

## Soviet President and West German Chancellor hold news conference on united Germany

"YOU may count on getting interesting information," President Mikhail Gorbachev said when greeting journalists who gathered at Zheleznovodsk (North Caucasus) on July 16, for a joint news conference of the Soviet President and West German Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

In his introductory remarks, Gorbachev described the two statesmen's meeting as "integral part of the intensive quest, involving all of us at this very responsible stage of European and world development."

Chancellor Kohl pointed to the "great frankness, mutual understanding and personal sympathies," characterising the atmosphere of the talks between the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union.

He said that the sides' unity was marked by the fact that they had been able to make further progress on key issues. The West German Chancellor emphasised that there was a unique chance to secure that European countries can live freely and safely.

Kohl said that the two sides agreed that after German reunification is achieved, they would work out a treaty which would regulate German-Soviet relations "for a long time ahead and in a good-neighbourly spirit." Such a treaty would cover all fields: political relations, the economy, bilateral security, culture, science and technology.

The leaders of West Germany and the Soviet Union agreed, Kohl said, that the talks between the six foreign ministers under the two-plus-four formula should be completed by the time of the CSCE meeting in Paris in November this year.

He set out the eight main points of a joint statement.

1. German reunification involves the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany and Berlin.

2. If German reunification becomes a reality, the four powers' responsibility and their powers will be fully abrogated.

3. A reunited Germany, exercising its unlimited sovereignty, may freely and independently decide which alliances or blocs it wants to belong to.

Helmet Kohl added in this connection that a reunited Germany would become a NATO member and voiced confidence that this accorded with the opinion of the government of the GDR.

4. A reunited Germany will conclude a bilateral treaty with the Soviet Union for the withdrawal of troops from the GDR. The troop withdrawal is to be completed within three or four years.

5. NATO structures would not apply to this part of Germany as long as Soviet troops remain on the former territory of the GDR.

At the same time Kohl pointed out that the FRG's Bundeswehr and West German territorial defence units that are not part of the NATO structure can be stationed there.

6. The troops of the three Western powers may remain in Berlin as long as Soviet troops remain stationed on the former territory of the GDR.

This, according to the Federal Chancellor, should be sealed by a special treaty with the Berlin authorities.

7. The Federal Government expresses readiness during the Vienna talks to undertake to reduce the armed forces of a reunited Germany within three or four years down to 370,000 men. The cuts should be started after a Vienna treaty on reduction of conventional arms in Europe takes effect.

8. A reunited Germany will renounce the manufacture and possession of nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons and will become a party to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

Then President Mikhail Gorbachev made a statement.

Soviet-West German relations are now characterised by a high level of political dialogue, a certain degree of trust and intensive exchanges at summit level, said President Gorbachev.

"We are leaving one epoch of the development of the international situation and international relations and are entering another one. This will be an epoch of lasting peace," he said.

Touching upon the decisions of the latest NATO Council summit meeting in London, the President pointed out: "I will not say that we laud everything that we heard from London. Far from that. But still the fact that things have begun to move signifies a historic turn in the development of such a very important organisation as NATO."

He voiced hope that what was said in London would make it possible to adopt a declaration that will be endorsed by both alliances and will have an immense impact on both European and world politics.

Gorbachev noted the Soviet Union's and the Federal Republic's desire to sign an international legal document that would cancel the four powers' rights and responsibilities and thereby grant full sovereignty to a reunited Germany over determining its social development and "from the viewpoint of what alliances it

would want to participate in and what contacts to maintain."

He said the two sides thoroughly discussed matters concerning the stay of Soviet troops on German territory. Their presence, he emphasised, should not affect the sovereignty of a united Germany, but the Soviet Union's interests should be taken into account at the same time. NATO structures should not apply to the territory of the former GDR, Gorbachev said.

He also voiced hope that no nuclear weapons or foreign troops would appear on the territory following the Soviet troop withdrawal in three or four years' time.

In response to journalists' questions, Gorbachev pointed out that "very deep changes" were taking place in the Soviet Union and that it was essential to make use of the possibilities of the division of labour and of obtaining financial resources in order to overcome the difficulties.

The Soviet Union's integration into world economic relations is beneficial, advisable and necessary for other countries as well, the Soviet President said. "Western aid is not a handout," Gorbachev emphasised.

Helmut Kohl, for his part, reaffirmed that he deemed it necessary to give aid to the Soviet Union during the transitional period and stated that such aid would be an important contribution to ensuring internal stability in the Soviet Union and to maintaining peace.

Commenting at journalists' request on the military and political status of a reunited Germany, Gorbachev emphasised that the Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that a reunited Germany, after it gains full sovereignty upon the termination of the rights of the four powers, "should think everything over within the framework of newly elected bodies, parliament and government and decide on where it wants to belong."

The Soviet Union expects that the Germans who have behind them the hard, dramatic les-

*(Continued on next page)*

### Shevardnadze and Woerner end talks in Moscow

TALKS between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and visiting NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner ended in Moscow on July 14.

Asked by Soviet journalists about the content of the talks held, Shevardnadze said that they were the follow-up to the dialogue, started in December 1989, during his tour of the NATO headquarters in Brussels.

On the question of the unification of the two German states, Shevardnadze said that this issue was discussed in general.

Soviet Foreign Ministry chief spokesman Gennadi Gerasimov said that the talks dealt with relations between the two blocs against a backdrop of the changing situation in Europe.

The sides positively assessed the documents adopted at the Moscow meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation member-countries and at the London NATO Council session. □

### IN THIS ISSUE

Gorbachev and Kohl on first round of talks ..... p234

Gorbachev sums up political debate at CPSU Congress ..... p235

Congress resolution - Party tasks..... p239

Vladimir Ivashko elected CPSU deputy leader..... p240

Mikhail Gorbachev's concluding remarks at Communist Party Congress ..... p242

Statement: Towards Humane, Democratic Socialism ..... p243



# Gorbachev and Kohl on first round of talks

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV and Helmut Kohl held a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists in Moscow on July 15, after they completed the first round of Soviet-West German talks, included in the programme of a two-day working visit of the West German federal Chancellor to the USSR.

"We are attaching much importance to the working visit of the West German Federal Chancellor. It was planned as a very important stage, and, I hope, it will hold a proper place in our relations, and not only our relations. The talks have just started, and it is premature to speak about the results. However, it is clear already that our dialogue is very meaningful, the discussion is constructive and the atmosphere is good. We immediately started by tackling major problems. Personal relationship between myself and Mr Kohl make the situation easier. It is our principle not to avoid any problems, no matter how difficult they are. Today at the luncheon we discussed at least two agreements," Gorbachev said.

Helmut Kohl agreed with the high appreciation of the dialogue so far. "We began our conversation in a very intensive manner," he said. "I can only confirm what Mr President said: the talks are being held in an excellent atmosphere. We are looking forward, being aware of the importance of this history-making moment and not forgetting the past."

Responding to the question whether he expected from the West German side any statements about the strength of the allied German Armed forces, the Soviet President answered in the affirmative.

**Question: Do you share the view that relations between the future united Germany and the Soviet Union will be put on a new treaty basis as early as next year?**

**Gorbachev:** We are discussing this issue. The first real factor is the following: history proves that we should co-operate, and that this co-operation is necessary both for our two nations and the whole of Europe. The second real factor is that West Germany is the Soviet Union's biggest trade partner among East European countries. Taking into account all these factors, we have quite a number of issues to discuss. Problems are numerous, but, on the other hand, the existing ties are evidence of our potentialities. Both sides wish to give a new dimension to their relations during the settlement of the Germany's unification problem.

**Question: Did the two sides manage to bring their stands closer together, at least a little, on the problem of Germany's future in NATO?**

**Gorbachev:** We are living in a very dynamic time, when the situation changes very quickly. I am sure that the West German side is following the development of our stand. We are following the development of its stand, and we are jointly influencing in this or that way the processes taking place within NATO and the Warsaw Treaty in the context of East-West relations. Many important changes took place in this sphere during the past month or two. A new context creates opportunities for achieving new understanding, which means that we have moved 'a little' towards each other.

**Question: Did you discuss such details as a commitment on deliveries to the GDR, to the Soviet Union? How will this problem be resolved in a united Germany?**

**Kohl:** No, we have not discussed it yet, but we are going to.

**Gorbachev:** We have just come close to discussing economic matters.

**Question: Mikhail Sergeevich, you told the Congress about Western economic aid to the Soviet Union.**

**Gorbachev:** Various foundations have experience of rendering assistance. I remember a letter to Kadar from one such foundation, which gave instructions what he should do first, second and third. If we are treated in this way, it is unacceptable. Besides, we are not asking for handouts, we are carrying out a major manoeuvre, we are moving from one economic model to another, which will turn the Soviet Union towards the rest of the world. I am sure that politically and economically it is necessary not only for ourselves, but also for all other countries, including industrialised ones. The time has come for those who are capable of responding to the challenge of the time. I am stating that present-day politicians are ready to take this history-making chance. We spoke about it with the Chancellor and mentioned one more thing: we possess the reserve of knowledge and experience, which permits to compare things and to see what kind of world, a better world, we can reach.

**Question: How did the idea emerge to visit the Stavropol region?**

**Gorbachev:** With the consent of Mr Chancellor, I shall reveal a small secret. We agreed in Bonn to see each other's native places during future visits. It is nice that the old agreement will be implemented. Besides, there is a lot of fresh air in the Caucasus, which will help us think clearly. □

## Mikhail Gorbachev meets NATO Secretary General

SOVIET President Mikhail Gorbachev received NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner on July 14. The very fact that this meeting could take place in Moscow's Kremlin shows that important changes have been taking place in the world. Things that appeared unthinkable and impossible quite recently have become part of a real world process. The limits of the

*(Continued from previous page)*

sons of the past, would prove that they "are open to the processes of democracy and co-operation with other peoples," he said.

In response to a question about the role of the human factor in international relations, Gorbachev said the democratisation of foreign policy introduces a new element to it, making it the job of not only politicians but the public at large as well.

Touching upon his relations with the Federal Chancellor, Gorbachev said the relations are progressing and this in is one of important elements that made it possible to achieve a solution to big problems.

Kohl shared this opinion. He emphasised that, notwithstanding differences, a very good relationship has developed between him and the Soviet President and that it "facilitates relations" between the two countries.

The Federal Chancellor announced that he invited the Soviet President to visit Federal Germany and that he hoped to play host to him in his hometown of Pfalz. □

possible are expanding, Gorbachev said. This depends on politics and politicians, on their ability to see realities and take development trends into account.

Gorbachev recalled that on many occasions, where it is leading and have begun to act and them when NATO would start changing. The London Declaration has marked the beginning of it. This is the movement towards each other, that rules out the notions of 'winners' and 'losers' in the cold war. Both sides have said 'accomplishments' in the arms race to their credit, and we should depart from that period together and on equal terms.

Woerner supported this approach.

We have lived through the drama of the cold war, Gorbachev continued, we have realised where it is leading and have begun to act and co-operate. "This was a turn of greatest importance. Everything in East-West relations, in the relations between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, in the European process should be subordinated to it. During the Malta meeting I told President Bush that the USSR no longer regards the United States as its enemy. The US President made a reciprocal statement. Now it has been stated that the whole of NATO does not regard the USSR as its enemy. It is a very important statement."

Woerner commented on the London Declaration, stressing the most important moments, and officially handed its text to Gorbachev.

Gorbachev handed to the NATO Secretary general outlines of his ideas about the future joint declaration of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO - a document, which can become a land-

mark in world politics.

Of course, both sides are still cautious, still have their own misgivings. It is natural after such a long period of confrontation. It is clear, however, that problems can be resolved, if the sides move towards each other. This process should be promoted together in every way.

Speaking about the London session of the NATO Council, Woerner pointed to the unprecedented unanimity of its participants in their attitude to the Soviet Union, in far-sightedness and boldness which are now necessary from both sides, in order not to miss a unique chance of giving an entirely new quality to the world situation.

Gorbachev and Woerner discussed arms reductions and pointed out, that there is no avoiding the question of drawing all nuclear powers into this process. They stressed the need to prevent the spreading of nuclear weapons and rocket technology.

Touching upon the 28th Congress of the CPSU, Woerner pointed to the tremendous importance of perestroika both for the Soviet Union and, in no smaller degree, for the whole world.

Gorbachev recalled that he had repeatedly drawn the attention of the West to this aspect of the present situation. The documents adopted by the Congress reaffirm the course of perestroika and new thinking. They will promote the country's further progress along the path of reforms.

Woerner conveyed an official invitation to the Soviet President to visit Brussels and make a speech at the NATO headquarters.

The invitation was accepted. The date of the visit will be coordinated later. □



## AT THE 28TH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU

# Gorbachev sums up political debate

*Soviet Communist Party leader Mikhail Gorbachev delivered the following remarks as he summed up the political debate at the 28th Party Congress in the Kremlin on July 10:*

THE discussion is only getting under way, and much is still ahead. It took place also here – both in this hall and in the working groups and commissions, in which Congress delegates are closely involved.

With the debates at our meetings with delegates – workers, farmers, secretaries of Party organisations and Party committees at district and city levels, and agrarian specialists – thrown in, we can say that the Congress raised a lot of issues.

On the one hand, it confirmed what we already knew about processes developing in the country. On the other, it added much to our knowledge, especially concerning the possible consequence of various trends gaining ground in our society.

It is not my aim now to sum up the results fully. This will have to be done probably after the Congress by a newly-elected Party Central Committee and its agencies, and by Party committees at every level.

It is not easy to sum it all up at once. But I shall say what I feel, think and see at this moment.

The discussion as a whole reflected the state of minds, the situation in the economy, the social sphere and political life, and the strains of perestroika.

There was a great deal of superficial, incidental and overly emotional things said during the debate – either out of excessive concern, in anger or due to an inability to argue. Never mind, we shall all have to learn. Such is our reality.

I would single out the most important issues in the focus of the debate, prompting the most heated arguments and most questions.

I think it is correct to pose the question in this way: what lessons can be drawn even today from the discussion and from what is happening at our Congress?

The first thing that should be stressed is that with a few exceptions, the political course of perestroika, the course of updating our entire society in the context of socialist choice, is not doubted and is supported by the Congress.

Most delegates realise that this course has been dictated by life itself and that, materialising in policies in every area – from the economy to culture – it has led to sweeping changes in society and continues to influence our development greatly.

My position – and it should be completely clear to you – is as follows. Despite the mistakes, miscalculations and foot-dragging, which delegates here were right to point out and sharply criticise because this costs a great deal to society and the Party, and despite the dramatic situation in the country, I consider the overall results of the changes to be substantial and positive.

Opinions clashed at the Congress about the achievements of perestroika. Some people attempted to weigh it on scales, using the four rules of arithmetic. This is not a serious approach, comrades. Such a phenomenon as perestroika should be judged by new criteria, historical criteria.

Those who really understand that perestroika is essential and that it is a revolution rather than a face-lifting, realise that we still have a great deal to overcome.

While accepting criticism, however stinging, in relation to the initiators of perestroika and being aware of critical attitudes to the Central

Committee's progress report, I do not renounce anything in it because it is thoroughly well-considered and balanced.

The principal positive result is that society won freedom, which unfettered popular energies, offered scope for ideas previously gripped in the vice of dogmas and old formulas, gave vent to concern about the future of the nation and the future of socialism, and made it possible to involve millions of people in politics and launch vital change.

Without freedom, this Congress would not have been held, or it would not have been held in the atmosphere we have here now.

Much of what accumulated in the stifling and repressive atmosphere of Stalinism and stagnation, and is now surfacing, is far from pleasant and constructive. But this has to be tolerated. This is what a revolution is all about. Its primary function is always to give people freedom. And perestroika with its democratisation and glasnost has already fulfilled its primary task.

Society needs spiritual revival as much as air. It takes place right before our eyes. With all the twists to this process, it has already exerted a huge impact. Society has changed. All of us have changed.

It is entirely another matter that neither the Party nor the country as a whole, neither the old nor the newly formed organisations and movements, neither of us, comrades, have yet learnt how to use the attained freedom. Therefore the priority task is to learn how to do this sooner and better.

We have made considerable progress in the political reform. We have created new structures of power from the top to the bottom on the basis of the democratic expression of the people's will.

They continue to be perfected, but we have already started to act, giving real substance to our democracy, the notion of a law-governed state.

It has been said more than once that there are many shortcomings in the work of these new structures, that experience is lacking, that procedures and mechanisms are not yet operating smoothly and that political culture, competence and specific knowledge are lacking at times.

The shaping of the personnel of elected councils has not yet been completed. Nevertheless, the new councils got down to business, people's deputies assumed a more responsible attitude and are striving to tackle specific problems and needs of the people as soon as possible.

Real Soviet power is being restored, and this is a gratifying factor, one of the most important achievements of perestroika, in which communists, Party organisations have been and are participating.

Still there is a certain distance, I would say, coolness between elected councils and the Party. And here communists should be more attentive. They should first of all consider how they should act. They should consider if this alienation is not linked with the fact that we still cannot abandon the former methods of dealing with local councils, methods inherited from the command-administrative system. New government bodies, in turn, react painfully to such methods.

I said in the report and would like to repeat again that the consolidation of legality, putting things in order and shaping a mechanism by means of which the decrees and resolutions will be implemented are now linked directly with an early achievement of full power by councils at every level.

It is a sacred duty of the Party, of Party organisations and committees, of communists and working in councils and production collectives to assist this.

But at the same time, I would urge council deputies to act constructively, within the framework of the Constitution and law. I address them first of all as President.

Frankly speaking, some deputies have begun to assume a confrontational stand, and this can bear nothing good.

It is bad if communists fail to understand what renewed councils mean now, and that they themselves should contribute to normalising the situation in the interests of the people.

It is also bad if councils fail to see the need to interact with Party organisations.

As regards another lesson learnt from the debate, I go along with the appraisals made by those delegates who, supporting perestroika, made many critical remarks that this line has not always been pursued consistently.

Many important decisions and laws which should have directed social processes and prevented the emergence of negative phenomena have not been fulfilled. All this should be considered and conclusions should be drawn.

When trying to react promptly to the requirements of life, to work out urgently needed laws and decisions, we gave little attention to their fulfilment. A real mechanism for this has not been created.

Hence it became apparent that there was a need for presidential power, there was a need to proceed faster with political reform, to create new councils, as without them all these laws were not working.

The centre is responsible for this to a considerable degree. But I also want to mention the responsibility of comrades working in republics and provinces. There is no need for us to shift the blame to the provinces, nor for them to the centre. There is a need to co-operate, to pool efforts, not to look for scape goats.

Many things can perhaps be explained by the fact that comrades in the republics and in provinces, and, there is no denying, also in the centre, became confused, even shocked.

And then there was a relapse to the old ailment – lack of initiative, of independent approaches, inability to act unconventionally in conditions of democracy, in unusual circumstances.

And I would like to say why. All the difficulties that perestroika encounters, and the fact that new bodies have difficulty starting up and gaining momentum should not be explained only by the resistance of those who refuse to accept perestroika.

There is no denying that such people exist, and I spoke of them in the report, at meetings with workers, with secretaries of Party organisations. But many people are yet to grasp the present situation.

And now we speak about a crisis in the Party, and it is rooted precisely in the inability, and in a number of cases in the unwillingness, to understand that we live and work in a new society of which unprecedented politisation is characteristic, in a society with broad and practically unlimited glasnost, unprecedented through the entire history of freedom.

Meanwhile, many Party organisations and communists continue to use habitual methods, inherited from the past.



And if any of the delegates, and going by the speeches there are some such delegates among us, came to the Congress hoping to take the Party back to the old conditions of commands and orders, I must say that they are deeply mistaken. We should devote every hour to advancing perestroika and adjusting our work to new conditions.

The Party will be the vanguard of society and will be able to act successfully only if it wholly realises its new role and completes within a brief period of time its reforms on the roads of democracy, and more promptly learns to work with the masses in a new way.

It is necessary to overcome the alienation from the people inherited from the previous times. This is to be achieved first of all by renewal of the activity of primary Party organisations, renewal of cadres and enhancing their prestige.

I am deeply upset by the misunderstanding that emerged here. We shall fail to advance unless we are able to consolidate the Party's positions, to offer an effective policy to society and thus impart fresh dynamism to perestroika, unless we realise that everything that took place in the past is now dated and unacceptable.

From the atmosphere of the Congress, from many speeches and the manner of debating employed by some delegates, I sensed that far from everyone has understood that the Party is living and working in a different society, that a renewed Party with a different style of activity is needed.

We are not changing our line or our choice and are committed to socialist values. But, believe me, the Party's success depends on whether it realises that this is already a different society. Otherwise it will be marginalised by other forces and we shall lose ground.

We now have immense possibilities and the main thing is to realise that we shall not achieve much without renewal, democratisation, without strengthening the living bond with the people or without active work among the masses.

I had a lot of personal conversations with comrades during the Congress and I must say that I came to feel more understanding of the unconventional and novelty of the situation in which the Party has found itself, from, so to speak, rank-and-file comrades – workers, farmers, intellectuals, and secretaries of primary Party organisations. Generally speaking, though, this is an expression from the lexicon of the past, and, maybe, I should not have used it.

Comrade Gaivoronsky from Donetsk spoke here. He correctly recalled that the most important thing is for the Party to increase broad and deep contacts with the working class. This was also illustrated by a meeting with worker delegates and with those invited to the Congress.

Party committees, including the Central Committee, are to blame for the fact that during major political campaigns they were unable to uphold the interests of the working class. They pondered for too long over their attitude towards emerging new forms in the working class movement. We have lost a good deal because of that. The working class puts this question squarely before us.

Another lesson from the discussion is that we must continue to act in the main directions of perestroika. The Party and state leadership were scathingly criticised for the economic situation, the state of affairs on the market and the provision of goods.

To solve the food problem is the key task in this respect and I put it to the fore. Once we remove its acuteness, 70-80 per cent of the acuteness of the situation in the social sphere – the transition to a regulated market and the housing shortage – will be eased as well.

In this connection, and I will not conceal it, I was worried when three quarters of the Congress decided to change the name of the commission for economic reform, excluding the word

“market”. This means that there is a persisting lack of understanding of the need for an abrupt turn in order to radically change the economic situation.

Has our entire history not shown, comrades, the futility of attempts to get out of the plight, in which both the state and citizens found themselves, by patching up the command-and-administrative system?

We have already incurred tremendous losses by stubbornly clinging to it for decades and continuing to cling even now, thereby applying brakes on renewal and the transition to new forms of economic life in the country.

If we continue to act in this way, then, I shall be frank, we will bankrupt the country. I am expressing my viewpoint explicitly.

The advantages of the market economy have been proven on a world scale and the question now is only whether high social protection – which is characteristic of our socialist system, the system for the working people – can be ensured under market conditions.

The answer is this: it is not only possible but it is precisely a regulated market economy that will make it possible to augment social wealth and raise the living standards of everyone.

We hold state power and therefore can make laws and take decisions to shape the transition to market relations.

Of course, there must be a period during which the market is formed before the advantages of the market will manifest themselves in full. The most complex task during this period is to work out and take a series of special measures for social protection, particularly of low-income citizens.

The report mentioned that people were frightened by the way in which the intention to move to a market economy was announced. They visualise a market in terms of high prices, and not shop shelves with a plentiful supply of goods.

From the beginning I said that raising prices was not the way to proceed. But when launching the reform one should bear in mind that there can be no transition to a market without a pricing reform.

In general, we should rectify this impression and, most importantly, submit well-thought-out proposals to both the Supreme Soviet and society by September, so that they can determine their attitude and make the choice.

I already had an opportunity to answer, in an expanded form, questions concerning the agrarian policy. These issues were acutely raised here but, I feel, were supported by the entire Congress.

On the whole we made much headway during our meeting with agrarians, shaping an understanding of necessary actions in the agrarian sphere. We have already begun to take specific measures. On Monday Nikolai Ryzhkov signed a decision to write off the debts of the countryside.

I have expressed my attitude: here at this Congress we must take up a political position with regard to farmers, the countryside, and not simply with regard to the food issue, which constitutes only part of the problem.

Once the countryside stands solidly on its feet, our farmers will become confident, begin to live well and get an opportunity to work with initiative – this means that the food issue will be resolved more quickly.

As far as the agrarian question is concerned, I still felt that there was no full understanding of the issue. Two main approaches to the advance of the countryside have manifested themselves.

I mean, on the one hand, the reorganisation of production relations on the strength of the laws on ownership, land and lease arrangements, and, on the other hand, assistance to the countryside in the provision of social amenities and facilities, the construction of roads, the production of farm machinery and so on.

There are people who, it seems, are out to deliberately provoke a negative attitude to Party

policy worked out at the March plenary session and who try, by hook or by crook, to create the impression that the leadership does not want to help the countryside.

Moreover, I heard this remark from the audience: “Gorbachev should be placed at the head of the agrarian commission because he does not like agriculture.” That was quite a suggestion, indeed. Just imagine me as a person who does not like agriculture.

You know that I am no proponent of strong language, but in this case I have to say that such things are the outcome of either lack of understanding or are prompted by unseemly calculations.

I repeat from this rostrum for the Congress, the Party and the entire country to hear: our position is, first, that it is essential to give full freedom to all types of management in the countryside on the basis of a completely free choice.

Second, it is necessary to establish reasonable exchanges between town and countryside, industry and agriculture, exchanges which would promote the advance of the countryside within the shortest period of time.

Third, the state should promote as fully as it can a solution of the urgent problems of the countryside, primarily the creation of living conditions worthy of our farmers. These are the three major strategies, on the strength of which it is possible to revive the countryside and provide the country with food. None of these principles can be removed from this triad, for the entire system would collapse.

We should make major decisions on matters concerning the agrarian sector, the countryside as a whole, and the position of farmers. This is, so to speak, my summary of the discussion which has been held here.

Yet another two subjects were raised here acutely and it was not easy to listen to all this because they concerned people's life and have already had damaging consequences. These are, to begin with, the ecological problem, one of the acutest issues. We should not put its solution off. We came to realise the acuteness of the problem too late. But much, comrades, can still be rectified. This is illustrated by foreign experience.

Approximately three decades ago, dozens of towns in the United States were within an ecological disaster zone, rivers were literally dead and the great lakes were on the verge of ruin. But large inputs and the implementation of special programmes made it possible to drastically improve the situation. The same is being done in Europe, which is saturated with industry and chemical businesses.

Therefore, however hard is the situation we now find ourselves in, it is necessary to make large inputs of funds in the nature conservation sphere, regarding it absolutely on a par with such vital tasks as the provision of people with food and housing.

Clean air and water are essential for people in a no lesser degree than bread, comrades. I think state programmes will be needed, of course, to tackle the sphere of ecology as a whole and major ecological problems.

The aftermath of the Chernobyl accident causes anguish in all of us. Comrades from Byelorussia, the Ukraine and Bryansk region must come to realise that we partake of their misfortune.

We face a situation that confronts us with more and more problems, and this is a cause for deep reflection. Just one reactor, and what consequences imagine what would happen if a nuclear war breaks out. Nuclear reactors will be destroyed even in a conventional war, and the consequences will be similar to those at Chernobyl. Our country is unable to cope with these consequences. Billions of roubles have been spent and will be spent, while new needs are emerging.

I want people in Byelorussia, the Ukraine, Bryansk region to hear my words, I want them



to know that the entire country is at their side, is aware of their tragedy and will continue to help. Similarly, we have mentioned the problem of the Aral Sea here and the people there should feel that we will come their aid as well.

The delegates have well-founded concern for what is going on in the spiritual sphere, in culture, science and education. I have received dozens of collective letters from intellectuals. The reasons are not in the material base, which is lagging behind, although this should also be borne in mind. The Congress, I hope, will state firmly that we should support the development and promotion of our culture, science, education, art and literature.

I fully share the concern of teachers who spoke at the Congress, that the genuine revival of our schools is crucial for the country's future. There is a direct dependence – we will never be able to create a prosperous economy, raise our science and technology to the world level, succeed in battling alcoholism, drug abuse and moral decline, unless we attach proper prominence to education and enhance the role of the teacher.

It is clear that all problems of Party life and work in new conditions in one way or another boil down to ideology. This area of Party work has been subject, perhaps, to the most fierce criticism.

Bluntly speaking, we have had our share of rudeness too. All of us still lack arguments and constructive proposals. We have made little progress here.

I do not doubt the gravity of the situation in some spheres of intellectual development. And I share the alarm over morals which have become widespread and which are incompatible with the ideals of humane socialism. This is not only a legacy of the past but also the result. I repeat, of the explosion of freedom, which society experienced all of a sudden, after being confined for a long time in a room with stale air. We were simply unaware of many things. All this demands great attention of the Party, intellectuals, the school, the entire system of our cultural and educational establishments. This is so.

But I also felt in the criticism of the ideological situation the strong breath of old attitudes. In the report I tried to approach the problem of ideology in its new form. The problem is what we understand by socialism. Some comrades believe that if we write down now in the policy statement and other documents that we remain loyal to old attitudes, everything will click into place. What place? Won't we find ourselves where we have been for more than 60 years, with the known consequences?

The ideology of socialism is not a text-book where everything is compartmentalised by chapters, paragraphs, rules and principles. It will take shape together with socialism itself, as we will facilitate the development of a well-fed, civilised, spiritually rich, free, and happy country, as we come to embrace universal human values again not as something alien from the class point of view, but as normal for man. These values have been worked out throughout centuries and millenia. What their neglect has brought us is well known.

The ideology of socialism will shape up as the country gets integrated into the general progress of civilisation. It is for this reason that new thinking, which is being accepted in the world as our new internationalism, bringing together rather than splitting the world into confronting camps, underlies the widest possible framework for shaping it.

We inherit from Marx, Engels, and Lenin the top methodology, the dialectical way of thinking, on which we will draw in theory and practice. But we will not allow everything created by the classics to be reduced into just another short course, which some people seem to regret judging by some speeches. This will not come to pass. It will kill perestroika and society.

It struck me that no sooner had a speaker mounted this rostrum, trying to set the problems of our day in a philosophical way and look at our

work in this context, as apathy could be felt in the hall and the clamp-down started.

But how have we grown accustomed to simple and clear formulae: "To be – or not to be", "down with – not down with". Let us think. We are after all a Party which lays claim to be the vanguard of society. Given the current level of intellectual work, the sluggishness and our attitude to intellectual work, we will never become the vanguard force and lose even what we have today.

And another lesson from the debates. Delegates have brought to the 28th Congress their concern over instability in society. At the meeting with workers one worker said bluntly: "Mikhail Sergeevich, Nikolai Ivanovich, answer two questions – when will there be order in the country and no profiteers?"

Seemingly simple questions which need simple answers, but they simply do not exist. I would say that the sooner we saturate the market, the sooner and more effectively the economy will work, the sooner we will defeat profiteers and the shadow economy.

A regional Party secretary said: "Can you do what Andropov did?" I replied to this question and can repeat here at the Congress:

Fighting profiteering is an 80 per cent economic issue. Where there is no advanced economy, the swindler flourishes. Black market dealers and corrupt elements feed on shortages.

But does this mean that we should sit with our arms folded until we tackle these issues? Certainly not. You rightly demand that we tighten order. I want to demand of you that the entire system of soviets, that we formed for the whole year while the profiteer and criminal were active, be set in motion. Now that the system is formed, let's join our efforts and take a swipe at them. Stabilisation in society will now be linked exactly with this, with the work of government, economic and Party bodies.

We have overlooked a good deal in inter-ethnic relations, lost time, and when we noticed this, were late to act. This is a lesson for all of us. I will not excuse myself. I do not want to make excuses. You cannot undo the past, although there were a great many meetings of the Politburo, meetings with Party chiefs and in commissions, and many trips. But evidently, all this was not enough.

The all-important thing is that we failed to see the danger in time. All of us, let's honestly admit, thought that everything was all right here, everything was solved, and basically raised toasts for people's friendship. This was our work in the sphere of nationality policy.

Suddenly, we became aware of the problem. But we did not react at once. Neither did we make a correct assessment at once. A platform, on which we relied to conduct our work, appeared only later. We should act now without losing time. We have political assessments, the Party's platform. Many decisions were adopted by the Supreme Soviet. Lastly, the Federation Council has begun work and the elaboration of a new union treaty is under way.

I propose to issue, on behalf of the communists represented at the Congress, a call to all people of the country: let's stop, let's stop tempting fate. Let's get down to injecting new vitality to our union on the basis of documents and approaches that are already clear to all of us. I think everybody will hear us and respond to this call, but this presupposes our active work.

Both at the Congress of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation and at this Congress, especially in commissions, we heard once again sharp criticism and direct objections to our new foreign policy. Certainly, we will take into account competent judgments on specific issues. But I dismiss attempts to question our policy as totally unacceptable and prompted by someone's selfish interests.

Our new foreign policy offered affected the economy, the Army, and defence. We are moving towards reforms in all these areas, including a state programme for servicemen's social pro-

tection. We should accomplish this so that the Army feels the people's concern.

Help needs to be given to our collectives in the defence industry, where the best personnel and teams of scientists are grouped and where there are good capacities to restructure production within the shortest possible time and get down to producing top-class output badly needed by the country. The entire country stands to benefit from this, especially concerning the retooling of industries turning out consumer goods.

Certainly, there are difficulties. But they are of a temporary nature. Problems here should be tackled as soon as possible. But is this a pretext for turning a blind eye to everything that our foreign policy gave to the country and the whole world? I reject attempts to question this. One of the Party chiefs even advised me not to go abroad. Why do we go there? We go there in order to avoid war, to conduct perestroika in normal conditions, and lastly, to free resources and convert them to the needs of the country.

One cannot find oneself to be under the thumb of people who are not competent in politics. There would be trouble. The Party that claims to be a vanguard should be a guiding force rather than adapt itself to various sentiments.

Just look what questions were raised: did we act wisely in embarking on the path of disarmament and cuts in military spending, exorbitant and unnecessary for ensuring security? The reply follows directly from the question. Did we act wisely in deciding against intervention in developments under way in Eastern Europe? Well, do you want tanks again? Shall we teach them again how to live?

I am certain the whole world is paying heed to us when we pursue the course of perestroika and seek to show the world that our society is capable of being progressive and disposed in a friendly way to all peoples, capable of offering co-operation. This is the way to influence the world.

It takes some thinking to ask this question: did we act wisely in withdrawing from Afghanistan? Well, I simply do not know who we are dealing with.

And more. Did we act wisely in adjusting and developing good relations with tens of countries on all continents? I am sure we did, and they responded in kind. Not only rulers, but peoples. One must be blind to overlook it.

Good sense, if it is not overshadowed by selfish or parochial interests, tells us that we were right in doing this, that this meets the crucial interests of our people and the norms of morality, to say nothing about the impossibility of transforming our own country without a fresh foreign policy.

In think that explanations made at the Congress and before the Congress by my colleagues and a number of other speakers were convincing enough, so I just added emotions to finalise the matters.

He who wants to hear and has ears, will hear. He who does not – leave it up to him. But we shall have our own opinion on this score.

But there is one fine point. Those who choose not to hear are not taking just a personal decision. Those who fill important posts in the state and are directly related to our international activity, even if they disagree with the policy pursued by the country's leadership, are obliged – contrary to their own opinion, to pursue state policy. The President and the government cannot have one policy and someone else has another and he will pursue that other policy. This does not exist in any state. All officials must be loyal to the government.

And if they are decent people and they disagree with government policy, they must resign.

Now about the Party and its fate – the issue which has brought us here. It is for me the issue of all my life and outlook.

(Continued on next page)



## GORBACHEV SUMS UP

(Continued from previous page)

What is the lesson the Congress teaches us on this score? Comrades have voiced great anxiety that the Party is losing authority, its position is becoming weaker. It is being crowded out by other political forces, and in some places communists have been forced into opposition. They blame the CPSU leadership and especially some of its members.

I will say this straight away. Comrades, in its essence this criticism is largely justified. I am only against the form. Two extremes are impermissible at this Congress – cooing with respect to anyone at all on the one hand, and boorishness on the other. This is all, as for the rest we must speak directly.

I am drawing a conclusion from this that impulses going out from the Central Committee along all these directions were insufficient. At the same time, a share of the blame belongs to Party committees of all levels.

The time, comrades, has gone for ever when a kind of mandate could be received from the Central Committee for managing a district, a city, a region or a republic, followed by sitting quietly in the place until one's last hour, irrespective of how well you conduct your affairs and what people think about you. This is the way it was here, at the top, the way it was at republican and all other levels. We have to admit that. But that time is over and done with, never to return. I am convinced of this. There are no ways to bring back the past, and no dictatorship – if this crazy idea is still being entertained by some – will solve anything.

We are on the right road. We must follow the way firmly and determinedly, getting rid of our weaknesses. This is the prime task, and we must work out a strategy and tactics which will ensure its accomplishment. There is no one to replace the Party in this. It can cope with this itself.

What should be done now for the authority of the Party to grow, for our influence to be as we wish it to be? The main thing is to have in all posts people who think in a modern way, politically vigorous and truly committed to perestroika, democracy, glasnost, but are actually unable and unwilling to work in a new way, but only seek to dominate.

I fully agree with the delegates to the Congress, workers who spoke at the Congress in favour of promoting to the leading posts advanced, literate workers, enthusiasts of perestroika. What people perestroika has discovered even at the meeting, where those were present who represented the working class at the Congress as delegates or invited guests, it was clear that they were people capable of thinking things out, analysing them politically. They were not vociferous, like some who strive to speak "the direct language of the workers" only to declare that they "have come directly from there."

It is, of course, not without importance that someone is from there – from the shopfloor and the like, from any place where our might is being forged, where the foundation is being laid on which we all stand.

Well, we are debating here, voting, arguing, forming a system, but what does the country rest upon? Workers, peasants and the intelligentsia who pull the economy forward.

Further. It is necessary to discard ossified ideological clichés from which some are taking guidance not only in debates but also in practical matters. As before, cases still occur frequently when priority is given not to the demands of life and results of work but to whether one's behaviour is consistent with stale dogma.

Adherence to dogma is a special hinderance to the development of new forms of economic management and people's initiative. If we act like this, we shall surely discredit socialism choice, the people will turn away from us.

And more. The Party will be unable to restructure unless we all realise that an end has

come to the CPSU monopoly on power and management. Even if we manage to win a majority at an election – an we can and must act so as to win a majority and retain the position of a ruling party – even in this case, it is advisable to co-operate with non-party deputies, representatives of other legally recognised political trends if they are sincerely concerned for the fate of the country. We must put an end to sectarian moods, put an end to this monopoly for ever, to erase its vestiges from the minds of Party workers and all communists.

Co-operation is a must. I share the view on this score voiced here by comrade Luchinsky. In the Central Committee report the question was raised about the desirability under present conditions of teaming with all democratic and socialist forces. Only by shoving aside party, political and national differences, shall we be able to pool all efforts in order to take the country out of the present critical situation and implement far-reaching reforms.

I am convinced that millions of communists and the overwhelming majority of Soviet people are looking to us for this – the consolidation of the Party itself and of all sound forces truly caring for the welfare of the people.

I say this with confidence, because this call has been repeatedly made in many letters and telegrams sent to me and addressed to the Congress.

Let us, comrades, heed this call of the people, the call of the times.

## Gorbachev reports on draft rules

WILL the changes recorded in the draft new rules of the Soviet Communist Party have the necessary dimension to ensure a decisive renewal of the Party, establishing the authority of Party masses in it and preserving its unity and partisan spirit? These questions were discussed by the commission to formulate the new fundamental law of the Party life.

Presenting the draft Party rules to delegates to the 28th Party Congress on July 12, the commission's chairman, Communist Party chief Mikhail Gorbachev, summed up their fundamental provisions.

The Soviet Communist Party is described in the draft rules as a political organisation which, basing itself on common human values and communist ideals, sets itself the goal of creating humane, democratic socialism in the country.

The working class, peasantry, intelligentsia, and other social strata adhering to the socialist choice form the social basis of the Soviet Communist Party.

The provision about democratic centralism caused impassioned debates both before and during the Congress. Gorbachev said it had been decided not to discard this term just because it had been used as a cover for the sway of bureaucracy and excessive organisation in Party life. He said that broad democracy should be combined with centralism and discipline so that the Party would not turn into a discussion club, should not lose its ability for vigorous political action.

At the same time, lower-ranking bodies have been given broader rights in discussion and decision-making. Another important innovation is the right of the minority to assert their views in the Party press. The holding of Party referendums is also envisaged, Gorbachev said.

The Party chief said that members of the Party are given the right to unite according to platforms that do not contradict Party rules. At the same time, factions with inner discipline are not permitted.

The draft rules give wider powers to communist parties of union republics, while rejecting

In many speeches, there was an implication: perestroika is to blame for all our troubles. In some speeches one could even discern nostalgia for old times, old methods of work. I felt it in the speeches made during the meeting with the secretaries of district and city Party committees. It was a good, fruitful gathering, I will even say that a most meaningful conversation took place.

Some issues were raised very sharply, issues crucial for the life of the Party and society. But here were comrades who charged the General Secretary with leading the Party the wrong way. They said they did not need the foreign policy we have. I completely dismissed these charges. I will say this: if perestroika is to blame for anything at all, then it is only for being implemented not resolutely and consistently enough.

And this, incidentally, stems from the position of the personnel in the centre and the localities. So let us change it, let us move perestroika ahead.

Then changes will be more rapid, we shall sooner obtain the results the entire nation will feel. I see no other way apart from continuing perestroika – resolutely and consistently – including everything we are doing to transform the economy, the social sphere and the political system of our multinational state.

So let us work, comrades. We have entered the most responsible phase of perestroika. The time has come for the most crucial reforms. □

the principle of federalism in the Soviet Communist Party. "We are firmly for a united Soviet Communist Party, with a common programme and rules. We are for independence and equality of communist parties of all Soviet republics, for their vigorous participation in resolving the tasks common to the entire party," the Party leader said.

Gorbachev said he does not go along with calls for the removal of Party organisations from the country's armed forces. Meanwhile, there is a need for restructuring there. From now on, the rules envisage that Party work in the armed forces will be conducted only by primary Party organisations and elective Party bodies.

Military-political organs that have so far been guiding Party work in the Army will be included in state, not Party, structures. Their purpose will be to conduct educational and cultural work in the armed forces.

The delegates then began to discuss the draft rules paragraph by paragraph. □

### NEW BOOKLETS

The following are available at the prices shown:

- To Find Oneself..... 60p
- Our Way to Victory..... 50p
- Europe on the Eve of the  
Second World War ..... 50p
- Man and Politics..... 50p
- May Day:  
a Hundred-year History ..... 70p
- USSR Yearbook '90 ..... £1.50
- USSR: Perestroika ..... £1.00

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

Name.....

Address.....

.....



# Congress resolution – Party tasks

*Here follows the full text of the resolution on the CPSU Central Committee's political report to the 28th Congress of the CPSU and the tasks of the Party:*

HAVING heard and discussed the political report of the Party's Central Committee delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Congress notes that deep-going changes have occurred in Soviet society in the time between the 27th and 28th congresses. The Central Committee of the CPSU and its Political Bureau, being collective bodies of political leadership, have directed the Party and all progressive forces to the country's revolutionary turn towards humanism, democracy, and social justice.

The Stalinist totalitarian system which has inflicted tremendous damage to the country, the people, the Party, and the socialist idea itself, is being overcome. The making of a society of free citizens based on socialist values is now under way.

The entire political superstructure is being radically altered, and true democracy is taking root, asserting human rights, free elections, and plurality of parties.

The over centralised state is being transformed into a true union based on self-determination and the free will of the constituent nations.

Ideological diktat is giving way to free thought, glasnost, and informational openness.

The state-monopoly relations of production which alienated the working people from property and from the results of their labour, are being dismantled.

Conditions are being created for free competition between socialist producers.

The Party decisions taken since perestroika was begun, have therefore paved the way for practical action aimed at reviving people's rule, working out the legal foundations of a democratic state, cultivating the new political thinking, and carrying out economic reform. All this has involved millions of people in political affairs and is helping to make perestroika irreversible.

Congress stresses that the future of the Party, its historical perspectives, are directly linked with the achievement of the goals of perestroika and the improvement of the people's quality of life. Congress calls for resolute renovation of the CPSU, for liberating it from dogmatism, mastering the art of political work with the masses and the skill of winning people's minds by the power of the truth, by valid arguments and co-operating constructively, chiefly by concrete deed, with other socio-political forces.

Congress declares: the CPSU, a voluntary union of people of like mind, remains a Party of the socialist option and communist perspective, which through its policy expresses and promotes the interests of the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, and all working people. This is inseparable from its commitment to universal human and humanitarian values, and social justice. Most communists have served and continue to serve the people honestly. They bear no responsibility for the crimes committed by Stalin and his accomplices or for the mistakes of the political leadership during the years of stagnation.

Congress is opposed to authoritarian thinking and stands for the creative development of the legacy of Marx, Engels and Lenin, of socialist theory, and for deep-going study of the historical experience of the 20th Century, the activity of the CPSU itself, and the achievements of world-wide social thought.

The CPSU attaches top priority to multiplying

society's intellectual wealth as expressed in science, education and culture.

Congress resolutely condemns attacks on V. I. Lenin. It is the duty of every communist and every decent person to protect him as a politician and thinker against slander and defamation, and also against official honours and over-praise.

Congress rejects attempts at implanting and cultivating anti-communism and anti-sovietism in our society, or extremism on the excuse of criticising deformations of socialism and the Party's mistakes, it expresses its firm intention to counteract by all legal means attempts at economic or political persecution of the Party.

The CPSU is a Party of consistent internationalists, sensitive to national interests, needs and customs, and intolerant of nationalism, chauvinism and racism, and any other manifestation of reactionary ideology.

Congress considers it a vital task to ensure the primacy of the Party's rank and file in the CPSU, so that every communist should have a real opportunity to participate in the elaboration and realisation of the Party's policy, radically heightening the role of its local branches. The ideological and political integrity of the CPSU is based on the self-administration of Party branches and the independence of the communist parties of the union republics incorporated in the CPSU.

Congress considers it extremely important for Party branches to actively participate in the workers' and peasants' movement that is reviving in the country.

In the setting of a plurality of parties, the CPSU is prepared for open competition and co-operation with other parties and movements on the basis of the law, in elections, parliamentary activity, and so on.

Congress confirms that the Party's policy of perestroika and revolutionary renovation meets the country's vital interests.

When perestroika was being carried into effect, the CPSU Central Committee, the Political Bureau and secretariat, did not, however, take due account of the economic, social and moral consequences of some of the concrete measures. The anti-alcoholic campaign, the practice of organising co-operatives, the transition to regional economic autonomy and independence of enterprises, along with a number of other major actions, were carried out unsystematically, without preliminary substantive consideration by Party branches. This either lowered the effect of these important and necessary measures or was even counter-productive.

Difficulties and snags in the practical implementation of perestroika policy are due above all to underestimation by the Central Committee of the CPSU of the difficulties in overcoming the legacy of the bureaucratic command system of administration, the unsatisfactory organisational, ideological and propaganda backing of the adopted decisions, and the absence at all Party levels of experience of working in the new conditions. The reports of members and alternate members of the Political Bureau, and of Central Committee secretaries, have borne out the fact that Central Committee activity in organising the fulfilment of adopted decisions has been insufficient. The Central Committee commissions failed to draw sufficiently on the Party's intellectual potential, and on the creativity of Party organisations.

As a result, many of the tasks set by the 27th Congress of the CPSU and the 19th All-Union Party Conference remained undone, aggravating crisis phenomena and complicating the situation in society and the Party.

The demand voiced at the 27th Congress concerning social reorientation of the economy to face up to the people's needs, has not been carried out. Serious social tension and legitimate public dissatisfaction was generated by what is in effect the collapse of the consumer market, growing shortages, and devaluation of the rouble. The socio-economic problems of the countryside have grown more acute.

The abrupt decline of state and labour discipline, growth of crime, violence entailing loss of life and appearance of refugees, corruption, profiteering, drunkenness, drug addiction, and the fall in morality, have created alarm and are complicating the political situation.

The disastrous state of science, education, culture, and public health, is a menace to the country's present and future.

Many regions of the country – the Chernobyl area, the Aral Sea and Aral area, the Volga Basin, the Semipalatinsk testing grounds and others – remain ecological disaster areas. Decisions on ecological problems are being implemented much too slowly. Government programmes on the elimination of the consequences of the earthquake in Armenia and other regions of the country are being held up.

Congress points out that the Party was taken unawares by deteriorating inter-ethnic relations. The Central Committee often lost initiative in settling conflicts and reconciled itself with half-hearted measures in the centre and the provinces. Conclusion of a new treaty of union has dragged out, jeopardising the integrity and the very existence of the USSR.

The 28th CPSU Congress denounces separatist tendencies as running counter to the interests of the peoples. It expresses regret over the split in the communist parties of the Baltic republics, which resulted in the loss of their decisive influence on the political situation.

Congress declares its support for the stand of the Party branches upholding the socialist option in the development of society. It calls on the communists of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia to unite on the basis of the 28th CPSU Congress policy documents.

Congress points out that the CPSU leadership, which took a bold step towards renovation of the Party, failed to use all the possibilities for its radical transformation from a government Party into a political leader. The CPSU Central Committee and other Party committees failed to reorganise their work and to mobilise the creative potential of the Party branches.

The 28th CPSU Congress holds that the activity of the CPSU Central Committee, its Political Bureau and the Central Committee Secretariat needs drastic improvement, while their personnel policy needs renovation. The Central Committee and its Political Bureau should concentrate their efforts on such key problems as the unity of the CPSU and the development of democracy in the Party, consolidating society, attaining civic peace in the country by political means, and working out and implementing immediate measures to extricate the country from the crisis. Fundamentally new approaches are needed in working among women, young people and veterans, taking into account their specific position in society and to involve these groups effectively in Party activity and in the social structures.

Congress entrusts the new CPSU Central Committee to work out, in the course of three months, the practical measures to implement the Congress decisions and to put into effect the

*(Continued on next page)*



## Vladimir Ivashko elected CPSU deputy leader

VLADIMIR IVASHKO, 58, who recently headed the Ukrainian Communist Party, was elected Deputy General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, it was officially announced at the Party's 28th Congress on July 12.

Ivashko, who was nominated by Mikhail Gorbachev, polled 3,109 votes, with 1,309 delegates voting against.

His main rival, Politburo member Yegor Ligachev, 69, polled 776 votes to 3,642.

The third candidate, who nominated himself, Anatoli Dudyrev, 45, the rector of a Leningrad institute, polled 150 votes to 4,268.

The "number two man" post was instituted in the Soviet Communist Party at this Congress. Because Party leader Mikhail Gorbachev is also the President of the Soviet Union, Ivashko is expected to be in charge of the Party's day-to-day activities.

tific degree of Candidate of Science (economics) and became an assistant professor.

Upon joining the Soviet Communist Party in 1960, Ivashko was elected secretary of a primary Party organisation. In 1973 he became the head of the department of science and educational establishments of the Kharkov Regional Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party (UCP).

Ivashko was elected Secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk Regional Committee of the UCP in 1978, Secretary of the UCP Central Committee in 1986, Second Secretary in 1988 and First Secretary in 1989.

In 1986 Vladimir Ivashko became candidate member and then full member of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party. He was elected a Politburo member in December 1989. He was also elected a USSR People's Deputy from the CPSU.

This year Ivashko was elected Chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. During the 28th Congress of the CPSU he resigned from the post. When asked about his resignation by Congress delegates, he cited disagreement with an attempt by a number of deputies to pressure him.

Ivashko is married. His wife, Lyudmila, is an engineer and teaches technical subjects. His son Andrei is also a teacher at an institution of higher education and is a Candidate of Science (technology). □

Vladimir Ivashko, a Ukrainian, was born in the city of Poltava in 1932. He graduated from the Kharkov Mining Institute after World War II and for many years worked as a teacher in higher education establishments in the city. He defended his thesis and was awarded the scien-

(continued from previous page)

delegates' critical remarks and proposals.

Taking into consideration the complicated socio-political situation in the country, to recommend that the current situation and the Political Bureau and Secretariat reports be discussed at the meetings of the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Control Commission. To entrust the CPSU Central Committee to consider within a year the problem of renovating the ideological work in the Party. To recognise it expedient to reorganise the Academy of Social Sciences, the Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the Institute of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee in view of the new tasks of the Party.

The Party should conduct a strong social and economic policy that would be understood by the people. It should make its own analysis of the situation and its own independent assessments to be able to offer society and the government bodies a way out of the crisis and means of stabilising the situation and solving problems of everyday life.

Congress views all acts aiming at eliminating Party branches in work collectives and other liquidatory manifestations as a violation of democracy and legality.

Congress declares that it is the duty of the CPSU to complete the political reform and to bring to conclusion the transfer of all power to the soviets. The Party committees should organise interaction with new soviets, help them emerge as bodies of real authority and give effective support to workers and peasants during election campaigns. The constructive posture of

the communist deputies and Party branches should help the soviets to pass over the effective and normal work as soon as possible.

Congress deems it right and necessary to introduce the institution of presidency into the country's political system. At the same time it points out that the structure of the President's interaction with the republican and local authorities has not been legalised nor the forms of control over the implementation of the President's decrees been determined.

Congress supports the international activity of the Soviet State, which is based, in keeping with the conclusions of the 27th Party Congress and the 19th Party Conference, on the freedom of choice, balanced interests, equality and non-interference, mutual respect for independence and sovereignty, arms reduction, primarily reduction of nuclear weapons, democratisation and humanisation of relations on the basis of respect for human rights.

Congress points out that the new Soviet foreign policy evolved on these principles promoted a marked improvement of the international situation, lessened military threat, and gave impulse to the solution of global problems, the integration of the economy into the world economic system, interaction in the field of ecology, cultural co-operation and broader communication among the people and to lessening the burden of military spending. As a result favourable external conditions are taking shape for the solution of domestic problems.

Positive shifts on the international scene do not eliminate the task of ensuring reliable safety of the country on the principles of reasonable sufficiency. Problems of military policy and concern for the servicemen and their families should be constantly in the field of vision of the state and the Party.

Congress comes out in favour of broadening and deepening the international contacts of the Party and emphasises the importance of close interaction with the communist and workers' parties and other left-wing forces and of looking for areas of mutual interest with a broad spectrum of political parties and mass movements.

The radical renovation of the Party calls for a

## Yeltsin quits Communist Party

BORIS YELTSIN, Chairman of the Russian Parliament, told the 28th Communist Party Congress on July 12 that he intended to leave the Party.

In a statement following his nomination for the Party's Central Committee, he explained that due to his current parliamentary post, which, he said, involves tremendous responsibility to the people of Russia, and to the changeover to a multi-party system, he will not be able "to fulfil only Communist Party decisions."

As head of the Russian supreme legislature, Yeltsin said, he must "obey the will of the people and their plenipotentiary representatives. This is why, in accordance with my campaign pledges, I declare my withdrawal from the CPSU," he said.

"In order to have a greater possibility to effectively influence the work of elected governing councils," Yeltsin said, he was prepared "to co-operate with all parties and mass political organisations in the republic." □

radical renovation of its programme. Congress deems it necessary to set up a commission to prepare a new Party programme and to bring its draft for discussion to the Party branches.

The CPSU offers society and the state a programme of action for the forthcoming period. It is expounded in the policy statement of the Congress "towards humane, democratic socialism" and in the resolutions on the key problems of the country's development.

Party Congress draws the attention of all of the communists and those who will be entrusted to work in the CPSU ruling bodies to the inadmissibility of repeating the mistakes of the past, which have led the party and society to the crisis, the country to stagnation and one-man rule and socialism to deformation.

★ ★ ★

The country is going through difficult times. It is necessary as never before to consolidate all the democratic forces. The CPSU proposes that all the champions of the socialist idea should rally within a broad coalition in the soviets, mass organisations and movements and in everyday practical activity. It is ready to conduct dialogue on an equal footing, upholding all constructive ideas for the sake of the working people, civic peace and national accord. □

## The Requirements of Common Sense

by Stanislav Kondrashov  
Stanislav Kondrashov (b. 1928), a graduate of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, is a political analyst with the newspaper *Izvestia*. His specialities are Soviet-American relations and life in the United States, where he spent many years as an *Izvestia* correspondent. Stanislav Kondrashov has written numerous books, essays, feature-stories, and articles, including, to mention just a few, *Martin Luther King*, *A Long Look at America* and *People Across the Ocean*.

price 70p from:  
Soviet Booklets (SN),  
3 Rosary Gardens,  
London SW7 4NW.

## USSR-USA SUMMIT

Washington May 30-June 3, 1990

Documents and Materials

available at 60p from:  
Soviet Booklets (SN),  
3 Rosary Gardens,  
London SW7 4NW



# Congress resolution on military policy

*The following is the full text of the resolution of the 28th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on the main aspects of the Party's military policy at the present stage:*

**1.** The CPSU considers consolidation of peace the most important area of foreign policy and will in every way facilitate the processes of relieving international tensions. The Party's military policy, based on the new political thinking, is in keeping with the Soviet Union's long-term interests.

Having made an exhaustive study of the state and prospects of the politico-military situation, Congress declares that so long as guarantees of the irreversible positive changes have not emerged, the military danger to the USSR continues to exist. In the circumstances, it is still one of the most important tasks of the people as a whole, the Party, and the state, to observe the constitutional duties related to the defence of the socialist homeland, buttressing and maintaining the country's security and defence capability at the level of dependable and sensible sufficiency.

The CPSU stands for the maintenance and consistent development of the defensive Soviet military doctrine and reaffirms its readiness to assist in shaping an all-embracing system of international security, expanding politico-military co-operation for this purpose, and advancing towards a world without wars and violence.

The Party believes that fulfilment of the defensive tasks should work to prevent wars, secure the inviolability of the state borders of the USSR, rule out impingements on the country's sovereignty, and, in the event of an outside aggression, guarantee that it is repulsed, the independence and territorial integrity of the country defended, and just peace restored.

**2.** Party Congress notes that the armed forces of the USSR are commendably doing their constitutional duty of defending the socialist state. Communists, servicemen of the Army and Navy, the border troops of the State Security Committee, and the internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, are loyal to their nation and its socialist option.

No few acute problems have accumulated in the Army and Navy, including those of performing functions foreign to them, bringing units up to full strength, ensuring professional training, obtaining new types of armaments and vehicles of due quality and in requisite numbers, maintaining discipline, remedying the imperfections of the organisation and personnel structure, and settling the question of the inferior social protection of servicemen and their families. This is creating negative sentiment, tension, and disaffection.

The CPSU emphasises the extraordinary socio-political importance and honourable nature of military service. Congress instructs all Party branches and all communists to uphold by all possible means the authority of the Soviet Armed Forces, heightening the prestige of military service, and protecting the honour, dignity, life and health of servicemen.

Congress declares that the CPSU is in favour of centralised leadership in matters of defence, security and development of the armed forces, based on single union-wide legislation.

The armed forces of the USSR must follow the principles of one-man leadership, extraterritoriality, a multinational army recruited on a mixed principle which combines universal military service with voluntary enlistment under contract, social justice and equality of all

servicemen and reservists before the law, and their use only for legitimate purposes, as entrenched in the Constitution of the USSR.

It is necessary to work out and to raise to a qualitatively new level the forms and methods of Party influence on preparing the young people for and their service in the Soviet Armed Forces. To improve work on patriotic and internationalist education and the readiness of the Soviet citizens to perform the sacred duty of guaranteeing the security of their homeland. To raise the role of the local Party branches in this field.

**3.** The CPSU holds that the revolutionary renovation of Soviet society and processes in inter-state relations call for the implementation of the military reform stage by stage on the basis of USSR laws.

The reform is to ensure the scientifically substantiated level of the defence potential in keeping with the principle of sensible sufficiency, a long-term military-technological policy and the equipment of the Army and Navy with modern high-quality weapons and military technology on the basis of latest scientific, technical and technological achievements, the optimisation of the structure and governing bodies of the Soviet Armed Forces, the restructuring of personnel policy, democratisation of military service relations, the transformation of the system of recruiting and training the personnel, its higher professionalism and better training of the reserve and enhanced legislation on Soviet citizens' active service.

Congress deems it necessary to speed up the adoption of the defence law and the law on the conversion of defence enterprises, taking into account the development of their scientific, experimental and production base depending on external factors and also the target-oriented government programme to guarantee social security and legal protection of the servicemen, members of their families, reservists and the retired military. Primarily part of the forces and means released due to the reduction of the armed forces and of the defence spending should be used for the above purposes.

Congress considers it to be top priority tasks to improve the material and social situation of

the military personnel, to ensure well-appointed housing for the servicemen and to introduce compensation measures in the conditions of growing prices and inflation.

**4.** A fundamental trend of the military reform is the radical reorganisation of the entire system of Party and political work in the Soviet Armed Forces, including the transformation of the existing structure, the definition of the functions of the Party branches and political bodies, their adjustment to the new tasks and conditions, democratisation of inter-Party relations, and development of a new moral climate, a high level of discipline, legality and comradeship.

Political work in the armed forces of the USSR should be based on the creative development of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin and the achievements of world socio-political thought and culture. The CPSU will strive to enhance its role of a political leader in the Army and Navy and to consolidate all the healthy and progressive forces in the interests of raising the country's defence capability. Congress comes out against depoliticising the armed forces.

The military-political bodies of the Army and Navy work in keeping with the country's defence policy and the USSR Constitution and aim at giving political, military, moral and legal education to the servicemen in a spirit of loyalty to the socialist ideals, the unity of the Army and the people, patriotism, friendship among the Soviet peoples, internationalism, vigilance and constant readiness to defend the homeland.

It is necessary to create and adjust the mechanism of work of Party branches in the Army and Navy and of their effective interaction with other mass political organisations acting in the country within the framework of Soviet laws to translate into life the Party military policy.

Congress holds that the armed forces of the USSR should be a reliable defender of the homeland and a factor for averting war and preserving peace. Concern for the careful preservation and improvement of everything that has been gained in strengthening the defences is the patriotic and internationalist duty of every communist and the cause of the entire people. □

## Presidential decree on demonstration of television and radio

"THE democratisation of society, the growing role of sovereign union republics and the councils of people's deputies, and the development of genuine political pluralism call for a cardinal change in the nature of the country's television and radio broadcasting," says a decree issued by President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The decree, circulated in Moscow on July 15, emphasises that "it is particularly important that television and radio in every way promote the consolidation of society, strengthen its stability and tranquillity, and ensure the protection of state interests, the humanisation of law and order, and inter-ethnic concord."

"These goals call for the maintenance and development of television and radio as a nationwide structure," the decree points out.

The decree recognises the need to determine a legal basis for the activities of television and radio broadcasting under new conditions and recommends that the USSR Supreme Soviet

adopt an appropriate law.

Provision is made for an extension of the rights and powers of republican, territorial and regional television and radio committees.

The decree envisages the creation of subdivisions within the television and radio committees to be in charge of the provision of information to local government bodies and registration, under licence agreements, television centres and studios which the councils of people's deputies at all levels, public organisations and parties have the right to open relying on their own financial and technical resources.

At the same time the document points out that "considering the importance of maintaining the nationwide system of television and radio, any acts taken by republican, territorial and regional bodies without coordination with the USSR Council of Ministers and aimed at changing legal or property status of the operating subdivisions of the USSR State Committee for Television and Broadcasting shall be considered invalid."

*(continued on next page)*



# Mikhail Gorbachev's concluding remarks at Communist Party Congress

*Mikhail Gorbachev made the concluding remarks at the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party on July 14:*

THE Congress has ended its work. The agenda has been completed and I have only this to say in conclusion.

It is as yet hard to assess fully the impact the 28th Congress will have on the Party and society. But I believe one thing is clear – the impact will be great and lasting. What directions has the Congress adopted for the Party and what signals does it send to society?

First of all, it is the determination of the Soviet Communist Party to bridge the still existing gap between Party organisations, Party committees and workers, farmers and intellectuals and organise an active everyday feedback with the country's work collectives and, on this basis, to increase the Party's vanguard role in society and make an even greater contribution to achieving the aims of our revolutionary perestroika.

The Party intends to radically change its attitude to soviets, reject the attempts to substitute their activities, intensively assist their formation and help people's deputies resolve problems connected with meeting vital demands of the population.

The Congress expressed its readiness to face other social and political movements and organisations. We now need to prove in practice that the idea of a broad coalition in the name of overcoming the crisis and carrying out deep reforms, which was stated in the resolution on the political report of the Central Committee, is not a tactical move but a serious proposal guided by the interests of the country and people.

It is not easy and I see that it will not be easy, but we have made a choice. I believe it is a right and necessary choice, dictated by the course of perestroika. We extend our hand to everybody who supports democracy and socialism and call on them to co-operate.

The Congress gives another important signal to society. The Congress has taken extremely important steps to move the Party out of crisis. We honestly exposed mistakes, resolutely denounced crimes that were committed under the banner of socialism and rejected everything that bound creative endeavours of our people.

At the same time, we resolutely refute all attempts to cross out everything positive that was done for the country by several generations of communists. Those who demand repentance from the Party, want to square accounts and declare it all but a criminal organisation, imply try to remove it from political life and hit the cause of revolutionary renovation of society. We consider it this way.

To put it in a nutshell, we recommend those who use such methods to stop the anti-democratic and instigating activities. And as far as communists are concerned, they should get rid of all complexes and enliven their activities. People will judge the Soviet Communist Party by its deeds.

*(continued from previous page)*

The Presidential Decree stipulates that the functions of state-run television and radio broadcasting "should be performed independently of political and social organisations and should serve an impartial and all-round coverage of processes taking place in the country."

The decree also contains instructions for a transition of studios and television centres to a contract-and-competition system of labour agreements and for the upgrading of the material and technical resources of television and radio. □

During these days, much was said here on ways for perestroika and on its priorities. Finally, we agreed that priority should be given to the development of the countryside, the solution of the food problem, the elaboration and signing of a new union treaty, the improvement of the situation on the consumer market, the radicalisation of economic restructuring and the strengthening of discipline and order. These are the things to be tackled at once.

As for me, I want to assure you that I shall use all constitutional powers of the Soviet President to implement this. We would not allow anybody to break perestroika.

There are many tasks for us in international affairs. I would like to use the rostrum to express satisfaction with the statement of Western countries' leaders that they no more consider the Soviet Union an enemy and extend their hand of friendship and co-operation. To be exact, we were the first to offer our hand, but let us not argue on priorities in such a case. It is important that an end has been put to the "cold war".

At the recent meeting of leaders of seven Western countries in Houston, they discussed the possibility of economic support for the Soviet Union. What is our position in this respect? The very fact that such a question is raised not only by the public, but by Western countries' governments, is evidence that our striving to overcome the self-isolation and to integrate ourselves into the world economy meets a positive response.

We are ready to co-operate and will be grateful for assistance. We come out not as applicants but as partners who do not want to take anything gratis. At the same time, I would like to stress that any attempts to put forward any political preconditions for such co-operation should be excluded. It can and should develop only on an equal and mutually advantageous basis.

Now, about the Party itself.

First of all, we should inform communists of the results of the Congress and help them to understand in depth that the Party has entered a period of radical restructuring. Let me formulate three conditions for the Party to manifest its vital capacity and really acquire the vanguard potential.

Next, it should resolutely and without delay restructure all its activities and all structures on the basis of the new rules and the programme statement of the Congress in order to take on its role as a vanguard in new conditions. We should do everything to establish Party grassroots' power in the Soviet Communist Party on the basis of all-embracing democracy, comradeship, openness, glasnost and criticism.

Second, if there are differing opinions and even platforms on some political issues or practical activities, the majority should show respect for the minority. We should learn to listen to, and not to put pressure on or intimidate one another. Let the right deed show its worth by the results.

Third, it is necessary to learn, comrades, and to raise our culture. If we choose this way, it will be easier to communicate and contact with other forces. And working people and their organisations will have more confidence in us.

The Central Committee and me personally, as General Secretary, will do everything to help republican communist parties acquire, as soon as possible, a new independent status that will lead not to dissociation of communists and nations, but to a new internationalist unity of the Soviet Communist Party on the common ideo-

logical and political basis in the interest of integrity of our great multinational state.

And there is one more thing I would like to say in conclusion.

It is no secret that before the Congress and even during its work, especially at the beginning, there were apprehensions in this country and in the world press that the Soviet Communist Party has lost its ability for renovation and it cannot break with dogmatism and sectarianism that penetrated it and that it is doomed to a split and retraced from the political arena.

We can say confidently that these apprehensions were not justified. Those who counted that it is the last Congress to be held and the funeral of the Soviet Communist Party, were wrong again. The Soviet Communist Party lives and will live. It will make its historic contribution to the country's progress and the progress of the world civilisation.

A serious step has been made to renew the Party. The 28th Congress was not an easy one. There were heated discussions and, I should say, dramatic clashes until its very end. But, finally, it adopted important decisions, meeting the spirit and aims of perestroika.

This is, maybe, the most important thing that we can daringly state with deep satisfaction as people who are anxious about their Party, socialism, our people and their today and tomorrow.

Now, we should hold the right note, not to return to old habits, to the beaten track. This would mean death for the Party. We simply have no right to thwart the hopes of millions of Soviet people who believe in the Party as a political force that is capable of expressing and defending their interests in new conditions.

Let us prove that the Soviet Communist Party, restructuring itself, can come up to expectations of the people and then it will restore its prestige and become a real vanguard party whose power lies not in ordering about, but in its influence on minds.

Let me in conclusion wish all of you good health and success and thank you for the work we have done here, at the Congress. □

## IN THE SERIES Perestroika

**PERESTROIKA as seen by  
a Writer**

**PERESTROIKA Through the  
Eyes of a Co-operator**

**PERESTROIKA as Seen by  
an Economist**

**PERESTROIKA as Seen by  
a Mathematician**

**PERESTROIKA as Seen by  
an Economist**

*The above booklets are priced 30p each and  
are obtainable from:*

*Soviet Booklets (SN),  
3 Rosary Gardens,  
London SW7 4NW.*



# Statement: Towards Humane, Democratic Socialism

A PROGRAMME statement entitled *Towards Humane, Democratic Socialism*, adopted at the 28th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), was circulated in Moscow on July 15.

The document stresses that the Soviet Communist Party Congress "attaches fundamental importance to an impartial evaluation of the current situation and the determination of the principles of the Party's policy at the present stage with a view to overcoming the crisis in society and within the Party, to renewing them and to advancing towards humane, democratic socialism."

In an evaluation of the current situation the Congress stated that the root cause of the crisis "is not in the inadequacy of the very idea of socialism but in those deformations to which it was subjected in the past."

The practice, under which the state took over all the aspects of social life, and the "dictatorship practised by the Party and state top leadership professedly on behalf of the proletariat brought about new forms of the alienation of the person from property and power and led to arbitrariness and lawlessness," the statement points out.

The document analyses in detail the course of perestroika, the launching of which "signified a radical turn to a policy of renewal and of freeing the country from social forms that are alien to socialism."

Perestroika also revealed the exceptional complexity of a simultaneous transformation of all spheres of the life of the huge state.

In this connection the statement points out that "the Central Committee and the Politburo quite often lagged behind the development of events and acted by the trial-and-error method in making and implementing decisions and in reforming the CPSU itself."

"A rapid process of the formation of various political groups and movements" is now under way in the country, the statement says.

"The conservative-and-dogmatic current, whose representatives regard the policy of renewal as an encroachment on the principles of socialism and who advocate a return to authoritarianism, has become active."

On the other hand "movements that reject the socialist choice are gaining momentum." Militants of monarchic and even fascist trend have also declared themselves, the statement noted.

In addition, "ethnic movements, in which chauvinistic and nationalist sentiments increasingly manifest themselves along with democratic trends, have considerably gained in scope," the statement points out.

"Setting nations against one another and putt-

ing forward slogans of separatism, 'national exclusiveness', they quite often turn out to be the exponents of the interests of old or new anti-democratic groups straining for power," the statement says.

The Congress regards "a consistent policy of renewing the social system within the framework of the socialist choice" as the basis for a contemporary strategy of advance towards a prosperous and free society and the tactic for getting out of the crisis. In this connection, the statement emphasises that "the CPSU is a Party of the socialist choice and communist perspective."

The document formulates urgent measures to take society and the country out of the crisis. The CPSU considers it as a matter of urgency "to elaborate a new treaty this year on the union of republics as sovereign states on an utterly voluntary basis."

In the socio-economic field, the Congress deemed it necessary "to normalise the consumer market, primarily the food market, within eighteen months to two years by reorienting the economy towards the consumer sector as soon as possible."

During the transition to a free price formation, the document says, it is essential "to maintain fixed prices of a number of prime necessities."

The statement also points out the need to carry out a financial-and-credit reform, reasonably to cut defence expenditures, to regulate foreign economic relations and "to ensure a transition to the convertibility of the rouble and to render the economy open to the world market."

The document mentions "a market economy" as the alternative to the obsolete administrative command system of economic management.

Favouring a stage-by-stage transition to the market, the CPSU considers it necessary in particular "to demonopolise production, banking and insurance, trade, research and development; and to give support to the network of small- and medium-sized enterprises."

The CPSU considers it the central strategic task of its policy "to ensure living conditions worthy of the Soviet people." The Party favours "the exercise of human rights at the level of internationally recognised norms."

The document also sets out the CPSU's stand on the formation of a civil society and the creation of a state genuinely committed to the rule of law and points out the need to carry out a military reform "based on the defensive doctrine and principle of reasonable sufficiency."

The statement highlights Soviet foreign policy guidelines. With a view to strengthening universal security, the Party "favours an energetic continuation of the successful demilitarisation of international relations: cutting arms and armed forces down to reasonable defence sufficiency, fully excluding the use of or a threat of the use of force from world practice, further reducing and then completely eliminating military confrontation."

Foreign policy guidelines include "the creation of global and regional security structures based on the balance of interests of all the sides in order to prevent conflicts or international instability."

The CPSU comes out in favour of "further normalising Soviet-American relations and directing them into the channel of constructive partnership; participating with initiative in the all-European process and overcoming the historical division of Europe; the development of new forms of political and economic co-operation with East European countries."

The Party also favours "all-round strengthening of positive tendencies in relations with the People's Republic of China; an active policy in the Asia-Pacific region with a view to making it a zone of peace and co-operation; participation in a political settlement of regional conflicts; co-operation with the Non-Aligned Movement and the developing countries."

The Soviet Communist Party is for "overcoming the historical split in the working class movement, for developing co-operation with communist, socialist, social-democratic, and national democratic parties and all organisations and movements that champion peace, democracy and social progress."

The statement sets out in detail a programme for the renewal of the CPSU, emphasising that "the Party renounces political and ideological monopolism and the practice under which it took over the functions that should be performed by state administration and economic management agencies."

The CPSU, the statement says, "becomes a political organisation which through its practical activities and a constructive approach to the solution of societal development problems will defend the right to political leadership in free competition against other socio-political forces."

Emphasising the need for democratisation within the Party, the statement points out that the CPSU "resolutely rejects democratic centralism in the form it assumed under the administrative command system, rigid centralisation, and upholds democratic principles — electivity, succession, openness and accountability, the subordination of minority to majority and the right of minority to uphold their views."

The Congress does not consider it proper "to deprive the communists in the Army, the State Security Committee (KGB) and the Interior Ministry of the rights to Party membership and to the setting up of Party organisations, just as of other forms of political activity."

However, those organisations, the statement stresses, "should be separated from state-and-administrative, including military-political agencies that are in charge of moral and political education of the personnel of the Army, the Interior Ministry and the KGB."

The statement points out that the CPSU "seeks to co-operate with movements and organisations of the socialist orientation, to have dialogue and maintain equal partnership with all progressive ideological-and-political currents. The Party is prepared to form political blocs with them."

Such are the CPSU's ideological and theoretical positions and political goals which the communists will be guided by in their practical activities until a new programme of the CPSU is adopted in 1992. □

## Visit of Mikhail GORBACHEV to CANADA

May 29-30 1990

Documents and Materials

price 40p from:  
Soviet Booklets (SN),  
3 Rosary Gardens,  
London SW7 4NW

## The Economic Structure of Socialism:

an attempted prognosis  
by  
Stanislav Menshikov

price 50p from:  
Soviet Booklets (SN),  
3 Rosary Gardens,  
London SW7 4NW



## CONGRESS RESOLUTIONS

### Resolution on nationalities policy

THE acuteness of inter-ethnic contradictions in the Soviet Union, which remain unsettled, creates a real threat to the recently started democratic processes. A further escalation of tension is fraught with a threat of disintegration of society and a possible destabilisation of the world situation. This is stated in the resolution *Democratic Nationalities Policy is a Way to Voluntary Union, Peace and Accord Among Nations*, adopted by the 28th CPSU Congress, which ended on July 13.

Inter-ethnic conflicts have already resulted in tremendous loss of life, turned hundreds of thousands of people into refugees and inflicted enormous moral, political and material damage. They are making a negative impact on the processes of democratisation and national revival, the resolution said. The Congress "denounces any forms of violence in the settlement of inter-ethnic problems and regards political means and constitutional norms as the only way of settling all conflict situations."

The resolution states that "the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the Party's top leadership failed to appreciate in due time the depth of deformations and contradictions in the nationalities policy, to foresee their impact

on the progress of perestroika, to overcome dogmatism and to work out entirely new approaches anticipating the development of the situation." In some republics the "political initiative was taken over by national popular movements, in which democratic feelings were often intertwined with political ambitions of their leaders."

According to the resolution, the 28th CPSU Congress believes that the situation can be overcome "through giving a clear picture of the existing situation and its possible consequences and suggesting a political strategy in this sphere. This strategy should be based on the unconditional recognition of the right of every nation, as well as every individual, to self-determination on the basis of a free democratic choice."

Union and republican laws adopted recently created the necessary conditions for the solution of the fundamental problem – the working out and concluding of a new union treaty. The Congress believes that it should follow the idea of a union of sovereign states, which will be based on a real equality of all signatories to the treaty, a clear definition of their status, the division of authority of the union and union republics, a possibility of establishing various forms of relationship between them, the voluntary nature and mutual benefit.

"Humane and just society, which is emerging in torment, is duty-bound to ensure peace and accord among nations. Otherwise democratic socialism and the Party of Communists will have no future, no right to confidence," the resolution stresses. □

### Resolution on news organisations

THE form, pace and depth of the restructuring of the Party press do not always keep pace with the changes taking place in society, says a resolution on *News Organisations of the Soviet Communist Party*, adopted on July 13 at the 28th Party Congress.

The Congress believes that in conditions of the emerging multi-party system, the Party "needs a press, capable of upholding the ideals and values of socialism, the goals and tasks of perestroika, the full power of soviets, the democratisation of society on the basis of the socialist choice and the formation of a law-governed state."

The resolution expresses the desire that the USSR State Committee for Radio and Television will model its work with public movements and organisations on the basis of treaty relations.

It has been recommended to use more fully in editing and publishing new forms of economic management, envisaged in the law on the enterprise. "Without claiming special legal and economic protection, the CPSU rejects, at the same time, the demands to deprive the Party of its own publishing base," the resolution says.

New relations between the CPSU, its branches, and journalists are based on respect for the law on the press and other mass media. One can influence public, trade union or youth publications not by force of instructions, but by force of prestige, the 28th Party Congress stressed. □

## After Congress Gorbachev won't be the same

By Vyacheslav Kostikov, *Novosti* political commentator

IN spite of sharp and often aggressive criticism at the 28th Communist Party Congress, Gorbachev has remained the leader of the Party. In fact, his re-election as General Secretary was predictable. Most analysts watching the Congress had foreseen it. An opinion study group formed at the Congress claimed that Gorbachev had rated higher than any other candidate to the top Party post.

So, Gorbachev remains in the Kremlin and retains all the attributes of power that go with this post. Yet, he will be a different man. It is not that the difficult Party forum has added a few more white hairs to his sideburns or a few more wrinkles to his forehead. I think the Congress has changed Gorbachev inside.

Unlike his predecessors, who preferred to describe all political and social phenomena in Marxist jargon, Gorbachev's favourite word is "sudba", which means destiny or fate. This is not accidental: having tied his destiny to that of perestroika, he must reap its fruit and suffer from its shocks. The 28th Party Congress was certainly one of such shocks for him.

When the die-hard conservatives rounded on him for "dismantling socialism", did he recall Boris Godunov's monologue from Pushkin's tragedy? The analogies strike the eye. Both tried to improve people's conditions, democratise society (you must allow for the difference in time) and rid the people from fear, and both were misunderstood and booed and jeered by the mob, incited by Boyar aristocrats, in one case, and Party bosses who had secured a noisy majority at the Congress, in the other.

"Angrily they swore at me," Boris Godunov complained.

Gorbachev did not complain or repent his sins at the Congress. He fought for "popular support", which seemed to be slipping away from him. Khrushchev gave up at the first attempt of the conservatives to strip him of power. Brezhnev learned the lessons of Khrushchev and gave himself up completely to the apparatus. Gorbachev fought to the end in order to win.

The drama of the "troubled times" described in

Pushkin's tragedy is that the reform-minded Tsar was ahead of his time. Gorbachev's reforms were also far ahead of the evolution of public consciousness in the Soviet Union. A dangerous gap has appeared between power and a part of the people, who are still living by the myths and dogmas of Stalin's socialism. The 28th Party Congress saw a dramatic conflict between the old and the new, a clash between the myths of the past and the realities and imperatives of perestroika.

The democratic trend seems to have prevailed closer to the end of the Congress. Perestroika has survived the conservative attacks. The conservatives did everything they could because they realised that it was their last chance. The risk was also great for the reformers, symbolised at the Congress by such figures as Gorbachev, Yakovlev and Shevardnadze. If they were defeated and perestroika reforms rolled back, the neo-Stalinists would not have forgiven them the encroachment upon their power and privileges.

It was not an easy victory. Those who watched Gorbachev in those days saw that he was very tired. I think that several days of the Congress cost him several years of life. As for political experience, the time of the Congress was worth all the five years of perestroika.

There is no doubt that Gorbachev has changed a great deal since March 11, 1985, when he was elected General Secretary. His ideas, speeches, views and place in the power structure and system of values have changed. A Party functionary who made his career inside the intricate system of Party power, he became the first President of the changing Soviet Union. Yet, in spite of his changed views, he remained very much a man of the system which he set out to change. Like a character in a Chekhov story, he squeezed the system out of himself drop by drop, changing before our own eyes, and yet remained a part of that system.

The two weeks of the Congress were for Gorbachev like sailing in Chiron's boat across the cold waters of the River Styx. Unlike the mythical travellers who drank from the hateful stream and lost their memory, he will never forget the past. The insults and humiliation he was subjected to by the revenge-seeking conservatives will always remind him who is friend and who is

foe to him and on whom he can rely and who may betray him any time.

The lessons Gorbachev has learned will repay all the political blows he received at the Congress.

Gorbachev's team will certainly take them all into account in formulating its policy after the Congress. One of the lessons is that in moving to democracy one should not lean on the conservatives. Democracy is something that requires co-operation with the democratic forces, whether you like it or not.

The other lesson, which is most important perhaps, is that at critical, "epoch-making" (as Gorbachev is fond of saying) points of history one should not play games with the people. One must tell them the truth, no matter how harsh it may be.

True, many "half-truths" told by Gorbachev with regard to such things as the market, private property and socialism were dictated by slow evolution of public mentality. On the other hand, he constantly had to watch the conservatives who were eagerly waiting for him to "babble it all out".

Yet, his difficulties and the lack of understanding between him and a part of the population arise to a great extent from his failure to tell the people the whole truth and his own adherence to old dogmas and phraseology. □

### ON THE "LITHUANIAN PROBLEM"

(White Book)  
Moscow 1990

price 60p from:  
Soviet Booklets (SN),  
3 Rosary Gardens,  
London SW7 4NW