for what was lost over the past decade. But we have to do this. We cannot avoid this work. No one will do it for us.

Revolutionary construction, the implementation of the great ideals and goals of the October Revolution now continues at a qualitatively new stage, in cardinally changed internal and external conditions.

What can be said about the reorganisation now taking place in society?

First of all, there are undoubted positive changes not only as regards awareness of its tasks and problems, but also practical approaches, concrete actions and their results.

We are now fuller and deeper aware of many things in our life than in the days of the 1985 April plenary meeting of the CPSU Central

### IN THIS ISSUE

Mikhail Gorbachev presents the Order of Lenin to Murmansk .....	p. 353
Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with 'Initiative-87' .....	p. 358

Committee and even the 27th Congress.

Fundamental directions of the work in the political, economic and social areas have been determined in just over two years that have passed since the April plenary meeting. The road to changes was thus opened widely.

We now realise clearer that we all have to put in much work, to rebuild by joint efforts many things in our society for our intentions and plans to become reality.

We are not satisfied with the situation with housing, the quantity and quality of goods and services, the functioning of the social sphere, the activity of state and economic organisations, and so on. These issues received prime attention here as well, during meetings on Murmansk land. But all this is connected with our work, with our attitude to work. So it turns out that we should change if the situation in society is to change the way we want. We know now that the reorganisation affects everyone of us, all without exception, that it involves certain difficulties.

We were saying quite recently that we need a new policy — new decisions, bold approaches. We have such a policy now. There are new ideas, intentions implemented in concrete solutions today in every area of life. A new moral atmosphere without which profound transformations cannot be embarked upon is thus emerging.

We all study now. We are learning life.

We are learning truth and glasnost.

We are learning responsibility and discipline.

We are learning the widening of democracy.

We are learning internationalism and patriotism.

## Restructuring programme

The first results of the reorganisation are felt most acutely in the political climate of our society. It can be said now that the new way of thinking emerges step-by-step in the conflict of opinion, sometimes in heated debates. I would say that social awareness of man is improving. This I feel with particular keenness on Murmansk land.

And one of the most noble tasks of the reorganisation is precisely to elevate working people, enhance their prestige and dignity, expand their capabilities and talents. This is the lofty aim and meaning of socialism.

The working people have seen for themselves how potent openness, criticism of shortcomings, and the drive for more democracy are as vehicles for renovation and restructuring. They expect restructuring to produce changes in the conditions of their life.

With this aim the CPSU Central Committee and the government, well aware of the fact that the implementation of the restructuring programme will take a no short period of time and require immense efforts, are seeing to it that issues of vital importance for the people be addressed in the nearest future, in the course of the restructuring drive.

At the June plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee we brought into the fore such tasks, as the provision of the population with foodstuffs, housing and consumer goods.

What has been done at the initial stage of implementation of the social programme drafted by the Party?

In the past two years cash incomes of the population increased by approximately 16 billion roubles in mean annual terms. The salary of physicians and teachers, stipends of students at secondary specialised and higher educational establishments went up. Pensions to certain categories of working people became bigger.

In the sphere of foodstuffs — in the same period mean annual indices of meat output increased by almost two million tons, milk

output — by 8.5 million tons, and egg output — by 7 billion eggs. More grain, sugar beet and some other crops are being harvested. Changes for the better in foodstuff consumption are taking place on that basis. They are more substantial in those regions and republics where collective and state farms are operating better, where possibilities of personal smallholdings are used skilfully.

For now the following principle exists: each republic, territory and region have an assignment for a five-year plan on the delivery of products to the union and republican fund. And all the rest remains for the needs of local supply. This is why everything that will be added over these years to the assigned plan — all this will remain at the local level. This is stimulating not only every collective and state farm, every work collective: every district and region is interested in it.

The scale of housing construction widened. Last year 6.8 million square metres of housing more than in 1985 were built at the expense of all sources of funding. In January-August 1987 the state alone put into service new houses with an area of 6.7 million square metres more than in the corresponding period of last year.

## Positive changes

Investments in the construction of schools and pre-school childcare centres, clubs and cultural centres, hospitals, polyclinics and sport structures were substantially increased.

The situation in the output of consumer goods is also beginning to change, albeit slowly and with difficulty so far. The range of services offered to the population is expanding. All sectors of the national economy are increasing their contribution to the output of consumer goods and services.

Let us put it straight: this process proceeds with big difficulties. Far from all have understood so far that no one can stay aloof from accomplishing that state task of paramount importance.

Last year overall goods turnover grew by nearly 8 billion roubles, while sales of alcoholic beverages dropped by 10.7 billion roubles. This means that we coped with the task of setting off the loss of a substantial portion of 'drunken' incomes. However, for the time being we fail to meet to the needed degree the growing consumer demand of the population. In the eight months of the current year, despite a smaller amount of proceeds from alcohol sales as against the previous years, goods turnover grew by 5.8 billion roubles compared with the corresponding period of last year.

So, there are some positive changes. But when the consumer market situation is evaluated as a whole it should be said frankly: we are still very far from a radical change in that sphere. Efforts should not be slackened either in the centre or on the periphery. On the contrary, they should be intensified. This especially applies to quality and variety.

Soviet people ardently support the state course toward improving the health of the people. A document of great social and humanistic significance — The Guidelines for the Development of Health Care in the Country — was published for a nation-wide discussion. This is a very big nation-wide programme. Huge resources will be channelled into its realisation.

Let me put it straight: we are ready to invest additionally in health care, just like in the educational sphere, the maximum share of what we will produce over the above plans. Even today additional financial resources to the sum of 5.6 billion roubles were found and devoted to urgent needs of health care for the remaining three years of the five-year period.

In a word, comrades, our long-term and short-term plans in the social sphere are important. Our approach is clear — more concern for the people, more concern for their work and life. But these plans are directly linked with the

acceleration of economic development, with better work of every enterprise, collective and state farm, construction site, research establishment, laboratory, design bureau, and so forth. And this means that the economy for us is the main area of restructuring.

We have lately boosted performance in industry, in the agrarian sector and in capital construction. However, alongside certain changes for the better there are setbacks, notably in machine building, the chemical and light industries. We are concerned about that. The situation in machine building where deep-running modernisation is in progress is the source of special concern. And we should surmount existing difficulties by all means and ensure the success of the undertaking.

Thus, changes do take place in our economy. But there has been no breakthrough so far. It would not be serious to believe that these ambitious goals can be attained in some two or three years, that during this period a dramatic change can take place in the fulfilment of those truly revolutionary tasks. We should do much in order to bring it about. There should be no illusions here, for the case in point is the reconstruction of a building, not corner sweeping or wall repainting. The main amount of work still lies ahead.

This question is often asked: but what should be done? Let me say the following: at the first stage we had to clarify the situation in the economy, in its individual sectors and regions and determine where to start from, make necessary structural changes, alter the policy of capital investment, allocate priorities. And, of course, we had to decide how we will be running affairs in the national economy: which forms of administration and what mechanism of management we need now. Which new approaches we should use now, which incentives we should provide in order to boost the initiative of work, production, scientific and design collectives.

## Discipline

We completed this work in the main and adopted the relevant documents. They were endorsed by the June plenary meeting of the Party's Central Committee. The main among them is the law on the State Enterprise.

The next stage has set in now. Every decision taken should now be implemented so as practical deeds follow our decisions. And, mind you, in strict compliance with the way we decided.

This effort, comrades, should be started — if it has not been done yet — by setting things in good order, by strengthening discipline and organisation in all production collectives, enhancing the responsibility of everyone for conscientiously fulfilling his immediate obligations. This is the starting point from which all of us should travel — do one's job conscientiously. A simple answer for all of us, for everyone, no matter what post one holds, no matter what is one's place of work in our society.

In the past society paid dearly for the failure to address these problems in what concerns order and organisation. It is all the more impermissible now.

Young workers at the Severonikel plant were right when they said that discipline has become rather loose among all of us in general. And this is why things should be set in good order everywhere both at the top and in the republics, regions, districts and in work collectives. Everywhere, comrades. This is very important now when we are effecting a radical reform of our economy, when work should be done in a new fashion, when initiative, self-reliance and lofty responsibility are needed for solving scientific, technological and organisational tasks, for putting new methods of management to work.

Hence, the first and very important task of all work collectives — decisively to set things

in good order, ensure good organisation, stronger discipline and greater initiative of the working people. Our senior officials and Party organisations should be pace-setters in this respect.

Until now many of them used to nod upward, as if saying, let them sort things out there first. By the way, many Party bodies and senior officials used to refer very widely to "those higher up" just to justify their own idleness and passiveness, especially when working people literally besieged them, demanding concrete steps along the lines of restructuring, changing the state of affairs and resolving problems accumulated in each work collective, in one or other city or region. The nearest future will clarify many things and show who is worth what. It is important to work now. All political directives are here, the decisions have been adopted. Everyone should act.

In a word, those who are still "in the trenches marking time" should rise without delay and go into offensive, attacking shortcomings, neglected problems and deficits.

Today we particularly count on initiative and vigour. A principled attitude by working people — this is how we are putting the question. And it is from this that economic agencies should proceed. As well as our leading cadres and Party organisations. Everything is the business of working people.

### Political guidelines

It is their country, it is their system, it is their society. They are masters. Party organisations, cadres serve the people, the entire Party serves the people. Not the other way round. In production, members of work collectives should feel and behave as real masters. Any attempts — no matter from what quarter — to hinder the exercise of this right or the manifestation of the working people's initiative should be resolutely curbed.

Everything that is directed at improving performance, removing all that impedes advance and the introduction of new methods of management, innovations and achievements of scientific and technological progress — all this is not only legitimate but vitally needed by our society.

The meaning of the decisions of the January and June plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee is to draw all working people into a genuine process of introducing order and organisation at enterprises. This is the main intent also of the Law on the Socialist Enterprise.

That is why, comrades, I want to say the following: do not wait any longer for instructions from above. You know the political guidelines. The relevant legal documents have been adopted. So now it is necessary to act, to unfurl initiative from below. Officials and Party organisations should do everything for this process to develop faster and gain in strength.

I have pleasant impressions of the visit to the Murmansk region, of the conversations. The people's initiative, their desire to be real masters make themselves felt already. V. N. Ptitsyn, First Secretary of the Regional Committee told me: summing up today's situation in the region, one should say directly that working people are pressing hard on the cadres, on Party organisations. They mean good, they mean intensification.

If some cadres in economic, local government or Party organisations are scared of that, this is only because they are not used to that. This is how things should be under socialism. Time will pass and you yourselves will look for ways to draw the collective's attention to any question, to resolve any question with its participation.

This is the principal means. If a real alliance of leading cadres, Party organisations and work

collectives is formed as a result, this will be a decisive force. Technology is good. But if there is no alliance of this kind, nothing will come off. People are the chief protagonists. Democracy, new methods of economic management are the chief means to set this force in motion. This is what the January and June plenums of the CPSU Central Committee discovered.

I would like to dwell particularly on the following. It is very important now to look very closely into everything that concerns the Law on the Enterprise, cost-accounting and collective contract, that we call the new economic mechanism. This, comrades, is not at all simple. I recall 1986 when we were preparing for the first stage of introducing the system of state quality control. Some took this seriously, others presumptuously. The first coped with their task well from the beginning of this year, though not without difficulties, while the latter found themselves in a feverish state. So much so that some of them cannot get out of it to this day. But there is nowhere to retreat, comrades.

### Quality control

We had a conversation in the port today. Dockers told us: loaders were provided, but they do not work. Why? The quality is bad. This is one example. Here are others: one bought a television set, several days or hours later it was out of order. A tractor was supplied to a collective farm or a combine harvester to a village, but it takes another month to bring it to working condition.

Can we depart from quality requirements, from the system of state acceptance, comrades? Why then do we spend our working hours, strength, raw materials and energy to produce a no-good end product? I don't want to smear everything. A lot of good things are being done in the country. Take defence, for instance. We are not inferior in anything here. So, we can work. But in this area, I should say, quality controllers work in a way that makes everybody sweat workers, designers, engineers and economic executives. This is the way the state acceptance system should operate. Then we will have technology and commodities we want. If that is not done, why do we need money, what to buy with it? One should think hard. Why then do we go to our workplace every morning? For what? We all, all of our society should ponder over this situation. We cannot depart from state acceptance. I already spoke about ten times on behalf of the Central Committee and expressed profound gratitude to the working class for its understanding, class understanding of the fact that we cannot retreat from the line towards improving quality. The working class rendered us immense support in this respect. But some economic executives simply became confused.

We ought to study well the experience of introducing state acceptance and operation of our enterprises in these conditions and draw correct lessons so as not to find ourselves in a difficult situation when, on January 1, 1988, 60 per cent of our economy will be transferred to principles of cost-accounting, self-financing and self-repayment. This undertaking goes even deeper than state acceptance. And as in the case of state acceptance, we cannot retreat in matters of introducing cost-accounting, self-financing, and self-repayment.

We cannot depart from anything that we started. We started a war on drunkenness — we cannot retreat, although many are displeased. We hear about remarks at the expense of the government made by people queuing up to buy this poison. We know that. Locally, some do not withstand the pressure. Well, we foresaw that. But the biggest mass of people stands for sobriety. If we waver, start retreating, the front of our restructuring will collapse.

Once cost-accounting is introduced, the situation at enterprises will change, the entire

economy will move forward, and end results will be different.

And hence, comrades, new opportunities will open up for resolving the entire complex of social problems. For tons of oil and ore, cubic metres of gas are not an end in itself, cubic metres of lumber, tons of pig iron and steel and so forth are not an end in itself either. We need all this in order to have ultimately a big national income which we would use to improve all aspects of life of our society and our people. By the way, we have many tons even now. But we spend 50 to 100 per cent more energy and material resources per unit of national income than the developed countries do. So it turns out that our national income could be 50 to 100 per cent bigger with the same resources we have today, provided they are used correctly, on the basis of new technologies, on the basis of achievements of scientific and technological progress. Think how vast these possibilities are! How wasteful our wealth has made us. I've already said that and I repeat that and shall repeat that because that's how it is. We are bathing in resources. It is shameful how we've come to treat them. We already feel what this is leading us to. Some talk on an occasion such as this. Am I right? But that's Leninist style.

Speaking of cost-accounting, work under cost-accounting will be rewarded and encouraged properly. This should also be borne in mind. For cost-accounting, speaking simply, in simple terms without using categories and terms of political economy, boils down to one simple thing — encouragement for good performance and a befitting evaluation of shoddy one.

### Decisive sphere

Quite intentionally I don't go into the economic substance of cost-accounting. But since cost-accounting makes incomes of the working people and, hence, their status and well-being, dependent on the final results one very acute problem is emerging. What I want to say is that in conditions of cost-accounting, the working people, a worker, a work collective are extremely interested in having at the head of teams, production sections, production shops, technical services and an enterprise as a whole competent, modern, able people to whom the work collective could entrust its fate and on whom it could count. This means that everything should be done in such a way as is demanded by the times and as the working people believe that it should be done — democratically.

The headquarters of industries, the economic national agencies, must come to the assistance of enterprises at this difficult transitional stage. This is the most important task for them now. Over these two days, while in Murmansk, I heard with concern many complaints addressed to ministries, primarily, in conjunction with the fact that they are slow in conveying new economic norms to enterprises. But without them one cannot start preparation for and transition to cost-accounting.

I want to stress once again that we must prepare for work in the new conditions in all seriousness, understanding that this concerns millions of people, that this concerns the most important and decisive sphere of our society — the economy.

The experience which we have accumulated in the past two-odd years in all the branches in using the new methods of management, new approaches, new forms of organising production, the experience which was gained in the course of the nation-wide discussion of the Law on the Socialist Enterprise convinces us now that we are on the correct path, that despite the initial difficulties this is a very promising endeavour. And we must do this job with a feeling of great responsibility.

Not everything will come out at once. Probably there will be miscalculations and some mistakes are possible. But we must treat all this

calmly, democratically, openly, without panic and without demagoguery, seriously. For everything that is planned is directed at accelerating the country's socio-economic development, at improving the life of the working people. This should be understood well. Every increment in the economy in the long run will serve the raising of the people's living standard and make itself felt first of all on the state of the social sphere. All these questions are now being widely discussed in the mass media — the press, radio and television. This is a normal process. It helps us to get to the bottom of things and act consciously, confidently and effectively.

The question of wholesale, procurement and retail prices is now being discussed along with many other problems. Many people ask me here "how will this problem be handled?" This is what I would like to say. This is an important element of the new economic mechanism. And it is impossible to solve.

The task of switching to new methods of management without getting to the bottom of things on the question of prices. The discussion of prices, as the conversations in Murmansk, Monchegorsk and information reaching the CPSU Central Committee and the government shows, has given rise to certain apprehensions among working people, the entire population of the country. This is understood.

These apprehensions boil down to the following: is not the present leadership planning to solve all the problems of the economy by lowering the people's living standards? I have already had the opportunity to speak on this matter both at the Congress and the plenary meetings of the Central Committee. I want to say once again that we will address the issue of prices just as other matters of the new economic mechanism.

## Subsidies

But, firstly, this should be done with the aim of accelerating our economy's development, increasing the output of the necessary products and commodities in the country, increasing national income and raising the wellbeing of working people. This is the aim.

And secondly. We will act in the same manner as at the early stage of perestroika, after the April 1985 plenary meeting of the Central Committee, i.e. we will further act openly. We will discuss on a countrywide basis all the main questions of our society's life. And, of course, when the need for this arises, the question of prices will definitely be submitted to the working people for discussion. There should be no uncertainties about this.

I should like to dwell some more on the prices problem and to cite several examples. The price that the state pays to collective and state farms for the farm produce supplied by them, primarily livestock-breeding products, is 50 or 100 per cent higher than that by which they are sold to the population. For this reason last year's meat and milk subsidies amounted to 57 billion roubles. Many people do not know how things stand, they are not aware of the situation.

Hence the lack of proper respect for those foodstuffs. You know it yourselves. One can see children using a loaf of bread as a football. A tremendous amount of foodstuffs go waste. There are examples of a different sort. Women's boots cost 120-130 roubles, and 62 kg of meat, which is today's average per capita quota of meat, costs about the same. In other words, the value of meat consumed by a person annually is equal to that of a pair of boots. This is the situation that has emerged. This is why no one saves foodstuffs, no one is careful with them.

However, the most important thing is that families with large incomes consume more meat and milk and, consequently, take advantage of the subsidies to a greater degree. These are the problems we are facing.

We are now thinking over the ways of tackling this question. I should like to cite a number of figures just to show the paradoxical nature of the situation in this country in comparison with other developed countries. Take foodstuffs of equal calorific value. If we take the price of bread in the Soviet Union for one unit, its price in the US will be 5.5 times higher. The figure for Britain is 3.6, for France — 4.1, West Germany — 4.9, Hungary — 1.5. The figures are for wheat bread. The situation is the same with meat, milk and so on.

So, the problem does exist, and it must be resolved. However, it is necessary to find the approach to it that would not affect the living standards of the population. And I am asking you: are we thinking in the right direction?

*Voices: yes, you are right.*

If these problems emerge, I point out once again that you should not get the impression that the leadership is planning some "secrets of the court of Madrid". No, it is nothing of the sort. This is not our method to resolve economic problems at the expense of reducing the living standards of the working people. As I have stated already, all the economic tasks will be fulfilled through better work from all of us, from all the working people of this country.

## Democratisation

And another matter that I would like to mention at our meeting. Comrades, we must pursue a strict policy of economising. We must save labour, we must save resources and we must save money. Here much is out of order. I want to confirm this by giving you one, but very important, substantial example.

Since over a period of many decades the emphasis in managing the economy and in fact society as a whole was made on centralisation, on the use of command and administrative methods this resulted in a ballooning of the administrative apparatus both state and economic, the apparatus of public organisations and to a certain extent also of the Party apparatus.

Some 18 million people are now employed in our sphere of administration. Of them 2.5 million are in the apparatus of various administrative bodies and some 15 million in the management of amalgamations, enterprises and organisations. All this amounts to 15 per cent of all industrial and office workers.

Now as we are advancing along the road of extensive democratisation, development of the initiative and responsibility of work collectives, increasing their independence, as we are introducing economic methods of management in place of administrative ones it is only natural that we should give serious thought to ways of simplifying the bloated administrative apparatus. Earlier, when any problem emerged in the sphere of economy or in society in general, it was immediately suggested that an organisation be created for resolving it, as though it could help. No, it did not.

But we shall do this with an acute sense of responsibility and in a well-considered manner, showing concern for every person and his future and the future of his family. We should in these cases decide everything in a socialist fashion. There is work galore in this country, and work will be found for everyone, a lot of work.

The upkeep of managerial staff is where we can save a great deal for national income. As yet, we spend more than 40 billion roubles a year on these purposes, while increasing our national income lately by an annual 20 or so billion roubles.

The CPSU Central Committee and the government recently decided to switch scientific institutions over to the pay-your-own-way system. This is being done to increase returns on the research potential accumulated in the

country as well as to make another saving. These measures are not only essential, but also fair.

Yesterday, Comrade Yermakov, Director of the Severonikel plant, said: now in conditions of profit-and-loss accounting we will pay to science a real effect which it will give us. Until now, because the state paid for it, we signed a treaty irrespective of what science gave us. Today we cannot do it. It is our money, we should ensure the cost-accounting and self-financing principles. Therefore, employees of research institutions should also think how to bring more honey into our socialist hive. And let those who fail to turn up profit disband themselves. This is also democratic. For socialism is pay according to one's work. And if there is no work, what pay can there be?

By the way, in keeping with the decision passed by the Council of Ministers we have already closed two branch institutes which produced nothing essential for the economy. The decision was now made to switch the entire science to the pay-your-own-way basis. This is dictated by the interests of society and research workers themselves. Frankly speaking, talented research workers raise as a matter of urgency the question of what should be paid for real work, for real contribution. The principle of socialism: from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work should be strictly observed.

We shall continue to take decisions and adopt measures motivating everyone in the economy to be cost-conscious. This is the meaning of reform in planning and management and one of the goals of perestroika. But we should enlist also the conscience of everyone to make merciless war on inefficiency.

## Perestroika

There still remains a lot of it to be mopped up in every sector of the national economy and, indeed, in every collective and at every workstation for that matter. Just think of all the losses incurred in harvesting and the storage of farm produce, wood-felling and construction. Every one of you sitting here can apparently cite without a moment's hesitation tens of examples confirming that mismanagement. We still are impermissibly, criminally wasteful and extravagant. We should realise this and change absolutely everything in the country for the better.

When we learn to be efficiency-minded and achieve proper economic order in the way things are done where each of us works, the economy will benefit tremendously. It will no longer be needed to build dozens of new facilities with billions of roubles and the results of the perestroika effort will be more tangible, not to mention the fact that any waste tends to have the most adverse effect on morality. Stopping waste will make the moral climate in which we live, work and rest still healthier.

It ought to be stressed, comrades, that with radical economic reform in the making, our society is entering the decisive phase of perestroika.

In a talk with economic managers representing the mining plant of the Murmansk region yesterday I said that in the Political Bureau we consider that a critical stage has emerged in the drive for restructuring. The success of this tremendous historic undertaking is in a competent political and economic leadership and in the working people's high consciousness. These are two main pre-conditions. Let us act in concert, proceeding from such an understanding of our responsible situation.

If something goes amiss and produces an unexpected, unforeseen or undesirable result anywhere, this is not enough reason to be disappointed and give up further tries.

This is reason enough for something else, namely — and solely — for posing the one Marxist, socialist scientific question possible:

what has prevented the plans from being realised? Apathy, inertia and wait-and-see attitudes are still lingering. After sorting out the causes of a failure, decisive action should be taken to put the situation right.

It will, of course, take a long time to nullify the consequences of the standstill. We have in a way got accustomed to it. Our psychology has adapted to its conditions, requirements and manifestations. Such things as wage levelling and parasitic attitudes have become widespread. I would even say that psychologically, the standstill was most comfortable for many. Some people are still nostalgic for that time. This must be seen and understood. This is a reality. And we should act with due account for this reality.

But seeing this reality does not mean putting up with it and letting things develop as they would. For us seeing and understanding is only a first step, an indispensable prerequisite of changing the situation. It is only on the path of economic and social measures and by raising general political and cultural standards that we shall be able to get done with all this and that in an atmosphere of openness. This will tell most appreciably on the people's morality and their civic stand. Qblomov and socialism go different ways — this we should clearly and firmly say to ourselves.

## Cultural services

On the whole, perestroika is continuing to gain both in speed and in scope and taking ever firmer hold. Everyone is duty-bound to sustain and accelerate the momentum. I would like to repeat once more: everything that we have planned can only be accomplished by our own effort. There will and can be no miracle. It is only with our own hands that we can revamp our life, in which we are vitally interested. This is the reply.

Comrades, it is through the prism of the common effort, the tasks of perestroika as a whole that one should look at the situation in your region, too. I have already spoken of your work contribution. We appreciate it highly. But I have criticisms to make concerning your work as well.

This is what I would like to say first of all. You live in the extreme north. The make-up of the population here is a special one, the tasks are special, the conditions in which they are handled are special. Many of the city's inhabitants have their workplace at sea, thousands of miles away from home. Extra concern should be shown for these people, social and cultural services should be made available to them.

Looking at the issue from this standpoint, I would like to call attention to the low pace of home building, which has made housing an acute problem, especially among fishermen. The situation has by now changed somewhat. However, calculations existing today in district organisations which are based on the data supplied by labour collectives show that they do not measure up to the task of resolving the housing problem by 2000. The situation must be changed and the development pace must be stepped up.

There are quite a few difficulties with the availability of child-care centres, schools, medical, cultural and sports facilities.

It pained one to hear workers' grievances yesterday. The capacity of the Severonikel plant doubled over the past six or seven years. But neither heads of the enterprise, nor heads of the branch had enough concern. Party principledness or mere conscience in handling these immense tasks to take care of the people coping with these production assignments. Once again, the approach to the social sphere rested on the take-what-remains principle. Whatever will remain. As a result we were embarrassed with Vladimir N Yermakov and other comrades to hear yesterday just remarks: there is nowhere to leave children, there is a shortage of pre-school centres. This is

outrageous. What helplessness. It is utter irresponsibility.

Of course, comrades, these are no easy tasks which I mention. Resolute measures are required, the capacities of pre-fabricated house-building should be better used. The region should get down to the development material production. It has unique possibilities for that, rarely found elsewhere. Everything can be here. But cement is brought into the Murmansk region. Building materials are in short supply. The Kildin brick-works, built in 1936, is reducing output due to outdated main assets.

Does it not characterise how local regional organisations view these problems, or the ministries' attitude to the solution of questions linked with social restructuring in the region? Enterprises of our major ministries operate here in the north. Cannot they see to it that normal conditions be created for the inhabitants of the harsh region? We will recommend that all these questions be considered in their entirety. But I ought to say that the Regional Party Committee and the Regional Executive Committee should also act more resolutely. No pains, no gains.

In per capita consumer goods production, you are 36 per cent behind the mean figures for the Russian Federation. I understand that the structure here is special — raw material branches. But it is possible to produce cement out of local raw materials and supply it to the national economy as a consumer commodity for retail trade, for the development of individual construction, for gardeners. Can the question be solved? It can. But it is not being solved.

## Local production

By the way, an excessive workforce is already emerging in the Murmansk region. It is to be employed. Can't women be engaged in production? Especially women from families of servicemen. They are, as a rule, educated people. Is it not possible to get in touch with such centres as Leningrad and Riga and organise here branches of the radio technical industry and electronics? This will add to the potential.

The Minister of Ship-Building, Igor Belousov, is here. The ministry manufactures a large quantity of means of automation and instruments for itself. Can this not be produced here? But no, Igor Sergeevich says: in Murmansk, not only wages but also wage differentials are to be paid. Is it right to talk like that?

A quarter of industrial enterprises in the region and Murmansk has not as yet been involved in consumer goods manufacture. This won't do, comrades.

The population is experiencing difficulties with flat decoration, home equipment repair and tailoring. Co-operatives keep a very low profile.

Take your neighbours, the Arkhangelsk region. 2-3 times less fruits, vegetables and potatoes per capita are marketed through co-operatives in the Murmansk region compared with the Arkhangelsk region. This means that passive, inert people are heading the co-operatives. I should praise as an accomplishment the growth of the local production of broilers, pork and milk in the recent years. This is good. Ways and reserves should be looked for in order to develop that further and reduce the import of produce from outside. This is more reliable, more profitable and stable. It is not clear how it happened that there are only 18 hectares of greenhouses in the region. The principle is one: one person — one square metre. There are 1,100,000 people living in your region. So, there should be 100 hectares of greenhouses. Greenhouses are assembled from pre-fabricated elements. Selkhoztekhnik can assemble as many as ordered. We assemble them in many countries. The capacities are great. Everything has been mastered. The majority of northern and Siberian cities have long since

resolved the problem of vegetable supplies from greenhouses.

In the specific conditions of the north, it is an important task to preserve and use everything that is brought in. Look, in 1986, you lost during storage and wrote off as livestock fodder 40,000 tonnes of potatoes and other vegetables and fruits. This, comrades, amounts to 22 per cent of the volume marketed. I understand that this might depend on quality as well, but, probably, on storage too. Is it not possible to have dependable facilities so as to resolve this problem once and for all in big cities? Where are the regional and city organisations looking? This means that their approaches reveal the take-what-remains principle.

Some remarks on other issues. There are a lot of problems here: vessels staying idle in port for longer than they should and shortcomings in processing. Today we heard interesting presentations and proposals on that score. It's good that they were corroborated by concrete suggestions made by amalgamations producing equipment for fish processing. I believe that we should help the region tackle that problem. But fishermen themselves should give the matter some thinking, too. They should act more decisively at the local level and Party organisations should keep these questions in the focus of attention. I believe that the Ministry of Fisheries and the Minister, Comrade Kotlyar, who is here now will also take measures.

## Revolutionary change

The problem of a comprehensive utilisation of resources and natural riches of the Kola peninsula has acquired great importance now. I'm speaking first of all of apatite-nepheline ores. Many approaches have been found here. Researchers have concrete suggestions. But it requires huge investments. I heard figures of three and more billion roubles mentioned. But I think that yesterday's discussion will benefit both the centre and all those who are associated with that problem. In the coming days comrades will work here and the ministry, the State Planning Committee and local bodies will draft proposals for the Central Committee and the government. We will examine these questions at a Politbureau meeting. Interests of the entire country are involved and they should be thoroughly considered.

Comrades, I would like to express the hope that the working people of Murmansk and the Murmansk region will persistently tackle the tasks facing the region and the country. And I think that you have ample skill both in tackling most difficult tasks and in upholding the Party line. You don't have to borrow patriotism from any one. I wish you every success.

Millions of people around the world are watching the restructuring process in our country with immense interest. Our bold embarking on large-scale constructive work and revolutionary change demanding consolidation of all of the country's might is convincing evidence of our confidence that peace can be preserved, that mankind does have a future.

Indeed, the international situation is complicated. The dangers, to which we have no right to turn a blind eye, remain. Still, there has been some change. Of course, judging the situation only from speeches made by top Western leaders, including their "policy" statements, everything would seem to be as it has been before: the same anti-Soviet attacks, the same demands on us to show our commitment to peace by giving up our orders and principles, the same confrontational language: "totalitarianism", "communist expansion", and so on.

A few days afterwards, however, these speeches are often ignored, and, in any case, these other than those contained in them figure in business political negotiations and contacts.

(continued on page 362)

# Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with 'Initiative-87'

*ON September 29 Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with a big group of representatives of the French public (Initiative-87) in the Kremlin's Sverdlov Hall.*

*The group consists of some 360 prominent French politicians and public figures: representatives of virtually all the main political forces and parties of France, Deputies of the National Assembly, Senators, Mayors, people prominent in culture and art, scientists, workers, office employees, Catholic priests, engineers, businessmen, doctors, lawyers, journalists.*

*The visit was organised on the initiative of the France-USSR Society and the Soviet Association of Friendship Societies. The group includes many officials and activists of the France-USSR Society. The trip was timed to coincide with the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and provides for acquaintance with the life of the Soviet people, the policy of the CPSU at the present stage and the main aims and first results of restructuring (perestroika).*

**Mikhail Gorbachev:** Until recently plenary meetings of the Party's Central Committee were held in this hall, the former Yekaterininsky and now Sverdlov Hall of the Kremlin. Still earlier, meetings of the All-Union Central Executive Committee were held there. This hall is the scene of such major political and cultural functions as the presentation of state prizes, meetings with representatives of culture, the working class and the peasants. So this hall has heard a lot and witnessed many events. And I am happy to welcome you, representatives of France, a friendly country, here, in this hall. Since I am familiar with those who are present here I can say that in your person I greet France, the French people.

Present here are representatives of the entire political spectrum of France. It turned out that the visit to the Soviet Union has helped bring everybody together. If this experience is applied to domestic affairs, then matters will quickly improve in France.

So far I cannot discern where the opposition is, both the left and the right, and also the centre. Perhaps all this will surface later, in the course of the conversation. So let us wait and see.

I suggest that the guests take the floor.

**Madeleine Gilbert,** Executive President of the France-USSR Society: Mr General Secretary, during your official visit to Paris in October 1985 you accorded us honour by meeting with the leadership of the France-USSR Society. Back then you spoke about the activity of our society and said that most diverse flows of intellectual thinking could be encountered in it. You emphasised the common desire of all members of the society to ensure a more durable peace and develop friendship between the Soviet and French people on the basis of diversification of efforts. We are trying to do everything to promote in France a better knowledge of such a great country, as the Soviet Union.

Mr General Secretary, you must be aware that today, two years after the meeting, we again have the possibility to discuss matters related to the life of our two countries. Our trip came to be known as Initiative-87 because of the initiative taken by our organisation in 1987. The people taking part in the current trip are in front of you. Their number is 365. I would like to emphasise

particularly the diverse character of the political and philosophic tendencies, professionals and experts in various fields represented here. This heterogeneity is indicative. It attests to the growing attention in our country to the processes of paramount importance taking place in the Soviet Union. One more thing is the interest evoked by the Soviet initiatives in the sphere of peace and disarmament.

We are grateful to you for receiving us on the second day of our tour, right the next day upon your return from holiday. We believe that this is indicative of your interest in France. And as citizens of France we are very pleased with that.

**Jean Sauvagnargues,** former minister of foreign affairs: Mr General Secretary, the people taking part in that fact-finding tour are well aware of its importance. We are satisfied with the honour you accorded us, representatives of 52 departments, by receiving us here, in the Kremlin, within these walls that witnessed many solemn occasions. The level and a heterogeneous character of our group reflect an immense interest evoked in our country by the process of change and renovation of economic structures which you have started.

In the remaining years of the current century the tendency toward solidarity and interdependence is increasingly making itself felt in the world. Everyone considers oneself to be involved in the affairs of a country, such as yours. Hence, the attention and expectant interest. I must say that the reception accorded to us and an exceptional quality of the exchange of views we had with our Soviet interlocutors enable us to say that our expectations have been fulfilled and that our curiosity was satisfied.

Franco-Soviet friendship has many years behind it. There were different periods. But General de Gaulle imparted stability to these relations, as well as to East-West relations on the whole. He saw three main directions in them: detente, concord and co-operation. These words are the slogan of Franco-Soviet friendship today as well. Our friendship rests on the need to preserve peace and ensure security and global balance within the framework of the choice which each of us has made by participating in its own alliance.

The dialogue, which we are starting here, can help improve understanding and develop co-operation in all spheres, extend and multiply contacts between people. All this will provide for us a better, more stable and durable future, and solidarity of all. I think that all this fits into the course proclaimed by General de Gaulle and which was followed by many of his successors.

**Pierre Mauroy,** former prime minister: Mr General Secretary, I would like to say that it is a great honour for me to be present at this conversation, to hear, see and greet you. First, I would like to say a few words as a citizen of France. We are extremely glad that you receive us exactly in this way. This is a message to France. It takes up the idea set forth twenty years ago by General de Gaulle during his visit to Moscow which dealt with co-operation.

One should also mention your visit to Paris followed by Mr Mitterand's visit to Moscow. Thus, the point at issue is the striving to strengthen ties between France and your country. These ties are traditional, France, abiding by its allied obligations, pursues an independent policy.

Mr General Secretary, I do not forget that I held the post of Prime Minister from 1981 to 1984. I frequently came to Moscow in complex periods. In November 1982, in particular, we discussed our hopes, the striving for detente, co-operation and peace. The world was destabilised.

Clouds were hanging over it. But years have passed and now the present day has set in. The hour of disarmament, the hour of peace has struck thanks to you, Mr General Secretary.

Thanks to the agreement which you will conclude with the President of the United States, thanks to the support which will be given to you, you will satisfy the aspirations of the popular masses, of people striving for peace. But peace not only in the name of peace but also peace in the name of co-operation, peace in the name of development and progress, in the name of overcoming the present crisis. This is a challenging task and the road is thorny. But you have found the courage to embark on this road.

Of course, peace will not come of itself, peace should be deserved. I think that in this connection mention should be made of agreements which could have been broader. They could have applied also to conventional armaments and to chemical weapons. Why not return to the idea expressed by Zores about the need of a simultaneous, verifiable and universal disarmament. It is desirable to advance along this road. And at every stage, I believe, each side should have its share of security. This applies to Europe as well. This applies to France, the Soviet Union and the United States.

May I dwell on questions related to both socialism and communism. I am speaking as the Mayor of Lille, where the Internationale was performed for the first time.

Years have passed since the end of the 19th century. Decades have already passed since 1917. Both socialism and communism are developing dialectically — I mean the dialectics of life, development, survival, the dialectics of growth. I think the ideas of socialism are inseparable from the idea of equality and freedom. The same can be said also of communism. I believe that thanks to you a new era is beginning, an era of dialogue, greater openness, glasnost. We all take this close to heart.

We arrived here on Sunday and to a certain extent have already felt the changes taking place here. On this road I want to wish you personally success, success to your ideas, success to your country.

Your stay away on vacation gave rise to all sorts of rumours. But they only point to the importance of the work you are doing.

**Mikhail Gorbachev:** It was thought that I was longer on vacation than normal. So let me tell you officially that I was on leave from August 24 to September 24.

**Joseph Rozier,** Bishop of Poitiers: Mr General Secretary, as a catholic bishop, I would wish to remind you, if I may, that on September 29 the church celebrates St Michael's Day. In this connection permit me to wholeheartedly congratulate you with your name-day and shake your hand.

I do not represent here the Bishops of France and the Bishops of Rome. I am speaking here simply as a priest who was invited to take part in Initiative-87. As a Frenchman I solidarise with my country, my people, with the feelings that we experience as we take part in discussing here the great problems of mankind. As a man of the church I feel solidarity with catholics, with other Christians, with members of other religions who belong to our delegation.

The belief in Jesus Christ, in the gospel of love is for us a powerful stimulus for the advancement of the ideas of peace, recognition of human rights.

We think that the keys to many problems associated with peace and freedom are in your

hands. And the efforts being undertaken in this direction under your influence make many people hopeful for the happiness of all those who are suffering because at times they are still denied the right to life, to creed, to the free choice of country. Happiness, peace and freedom in the whole world require that these efforts of yours continue and bear fruit.

I recall Pope John Paul the Second as saying on the day of his election: "Do not be afraid, do not fear, open the boundaries to Christ." To our joy, the doors have opened here for us, Mr General Secretary, and we thank you wholeheartedly for that, we thank you on behalf of those who yearn for fear, apprehensions, obstacles and oppression to disappear, who want openness and brotherhood to triumph. I wish you a happy name-day. I congratulate you.

**Roland Leroy:** Member of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party, Deputy of the National Assembly; Mr General Secretary, it is difficult to be the fourth speaker on the list. We are pluralists, but we frequently repeat ourselves in our ideas.

**Mikhail Gorbachev:** If pluralism develops such a phenomenon as repetition, this means that you have something in common, which unites you.

**Roland Leroy:** During the February 4, 1986, conversation when you gave an interview to the newspaper *L'Humanite*, you spoke about the processes which were unfolding in the Soviet Union. I told you: this is a real revolution. You replied, however, that the revolution had already taken place in 1917, that what you had in mind was the acceleration of the process which it started. Since then, and these words reflect reality, you speak about a revolutionary process, about a revolution. We in France follow with keen interest everything that is happening in your country.

The meetings and conversations which started during our stay and will continue, allow us to conclude that the Soviet people express their ideas freely. We take note of this and see in their words different approaches. It seems quite natural to us.

There is a certain struggle behind any differences. In France we are accustomed to this. Here as well we witness keen struggle. It happens before our eyes. We are closely following it, listen to your calls for democratisation and wider citizen participation in public life. We take note of your good will aimed at more fully implementing human rights. We would like to hear from you what perestroika means for each Soviet citizen. We are amazed by the changes which are taking place in the field of the mass media. We believe that Soviet society today tolerates ever more openly pluralism of opinions on different issues. We like it.

**Mikhail Gorbachev:** That's right but to the word pluralism we add only one adjective — socialist pluralism. This means that our democracy, our pluralism are based on our socialist values.

**Roland Leroy:** You may rest assured that we are aware of that. We do not separate the processes taking place in your country from the essence of socialism.

In about one year's time we will observe the 200th anniversary of the Great French Revolution. In all periods of history we have always pointed out that the struggle of the working people, the struggle of the people for social gains is playing the decisive role. This has been the case throughout the history of France.

**Mikhail Gorbachev:** If we start looking for the roots of our restructuring drive we may go back to the French Revolution and then to the Paris Commune. Generally speaking, we are really linked with France very firmly. And our cultures and our experience have been enriching each other for centuries rather than decades. I'm saying this not to make a pleasant gesture because the representatives of France, of the

French people are in this hall. I'm simply stating what is actually true.

**Roland Leroy:** During the conversation to which I've just referred you emphasised the need for ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, primarily, of medium-range missiles. Now you are going to sign an agreement with the US on that matter. And this is an important step forward. Many people in our country were somehow uneasy at the prospect of the conclusion of that agreement. And some kind of anachronism could be observed in such an attitude. In the final analysis, the advance toward disarmament, toward peace should be supported not only by words. It is important to take permanent actions which would come in line with the cause of creating a world without weapons, without wars.

**Mikhail Gorbachev:** This time the applause is more expressive. There is more of it deeper in the audience and less of it in the front rows. Pluralism begins to work.

**Roland Leroy:** When General de Gaulle arrived in Moscow in 1944 he said "history shows that when France and Russia are disunited, this is a misfortune for Europe".

**Mikhail Gorbachev:** We recall this utterance by de Gaulle.

**Roland Leroy:** We act within the framework of the France-USSR Society in the name of co-operation, better understanding of your country's life, friendship and peace.

**Pierre Pineau,** Deputy Mayor of Bordeaux; Mr General Secretary, those who, like myself, are committed to the policy, example and ideas of General de Gaulle are now under the influence of this meeting. I spoke with Prime Minister Jacques Chirac, and often conversed with Jacques Chaban-Delmas, President of the National Assembly, the Mayor of Bordeaux, whose Deputy I am. We all are attentive to the innovations which you introduce to the life of this vast country and to the transformations which we observe in their entirety.

Your country intends to sign an agreement with the United States. It does not involve France but the cause of disarmament meets our wishes. Disarmament which applies to all categories of weapons leads to genuine balance. We live on one and the same continent, and we shall go on living here. Therefore we should improve relations, develop economic and cultural ties and co-operation, and more widely spread ideas and contacts between people in the name of human rights.

The reforms which you effect facilitate the process. We ardently wish the process to be a success. It was precisely in this spirit that we responded to the invitation of the France-USSR Society to participate in the 'Initiative-87'.

**Mikhail Gorbachev:** The list of speakers is over, but maybe there still are people who would like to take the floor?

*A number of French participants in the meeting in their brief speeches asked Mikhail Gorbachev a number of questions concerning various aspects of the internal and foreign policy of the CPSU.*

**Mikhail Gorbachev:** Friends, I would like once again to welcome the initiative of the France-USSR Society which you call Initiative-87. I want to do this not only because of politeness and hospitality, but also to emphasise the great political meaning of this initiative.

Upon taking a look at the present-day world, I would say that concern is characteristic of it, concern over a direction in which the world is going or, maybe, to be more exact, what will be the direction in which the world, which is now at a crossroads, will go? Whether it will go along the road of further confrontation and tension or along the road of search, even if a difficult one, for peace, co-operation and mutual understanding.

Modern imperatives are such that it is not only politicians, and not so much politicians,

that will be further determining the direction of world processes concerning mankind's survival and preservation. For sure, the voice of the public, of world public opinion, of various political forces irrespective of their class content, will sound increasingly louder with every passing day, with every stage.

In this sense I regard the Initiative-87 as a big political initiative deserving support. We view it as a desire to join in the search for ways to mutual understanding, co-operation, the development of relations, to considerate attitude to one another, and to a change of the entire atmosphere. Those changes could afterwards transform into a policy, too, and thereby ensure a new character and type of international relations.

The whole tradition of our foreign policy stems from Lenin. This is people's diplomacy. When we are accused of propaganda, I cannot agree with that. It is something different if some of our steps, our appeals to the peoples, to public opinion produce some propaganda effect. We proceed from realities. From the fact that a new type of international relations cannot be built now without the involvement of public forces, the peoples themselves.

The politicians who will take this into account will receive the support of the peoples. And, on the contrary, those who will ignore the opinion of the masses or who will engage in politicking, and politicking always involves deceit, will be short lived politically. I am deeply confident of that.

It is on this plane, from these positions that I perceive your Initiative-87. I think this is a good example to all countries, to the public of other countries, including the Soviet Union. I feel in this initiative the mood of the French people. This is the main thing.

I was very glad to hear what was said here, as I understand, on behalf of the whole delegation, and on its instruction, by Madeleine Gilbert, Executive President of the France-USSR Society whom we already know. Her contribution to Soviet-French friendship is highly appreciated in the Soviet Union. The statements by all the other participants in the meeting were also interesting and pithy. They voiced the desire to understand what is taking place in the Soviet Union, our intentions and plans both in home policy and in international affairs. I also heard words of support for our efforts in both directions. I thank you for that.

Recently I have finished a book on perestroika and new thinking. It sums up to some degree all that has been thought over, undertaken and made in these years. It also deals with plans for the future.

In a short preface to the reader I said that we, the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people, want to be correctly understood by all nations, Europeans in the first place. They are our natural neighbours. We have a common history with them, a common fate and, hopefully, a common happy future in our European house. We want to be correctly understood in our plans concerning the restructuring, new thinking and concerning our foreign policy. We feel appreciation when the French representatives speak here with understanding about our home and foreign policy, even more than with understanding, with sympathy, solidarity and support from the whole pluralistic complex which is present here.

Here I am going over to the next theme which you are interested in and want to understand better before returning to France. I mean perestroika.

Perestroika is our internal matter. It was born out of internal demands of our country. It is not an invention or some fancy idea which crossed the mind of a group of people who, all of a sudden, decided that some perestroika was needed. No, life itself led us to perestroika.

You already know a lot. You heard a lot and will hear even more. I do not want to dwell upon the details of perestroika. I want to let you into our plans. This will be shorter and, maybe, more convincing.

We take pride in our history, we take pride in our revolution the way France takes pride in its own, French Revolution. At one with France we take pride in the French Revolution. It was an immense contribution to the history of the French people. The October Revolution made it possible to take our country from the difficult situation in which it found itself at the beginning of the 20th century. Over the 70 years we have traversed a long road. It is precisely due to the revolution, due to the fact that the choice was made in favour of socialism, that the Soviet Union has become a country you see today. It is a modern state which has immense achievements. It is a society possessing a huge political, intellectual, scientific and natural potential. But it is a society which has many problems. There are problems in the political process, in the development of our democracy. There are problems in the social sphere and in the economy. Problems also exist in the spiritual sphere, in the sphere of moral philosophy and morality. Restructuring is called upon to resolve and remove the problems and contradictions that have accumulated, to enable socialism to develop a second breath — for the good of the people and on the basis of the socialist values.

We are not being cunning — either with our own people or with the people in other countries. We continue developing and strengthening socialism. We shall be modernising the economy on the basis of socialist principles. We shall be developing the process of democracy on the basis of socialist principles. We shall preserve social protection of our people which is characteristic of socialist society.

Today we are not satisfied either with the level of the country's development or with the situation in the country. We want to have a better society in all respects. However, even today a Soviet citizen is well protected socially. His right to work is guaranteed. He has access to housing, although there are a lot of problems here. It should be borne in mind that housing is free or inexpensive. Education, secondary and higher, is free. So is health care. This is what creates social guarantees and ensures man's confidence.

The principle of socialism — from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work — operates on the basis of these guarantees. For the time being we are unable to provide what the future society — communism — will provide: to each according to his needs. Hence, there can be only one criterion — according to one's work, one's talent, one's contribution to the development of the country's economy. These principles have been tested by our experience and they are working.

We are not giving up socialism. We want to make it better. Therefore we say: more socialism. We are not giving up our democracy. But we are speaking about using the possibilities of exactly socialist democracy.

The distinctive feature of socialist democracy is, above all, that it ensures the decisive say of working people, of the demos, the people. Well, this is insufficient now, we believe. Therefore we are unfolding processes of democracy, openness. Such processes that would embrace both the Party and the political system as a whole, the public organisations and the economy. We want the working people at the enterprise to feel themselves the real masters, that they are to elect the managers, starting from the foreman to the enterprise director, we want them, on having formed a council, to decide questions of planning, determine prospects of their development, to participate in the distribution of profits; to resolve social issues. This is how we intend to advance the process

of democracy, to deepen and broaden it.

When the question is asked about the limits of the reconstruction drive, about the limits of public openness, the limits of democracy within the framework of the process which we are unfolding, we say: all that strengthens socialism, including public openness, democracy, should be supported and welcomed. But exactly all that strengthens socialism. But if — and we are already encountering that — somebody in the country or beyond it, wants to use our openness to instigate extremist elements, anti-socialist elements, and there are such elements, though this phenomenon is not so widespread and is not so extensive, we instantly say openly: no, we shall allow nobody to act against socialism. Everything will be done for socialism to strengthen. Those who entertain hopes for democracy and reconstruction to lead to a social and political turnabout in the Soviet Union, are mistaken. Such expectations are expectations in vain and the matter here is not what leadership we have — radical or less radical, revolutionary or less revolutionary. Ninety per cent of our people were born and grew up under socialism. They shall not waive its gains. Look how they are following the assertion of openness, the unfolding of the process of democracy. How they are trying to see to it that individual activity should not lead to a hoarding mentality, to private-owner psychology, that the spread of co-operatives should not lead to grubbing habits, to stripping the working class through high prices of co-operative products. They do not want those who dislike socialism to use the democratic process to smear our system. And we are encountering such attempts. Struggle is being waged against them, just as against those who would like to put a brake on democracy, since it hits out at the privileges which they arrogated; those who are accustomed to hold power and command the people.

The reorganisation is a very complex and deep process which the Party, the entire society and all its sections have joined in. The whole of our society will undergo changes in the powerful crucible of the reorganisation and will acquire a new quality in truly human dimension, in the interests of the working people.

The working people's interests are the main criterion of the entire reorganisation process. Such are our plans. All the rest are details. Is everything successful in this country in this respect? Not at all everything is such. Is everything proceeding so easily and simply? No, it is not. It is often asked is there political opposition to the reorganisation process? There is no political opposition in the Soviet Union.

Opposition and brakes and the very mechanism of braking are within ourselves. I do not exclude myself. The working people and the working class are fully and resolutely in favour of the reorganisation. They urge us and urge vigorously. They monitor the process and the attitude of the leadership all the time. The following impulse reaches us all the time: not to retreat, and not to slow down, not to stop, and proceed ahead however difficult it would be. The people, the workers, and the working class have the most revolutionary attitude in the sphere of the reorganisation. Herein is the strength of our policy.

If we suggested a policy which the people and first of all the working class would not respond to, such a policy would be doomed to failure. Good wishes can be wrapped into the best propaganda packages — the art of rhetoric in our age progresses rapidly, quite often, it is true, for the sole purpose of concealing the truth, rather than revealing and honestly presenting it.

But no rhetoric, no political contrivances will deceive the people. The people are siding with the reorganisation process. This is a decisive guarantee.

We think: why is it that the processes of

perfecting Soviet society were broken off earlier at some stages. All the time the Soviet society has been progressing but it could have attained a higher level in the sense of social, political, cultural, scientific and technological progress.

Why did the initiatives, and big ones, too, break down? This is how it was in pre-war and post-war time, particularly since the 20th Congress of the Party. A good deal of effort was made at that time but those efforts were not carried through. They proved half-and-half ones. Why did it happen so? We are very much concerned with this question. For history should be actually studied in order to draw certain lessons from it.

The chief lesson is that the processes which originated in the past and the attempts at reforms concerning political, economic and social spheres were not substantiated by the broadening and development of democracy and by drawing the entire society and the working people themselves into the processes through the mechanisms of democracy. This is the main cause of setbacks in the past.

Socialism is such a social system under which the working man should be the chief character. And when the initiatives, reforms, plans, and programmes were not backed up by further development and deepening of democracy, they petered out.

This is why we are so attentive to the processes of openness and democracy. Reorganisation without democracy and openness is doomed to failure. The "more socialism, more democracy" formula expresses the essence of our platform. It embodies the main idea. More socialism means that everything should be done and reorganised on the principles of socialism. More democracy means that everything should be done with the participation of the people.

These are our plans. On this I end my explanation of what perestroika is and how we understand it. The rest is only a manifestation of these plans in different fields. Maybe, some things are done more successfully and some less so, some things are done faster and some slower. This is already a question of struggle.

We have started perestroika on the initiative of the Party and with the Party. And we believe that the Party must spearhead this process. The Party formulated the policy of perestroika, created the political and moral atmosphere in society through openness and democracy. At the stage of implementing perestroika the Party will do everything to ensure the advance of this process. You might say: does everyone understand and feel perestroika deeply enough; is everyone, so to say, actively involved in perestroika? No, this is a process. I can only say that perestroika is gaining momentum.

You asked me to speak about the new thinking and our foreign policy initiatives. You are basically familiar with them. This makes my task easier. Here I also want to speak about our plans, our view of the present-day world. It is this view that is underlying our initiatives. Each of them taken separately is, so to say, an isolated case. But taken together they give an idea of our world outlook and our approaches to world politics.

I think that in world developments and processes we have approached a stage when new attitudes are needed. Any crisis phenomena, tension and situations of confrontation, in my view, are due to attempts to approach absolutely new problems on the basis of attitudes of the 1940s and even 1930s, from imperial positions. At one time there was a group of countries which had their empires and pursued their foreign policy accordingly. There was a group of countries which tried to use military and economic superiority to pursue foreign policy from the position of strength. It is no use looking for answers to new questions in speeches by Churchill and Truman — I mean the notorious Fulton speech. Neither are attempts to look for answers in the speeches by latter-day politicians



of any use. There is no time to be wasted.

The nuclear threat has become a reality. War should be ruled out as a means for resolving political issues. Clausewitz's formula to the effect that war is a continuation of policy by other means no longer applies.

Problems of ecology have put a very firm grip on us. Co-operation is a must here. And still even today resources of the Earth are being plundered on all continents. Finally, take scientific and technological progress. It has brought all peoples and countries closer together. Enormous structural changes are under way and they produce immense social and political consequences. Take information. Even today information media can be manipulated in such a way as to complicate the situation in the world.

The list of new problems and new realities could be extended. They demand correct perception and co-operation. They are making us seek new approaches to the way international relations are built. This is why we are saying that a new thinking is a must. It is not a mere phrase either.

We have taken a step toward the new thinking not only in the sense of philosophy, not only in the sense of proclaiming a policy, but also in the sense of concrete steps and initiatives. They demonstrate that from philosophy, statements and declarations we are switching to a real policy in foreign affairs — to the construction of a world on the principles of new thinking.

The initial reaction in the world to all of our statements that we are living in a contradictory, yet an interrelated and integral world and that, despite all contradictions, we should rise to the new thinking was as follows: utopia. What you see, they used to say, is a new leadership with little experience in politics and it, so to say, has followed the path of the French and English utopians.

By the way, I'm against a disrespectful attitude to the French and English utopians. They engendered creative ideas in humanitarian thinking, man's thinking and in politics. Their heritage continues playing its progressive role to date.

But that's another point. What we are offering is not utopia. We are offering a realistic philosophy and realistic initiatives. I believe that such a policy will be forcefully making its way forward. Primarily because nations are tired of tension, the burden of militarisation and confrontation. This is a matter that concerns not only adults, but also children. And we have felt that.

Politicians, analysing what the new Soviet initiatives mean and carry with them, do so primarily from the point of view: will it not undermine their interests? As for peoples, they felt with their common sense and intuition that the policy based on new thinking was exactly what the present world needed.

Speaking of interests, is it possible to build international relations in the interests of Britain or in the interests of only the Soviet Union, France or the USA? No, there will be neither international peace nor international co-operation. A balance of interests is needed. This means that it is necessary to meet each other halfway, to make some concessions. We all stand to gain eventually. This is a difficult process.

The developing countries also have their interests which need to be taken into account. Today, relations between developed countries, to which France belongs, and the developing world are not equal. Cheap labour and cheap natural resources are used through transnationals. Due to this capitalism is manoeuvring and maintaining the standard of living of the working people. Meantime, there is hunger, disease and poverty on continents populated by 2.5 billion people. Task: is this normal?

On the other hand, one state has resources while another does not. So, does the new thinking, advocated by Gorbachev, mean an

undermining of all world economic ties? It would be a gamble. But the world economic ties need to be perfected, and in interrelationship with disarmament which releases huge resources, at that. The slogan "disarmament for development" must attain real forms.

The new thinking, when it is translated into reality, gives an opportunity to raise many issues and questions. It enables us to find solutions through scientific and technological progress, through a new economic order, sensible rather than egoistical policy, through compromises and mutual interest.

You are interested in questions related to the disarmament complex. We ourselves attach great, priority significance to this complex of world issues. We believe that disarmament is a top priority issue. Yes, there are regional problems, economic and ecological problems. All of them are important. One cannot dissociate oneself from them, brush them aside. But there is a threat of a nuclear war. This is the danger which we feel and, I believe, everybody feels now. A nuclear conflict can break out without any political solutions. Given the stockpiles of nuclear weapons, it can break out uncontrolledly. Therefore, we need to stop the process of the arms race and get down to disarmament.

When we proposed the 15-year programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons we travelled from several basic premises. The first one is as follows: security can be only equal. Efforts to outwit each other, to achieve superiority are fraught with serious consequences. And this is impermissible.

I told Mr Reagan both in Geneva and Reykjavik: we do not want the United States of America to feel less secure than the Soviet Union does. We would not stand to gain from such a situation, for it would be a continuing concern for the American Administration. It would start seeking ways for tackling that problem and this would lead to a disruption of political stability. As a result there would be no trust at all. This is why we want equal security both for ourselves and for America. And we hope you will understand why we formulate the question that way.

In precisely the same manner, we never forget the interests and security of other nations, including — naturally enough — all European nations, when we and America are tackling some issues jointly. We are very punctual and scrupulous in everything as regards our policy with respect to European countries. We are living here, we have been linked for many centuries, we are going to live together with those nations in the future and co-operate with them. I dwell in detail on that matter in the French Parliament. There, I spoke about the common European home. I discussed that matter in detail with your president. We have good relations and maintain a good dialogue with Mr Mitterand. I highly value that dialogue. He is a major political figure of the contemporary world.

If you read the January 1986 statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee you will see: it considers in detail how the process of nuclear disarmament of the USSR and the United States should proceed. But the problem of European security is present there all the time. The statement touches upon problems of chemical weapons, the reduction of conventional armaments and the number of troops. Everything has been calculated in such a way as to preserve a balance and equal security at every stage so that no one should feel threatened.

We are confident adherents of such an approach. And we shall be acting this way.

We are prepared to co-operate in all spheres. And we are persistently promoting the idea of co-operation in the humanitarian sphere in the spirit of what was agreed within the framework of the Helsinki process. Now this process is sometimes used for forcing onto other countries

through the channels of exchanges and contacts something that is unacceptable to them. We are confident that it is necessary to proceed from the fundamental and main principle — the political and social choice of every nation should be respected.

We trust the choice made by the French people. It is up to it which government to have. We shall do business with France the way it is. We shall co-operate with the French Government that exists there. Generally speaking, we respect the values which are respected by a people itself.

But we have a right to say that we expect respect for our values and our choice. We made our choice seventy years ago. We have been proceeding along our road. We have achieved a good deal, although sustained tremendous losses and made big errors. We draw conclusions, learn, and want to make our society better. But this is our cause and our endeavour. When attempts are made to plant unacceptable-to-us values through humanitarian contacts, we reject that. We consider that as interference in our affairs.

Let every people profess its own ideology and its beliefs. It is the affair of each people to decide what kind of government, political institutions, and morality it wants to have. If these principles are observed, vast possibilities for co-operation open up.

As far as the humanitarian sphere is concerned, we have suggested: let us gather in Moscow for a conference on humanitarian issues. We have got something to say on this score to the whole world. We hope that France will support this idea.

In the humanitarian sphere, there are private, personal problems pertaining to people's families and relatives, and other problems. We consider them, resolve them, and will continue to resolve them.

As far as departures from our country are concerned, we have the only obstacle and restriction on this score: if a person was connected with state secrets and if his departure may do a certain damage to the security of the state. When the secrets get outdated, the person may leave.

Here I approach the subject to which I would like to draw your attention. The bourgeois press of France — like no other press in the Western world in the past and particularly now that such changes take place in the Soviet Union — acts from most rabid anti-Soviet positions.

It is no wonder that French people develop prejudices with regard to the Soviet Union. If a person is told one and the same thing day in and day out and every hour, he or she begins to believe that this is exactly so. I told Mr Mitterand and Mr Chirac about this.

We appreciate the political dialogue with the leadership of France. We value kind relations imbued with human sentiments between our peoples. In this context we cannot understand the atmosphere which is cultivated in France with regard to the Soviet Union.

French people visit our country and know the truth about our life, about Soviet people's attitude to the French people. What is the matter? Why does the French press stick to positions which are hostile to us? Apparently, the internal political struggle tells of its stand.

The bourgeois press now wants either to pass over in silence or distort the picture of the processes taking place in the Soviet Union and to weaken the impact of socialist ideas, to prevent people from realising that socialism has the ability for self-development and self-perfection.

The adversaries of socialism have long discarded socialism and consigned it to the dust-heap of history but it turns out that it is capable of developing and even gathers strength. This is, may be, the root-cause of the matter. This is, of course, your concern but we cannot but take into

(continued on back page)

## MIKHAIL GORBACHEV'S SPEECH IN MURMANSK

(continued from page 357)

And this is a very interesting moment, an interesting phenomenon. This confirms the fact that we are dealing with yesterday's rhetoric, while real-life processes have been set into motion. This means that something is indeed changing. One of the elements of the change is that it is now hard to convince people that our foreign policy, the policy of the Soviet Union, our initiatives, our nuclear-free world programme are mere "propaganda".

A new, democratic philosophy of international relations of world politics is breaking through. The new mode of thinking with its humane, universal criteria and values is penetrating inside diverse strata. Its strength is in being concordant with people's common sense.

Considering that world public opinion, the peoples of the world are very concerned about the situation in the world, our policy is an invitation to dialogue, to a search, to a better world, to normalised international relations. This is why despite all attempts to besmirch and belittle our foreign policy initiatives, they are making their way in the world because they are consonant with the mood among the broad masses of working people and with the mood in realistic political circles in the West.

### Reykjavik

Favourable trends are gaining in strength in inter-state relations as well. The substantive and frank East-West dialogue, far from being without results for both sides, has become a characteristic trait of contemporary world politics. Quite recently the entire world welcomed the agreement reached at the talks in Washington, to draft an accord on medium- and shorter-range missiles within the briefest possible time to be then signed at the highest level. Thus, we are close to a major step in the field of real nuclear disarmament.

If it is made, it will be a first step for the post-war years. As yet the arms race has proceeded either unimpeded or with some limitations, but no concrete move has as yet been made towards disarmament, towards eliminating nuclear weapons.

The road towards the mutual Soviet-American decision was hard. Reykjavik was a pivotal event along that path. Life has confirmed the correctness of our assessment of the meeting in the Icelandic capital. Contrary to panic wavering of all sorts, sceptical declarations and propaganda tooting about the "failure", developments have started moving in the direction blazed by Reykjavik.

And they have borne out the correctness of the judgement we expressed, as you remember, just 40 minutes after the dramatic end to the meeting.

Reykjavik indeed became a turning-point in world history, it showed a possibility of improving the international situation. A different situation has emerged and none could act after Reykjavik as if nothing had happened. It was for us an event that confirmed the correctness of our course, the need for and constructiveness of new political thinking.

Full use of the potential created in Reykjavik is yet to be made. Gleams have emerged, however, not only in the field of medium- and shorter-range missiles. Movement has become apparent on the question of banning nuclear testing. Full-scale talks on these problems will soon be started. It is obvious that our moratorium was not in vain. This was not an easy step for us either. It engendered and intensified worldwide demands for an end to the tests.

I can't undertake to predict the course of events. Far from everything depends on us. There is no doubt that the first results achieved in Washington recently and the forthcoming meeting with the President of the United States

may cause a kind of peaceful "chain reaction" in the field of strategic offensive arms and non-launching of weapons into outer space as well as in many other issues which insistently ask to be put on the agenda of international dialogue.

So, there are signs of an improvement of the international situation but, I repeat, there are also disquieting aspects which are fraught with a sharp aggravation of the situation in the world.

It would be irresponsible on our part to underestimate the forces of resistance to changes. Those are influential and very aggressive forces blinded by hatred for everything progressive. They exist in various quarters of the Western world but the largest concentration of them is observed among those who directly cater for the military-industrial complex ideologically and politically and live off it.

Here is a recent meaningful example. A series of hearings on the subject "The Economic Reforms of Gorbachev" began at the Joint Economic Committee of the US Congress on September 10, with Senators and Congressmen participating.

The hearings are both open and closed-door ones. Speakers include representatives of the administration and analysts-sovietologists from the Central Intelligence Agency, the US Department of Defense and from various scientific centres.

This in general is quite normal and even good that in America officials at such level want to gain a thorough understanding of what takes place in the Soviet Union and what our reorganisation means for the rest of the world and for the United States itself.

### International arena

Various views are expressed, including diametrically opposite ones. There is a good deal of sensible and objective in them. Some of them can be debated in earnest. There would be no harm in listening to some things in them. The committee members also heard an opinion that the United States "should welcome the reorganisation" because it would lead to a reduced risk of nuclear clash. All this is taking place at these hearings and discussions.

But different kinds of recommendations are also being offered at these hearings to the Administration and to the Congress. Here is one of such recommendations nearly word for word: if the Soviet Union attains the targets planned by the 27th Congress of the CPSU, that would first of all, enhance its prestige in the international arena, and heighten the CPSU's authority inside the country and abroad — thereby increase the threat to US national security.

Another recommendation runs as follows: success of the reorganisation may weaken the political and economic unity of Western Europe, for the USSR would reach its market. The USSR's political influence in the developing countries would gain in scope, since Soviet military and other aid to them may be increased, and some of them would want to adopt the model of the Soviet economy if it proves competitive with regard to the US economy.

And yet another recommendation: the reorganisation is dangerous because it would strengthen the Soviet Union's positions in international financial and economic organisations.

Those analysts perceive a particular threat in the Soviet Union's increased influence in the world arena connected with its initiatives in the field of arms control as well as with the prospect of signing a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles.

Just listen at what conclusion is drawn as a result: a failure of the socio-economic

policy being pursued by the Soviet Union under the leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet Government would accord with US national interests.

In order to "facilitate" such a failure it is recommended as follows: to speed up the programmes of costly ABM systems under SDI and draw the USSR into the arms race in order to hinder its restructuring, to allocate still more funds for the development of expensive high-accuracy weapons and space-based military systems for the same purpose, to increase the amount of military and other aid to groups and regimes which actively fight against the governments of the countries supported by the Soviet Union, to counteract the establishment of economic and trade contacts by the USSR with other countries and international organisations, fully to rule out a possibility of transfer of advanced technology to the USSR and other socialist countries, and to toughen control over the activities of COCOM and of its member-countries.

Such are the views expressed overtly and cynically. We cannot but take into account such stance. They are also backed by certain forces, above all by the military-industrial complex. The more so as assurances of peaceableness which we often hear from US officials are immediately accompanied, at one go, so to speak, with praise of "power politics" and with arguments very similar to those being used by the authors of the recommendations which I just mentioned.

### Three continents

Militarist and anti-Soviet forces are clearly concerned lest the interest among the people and political quarters of the West in what is happening in the Soviet Union today and the growing understanding of its foreign policy erase the artificially created "image of the enemy" — an image which they have been exploiting unabashedly for scores of years. Well, it's their business after all. But we shall firmly follow the road of restructuring and new thinking.

Comrades, speaking in Murmansk, the capital of the Soviet transpolar region, it is appropriate to have a look at the idea of co-operation between all people also from the standpoint of the situation in the northern part of this planet. In our opinion, there are several weighty reasons for that.

The Arctic is not only the Arctic Ocean, but also the northern tips of three continents: Europe, Asia and America. It is the point where the Euro-Asian, North American and Asian-Pacific regions meet, where the frontiers come close to one another and the interests of states, both belonging to the opposing military alliances and not parties to them, overlap.

The north is also a problem of security for the Soviet Union, for its northern frontiers. In this respect we have some historical experience which cost us dearly. Residents of Murmansk remember well the years 1918-1919 and 1941-1945.

The wars fought during this century proved to be a grave trial for the countries of northern Europe proper. And, it seems to us, they have drawn some serious conclusions for themselves. Evidently this is the reason why the public climate in those countries is more receptive to the new political thinking.

It is significant that the historic Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe was held in one of the northern capitals — Helsinki. It is significant that another major step in the development of that process — the first ever accord on confidence-building measures reached in principle — was made in another northern capital — Stockholm. Reykjavik has become a symbol of hope that nuclear weapons are not an

eternal evil and that mankind is not doomed to live under that sword of Damocles.

Major initiatives in the sphere of international security and disarmament are linked with the names of famous political figures of northern Europe. One is Urho Kekkonen. Another is Olof Palme whose death at the hands of a vile assassin left Soviet people shocked. One more is Kalevi Sorsa who has headed the Consultative Council of the Socialist International for many years now. We hail the activities of the authoritative World Commission on Environment and Development headed by Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland of Norway.

The Soviet Union duly appraises the fact that Denmark and Norway, while being members of NATO, unilaterally refused to locate foreign military bases and deploy nuclear weapons on their territory in peacetime. This stance, if consistently adhered to, is important for lessening tensions in Europe.

However, this is only part of the picture.

The community and interrelationship of the interests of our entire world can be felt better in the northern part of the Earth, in the Arctic perhaps more than anywhere else. For the Arctic and the northern Atlantic are not only the 'weather kitchen', the point where cyclones and anticyclones are born to influence the climate in Europe, the US and Canada, even in south Asia and Africa. At the same time one can feel here an ice-cold breath of the "polar strategy" of the Pentagon. An immense potential of nuclear destruction concentrated aboard submarines and surface ships affects the political climate of the entire world and can, in its turn, detonate from an accidental politico-military shock in any other region of the world.

## Co-operation

The militarisation of that part of the world is acquiring a threatening character. One cannot but feel concern over the fact that NATO, in case of an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles, is getting ready to train for using sea- and air-based cruise missiles from the northern Atlantic. This would mean an additional threat both to us and to all the countries of northern Europe.

A new radar, one of the elements of the "Star Wars" programme, has been made operational in Greenland in violation of the ABM Treaty. US Cruise missiles are tested in the north of Canada. The Canadian Government itself has recently worked out a large programme for forces build-up in the Arctic. The United States' and NATO's military activity in districts adjoining the Soviet Arctic areas is being enhanced. The level of NATO military presence in Norway and Denmark is being built up.

Therefore, staying in Murmansk, on the threshold of the Arctic and the North Atlantic, I would like to invite, above all, countries of the region to the discussion of security questions long ripe here.

How do we visualise this? It is possible to take simultaneously the roads of bilateral and multilateral co-operation. I had an opportunity to speak on the subject of "our common European home" more than once. The potential of contemporary civilisation enables us to make the Arctic habitable to the benefit of the national economy and other interests of humanity and near-Arctic states, to the benefit of Europe and the entire international community. And security problems that have accumulated in the area should above all be resolved for this purpose.

The Soviet Union is for a radical lowering of the level of military confrontation in the region. Let the north of the globe, the Arctic, become a zone of peace. Let the North Pole be a pole of peace. We suggest that all countries

concerned should embark on talks on the limitation and scaling down of military activity in the north as a whole, in both the eastern and the western hemispheres.

What, specifically, do we mean?

First. A nuclear weapon-free zone in northern Europe. If such a decision was adopted, the Soviet Union, as it has been already declared, would be prepared to act as a guarantor. It would depend on the participating countries as to how this guarantee should be formalised: by multilateral or bilateral agreements, governmental statements, or in some other way.

The Soviet Union simultaneously reaffirms its readiness to discuss with each of the countries concerned or a group of countries all the problems related to the creation of a nuclear-free zone, including possible measures applicable to Soviet territory. We could go sufficiently far, for instance, remove submarines equipped with ballistic missiles from the Soviet Baltic Fleet.

As is known, the Soviet Union had earlier unilaterally dismantled launchers of medium-range missiles in the Kola peninsula and the greater part of launchers of such missiles on the remaining territory of the Leningrad and Baltic military districts. A considerable number of shorter-range missiles were removed from those districts. The holding of military exercises was restricted in areas close to the borders of Scandinavian countries. Additional opportunities for military detente in the area will open up after the conclusion of the agreement on "global double zero".

## Confidence-building

Second. We welcome the initiative of Finland's President Mauno Koivisto about restricting naval activity in the seas washing northern Europe. On its part, the Soviet Union proposes consultations between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO on the restriction of military activity and scaling down of the naval and airforce activities in the Baltic, North, Norwegian and Greenland Seas and the spread of confidence-building measures to these areas.

These measures could include arrangements on the limitation of rivalry in anti-submarine weapons, notification of large naval and airforce exercises, invitation of observers from all countries participating in the European process to large naval and airforce exercises.

This could be an initial step to the spread of confidence-building measures to the entire Arctic, to northern areas in both hemispheres.

At the same time we propose to consider the question of banning naval activity in mutually agreed-upon zones of international straits and in intensive shipping lanes in general. A meeting of representatives of countries concerned could be held for this purpose, for instance, in Leningrad.

The following thought suggests itself in connection with the idea of a nuclear-free zone. At present the Nordic countries, that is Iceland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland have no nuclear weapons. We are aware of their concern over the fact that we have a testing range for nuclear explosions on Novaya Zemlya.

We are thinking how to solve this problem, which is a difficult one for us because so much money has been invested in the testing range. But frankly speaking, the problem could be solved once and for all if the United States agreed to stop nuclear tests or, as a beginning, to reduce to the barest minimum their number and yield.

Third. The Soviet Union attaches much importance to peaceful co-operation in developing the resources of the north, the Arctic. Here an exchange of experience and knowledge is extremely important. Through joint efforts it could be possible to work out an overall concept of rationally developing northern areas. We propose, for instance, to reach agreement on the

working out of a single energy programme for the north of Europe. According to existing data, the reserves there of such energy carriers as oil and gas are truly boundless. But their extraction entails immense difficulties and the need to create unique technical installations capable of standing up to the polar elements. And it would be more reasonable to pool forces in this endeavour, this helping to cut both material and other outlays. We have an interest in drawing, for instance, Canada and Norway into the creation of mixed firms and enterprises for extracting oil and gas on the shelf of our northern seas. We are prepared for relevant talks with other states as well.

We are also prepared for joint work to utilise the resources of the Kola peninsula, to carry out other major business projects in most diverse forms, including joint enterprises.

Fourth. The scientific study of the Arctic is of immense importance for the whole of mankind. We have a wealth of experience here and are prepared to share it. In turn, we are interested in the studies conducted in other sub-arctic and northern countries. We already have a programme of scientific exchanges with Canada.

We propose to hold in 1988 a conference of sub-arctic states to coordinate research in the Arctic. The conference could study the question of setting up a joint Arctic scientific council. Should the partners agree, Murmansk could serve as the venue for the conference.

Questions connected with the interests of the indigenous population of the north, the study of its ethnic specificities and the development of cultural ties between northern peoples require special attention.

Fifth. We attach special importance to the co-operation of the Nordic countries in environmental protection. The urgency of this is obvious. It would be worthwhile to apply the experience of joint measures to protect the marine environment of the Baltic, now carried out by a commission of seven littoral states, to the entire oceanic and sea surface of our planet's north.

## Our proposals

The Soviet Union proposes jointly to work out a single comprehensive plan of protecting the nature of the north. The north European countries could set an example to others by reaching agreement on the establishment of a system to monitor the state of the natural environment and radiation safety in the region. We must hasten to protect the nature of the tundra and forest tundra, of the northern forest areas.

Sixth. The shortest sea route from Europe to the Far East and the Pacific Ocean passes through the Arctic. I think that depending on progress in the normalisation of international relations we could open the north sea route to foreign ships with us providing the services of ice-breakers.

Such are our proposals. Such is the concrete content of Soviet foreign policy in the northern direction. Such are our intentions and plans for the future. Of course, safeguarding security and developing co-operation in the north is an international matter and depends by far not on us alone. We are ready to discuss any counter-proposals and ideas. The main thing is to strive for the climate here to be determined by the warm gulfstream of the CSCE process and not by the polar chill of accumulated suspicions and prejudices.

What everybody can be absolutely certain about is the Soviet Union's profound and definite interest in preventing the north of the planet, its polar and sub-polar regions and all Nordic countries from ever again becoming an arena of war and in forming there a genuine zone of peace and fruitful interaction. □

# Joint Soviet-Brazilian Communiqué

A JOINT Soviet-Brazilian communiqué issued in Brasilia on October 1 upon the conclusion of an official visit to Brazil by Eduard Shevardnadze, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, points out with satisfaction the strengthening of the tendency toward intensification, widening and deepening of Soviet-Brazilian interstate relations.

The communiqué emphasises that serious efforts on the part of all governments are needed to resolve the cardinal problems agitating humanity, above all, in the direction of disarmament, consolidation of peace and international security. In this connection the sides confirmed complete support for the United Nations Organisation, its goals and principles, and declared that they view the United Nations Organisation as an important instrument for the peaceful settlement of contemporary international disputes and crises.

The sides emphasised that the preservation of human civilisation and the building of a nuclear-weapons-free and non-violent world are the key questions of the present epoch, and confirmed the need to take concrete and urgent measures to achieve general and complete disarmament under effective international control. The ministers proclaimed the priority of nuclear disarmament and the need for bilateral talks in this field to be supplemented with efforts exerted at numerous forums on disarmament. The ministers proclaimed an urgent necessity for holding talks to draw up a treaty on a general and complete ban on nuclear weapon tests, and declared for an early con-

clusion of the convention on banning and elimination of chemical weapons on an equal and non-discriminatory basis.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR spoke in detail of the importance of the accord reached in principle concerning the forthcoming signing of an agreement on the complete elimination of Soviet and US medium and shorter-range missiles. Thereby the physical elimination of part of the nuclear arsenals would be effected for the first time. Soviet-US full-scale bilateral talks on limiting and ultimately completely terminating nuclear tests, the talks which are agreed to begin as early as this year, would be also of practical importance.

Eduard Shevardnadze pointed out that exact observance of the ABM Treaty was a logical and indispensable prerequisite for preventing an arms race in outer space, and for deep cuts in strategic offensive arms. The Soviet side explained the essence of the proposals which it had put forward to establish a world space organisation as well as to set up an international centre, with the participation of leading spacefaring powers, for joint research and for

development of specimens of space technology on orders placed by the developing countries, the centre at which a proving ground for the launching of space objects would function. It was emphasised that the implementation of these proposals could become an important stage in building the foundations of "Star Peace".

The sides agreed that the Antarctic Treaty and agreements supplementing it had ensured over two-and-a-half decades the maintenance of peace in Antarctica, of its non-nuclear status, the preservation of the environment, and fruitful development of international co-operation in the area, thereby promoting the attainment of the goals and implementation of the principles of the United Nations Charter. In view of this the sides declared in favour of strengthening and perfecting this international mechanism.

The ministers reaffirmed that international terrorism in all its manifestations posed a serious threat to the cause of peace, security and co-operation among nations. They strongly condemned any terrorist activity and came out for more active co-operation between countries with a view to taking measures in accordance with international law to eradicate terrorism. □

## Nikolai Ryzhkov's message to international space forum

I GREET the participants in the Moscow International Space Forum, timed to coincide with a memorable anniversary. Thirty years ago, the Soviet Union launched the world's first artificial Earth satellite: the fruit of the dedicated efforts by scientists, engineers and workers.

The satellite opened a new stage in civilisation, and unheard-of horizons before humanity.

Space knows no state frontiers. Space exploration presupposes international co-operation. The world space effort is called upon to help settle many global problems for all nations' sake.

Space research and exploitation is ever more of an international task. The Soviet Union and all other nations welcomed Yuri Gagarin's flight, which started manned space ventures, and the first steps Neil Armstrong made on the moon.

The Soviet Union actively supports international co-operation in using space for peaceful purposes. The Vega Project and international crews of Salyut and Mir orbital stations are fine examples of such co-operation. We firmly oppose space militarisation.

We shall not relent our efforts in support of international space co-operation and of its emergent patterns, like the World Space Organisation, which can later join the United Nations as an autonomous part. I hope this forum will do its bit for the noble cause.

As we see it, it is high time now for international co-operation to reach a qualitatively new level, as our civilisation becomes increasingly integral and interdependent.

Our civilisation is unique: perhaps, the only one in our galaxy. To preserve it, we want stable peace all over the world. The motto of this forum, "Co-operation in Space for Peace on Earth", shows that international co-operation in

space can and must serve confidence-building and better understanding between nations and countries. That will reduce the global war danger.

Your forum is able not only to expand joint space programmes but to improve the political atmosphere on Earth. I wish it every success.

Nikolai Ryzhkov.

Chairman.

USSR Council of Ministers.

(continued from page 361)

account the real situation. I'm telling this to you as representatives of France.

If the new thinking grows stronger and co-operation gains in scope, there will emerge confidence, and all these accretions will be removed. We are realists and we are patient. We shall not abandon our policy of co-operation with France, and we count on a similar reaction on its part. And we, of course, believe in the French people.

There are matters which I will cover in my speech or speeches which I will make on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. I will give answers to some of the questions which you asked me. I'm reserving, so to say, an opportunity to answer you later during those speeches.

I'm now working on a report concerning the memorable date. Incidentally, my holiday was very fruitful. I have managed to do much. I did not even go to a distance of 100 metres away from the grounds of the house where I lived. I was fully preoccupied with thinking the situation over, with thinking over our present-day and future actions, and worked on some problems, including a report on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. Much of what I have told you will be in it. Something I did not tell you will be in it, too.

Thank you for the meeting. I was wholeheartedly gratified, not only from the political point of view but from the human one, too, to meet with representatives of France. I wish your mission, which I highly appreciate, to be completed successfully.

The meeting was attended by Anatoli Dobrynin, Vadim Zagladin, Anatoli Kovalev, Valentina Tereshkova and Viktor Karpov. □

### Mikhail Gorbachev Restructuring — a Vital Concern of the People

Speech at the 18th Congress  
of the Trade Unions of the USSR  
February 25, 1987.

Obtainable as a Novosti booklet from  
Soviet Booklets, 3 Rosary Gardens, London.  
SW7 4NW (01-373 7350).

Price 30p.

### ADVANCES OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

This fortnightly bulletin from the USSR will keep you up-to-date with the latest developments in Soviet science.

As a special introductory offer you can receive it regularly by post for 12 months for £6.00. The normal annual subscription rate is £12.00. Europe £16.00, USA and Canada \$50 airmail.

To subscribe please write to Circulation Dept (ST), 3 Rosary Gardens, London, SW7 4NW, enclosing the appropriate amount (cheque/postal order).

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