

343032

JPRS-UKO-88-016
17 OCTOBER 1988



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

KOMMUNIST

No 10, July 1988

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980716 069

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

10
86
A05

Soviet Union
KOMMUNIST
No 10, July 1988

JPRS-UKO-88-016

CONTENTS

17 OCTOBER 1988

[Translation of the Russian-language theoretical and political journal of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow 18 times per year.]

M.S. Gorbachev's 28 June 1988 Speech [M.S. Gorbachev; pp 3-59]	1
Resolutions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: On Political Reform [pp 60-87]	37
Speech by M.S. Gorbachev at the Closing of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on 1 July [M.S. Gorbachev; pp 88-95]	54
Social Type of Personality [V.A. Yadov; pp 96-104]	59
Comintern: Practical Experience [F. Firsov, K. Shirinya; pp 105-115]	65
1956, 1965: Lessons of Uncompleted Turns [Ye. Zubkova; pp 116-120]	72
National Conference of the BCP [G. Cherneyko; pp 121-125]	76
Short Book Reviews [pp 126-127]	81
Chronicle. Meetings With the Editors [p 128]	82
Publication Data	83

KOMMUNIST

No 10, July 1988

[Translation of the Russian-language theoretical and political journal of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow 18 times per year.]

M.S. Gorbachev's 28 June 1988 Speech
18020016a Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 88 (signed to press 6 Jul 88) pp 3-59

[CPSU Central Committee report delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]

[Text] Comrade delegates!

How to deepen the revolutionary restructuring that has been launched in our country on the initiative and under the guidance of the party, and make it irreversible—that is the fundamental issue facing us, the delegates to the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

This question is posed by life itself. It is being discussed broadly in the party and among the people, and whether the party is in a position to fulfill the role of political vanguard at the new stage of the development of Soviet society depends on how correct an answer we give.

One can quite justifiably call the last 3 years of our lives a turnaround. It has been possible, by the efforts of the party and the working people, to stop the slide toward crisis in the economic, social and spiritual spheres. Society now knows and understands better its past, present, and future. The policy of restructuring, developed in specific socioeconomic programs, is becoming the practical cause of millions. This is the essence of the political situation in the country.

We can see how society has become enlivened. The country's spiritual life has become more varied, more interesting and richer. Many of the ideas of Karl Marx and Vladimir Ilich Lenin, which until recently were either taken in a one-sided way or were passed over completely in silence, have been getting new interpretations. In the struggle against dogmatism the creative principle of scientific, humanistic socialism is being reborn.

People have started to feel their own responsibility; they are breaking free of apathy and alienation. The wind of renewal is tempering the people's moral health. Democratization has released a great stream of thoughts, emotions and initiatives. The assertion of truth and glasnost is purifying the atmosphere in society; it is inspiring people, unfettering their consciousness and stimulating active work.

This, comrades is a brilliant and impressive process in which all that is honest and progressive in our people is involved. The forces of revolutionary renewal are being consolidated. People have come to believe in restructuring and demand an unfaltering advance—and only an advance.

The working class is demonstrating a lofty consciousness and level of organization. In the process of the unusual, new and complex developments invading our life, it is once again demonstrating its fine political and moral qualities, exhibiting a truly civic and statesman-like approach to matters and expressing support for restructuring through its labor. This stance by the working class enables the party to confidently carry out revolutionary transformations.

The peasantry has responded with great commitment. The Congress of Kolkhoz Members proved what a powerful restructuring energy it possesses. The champions of restructuring in agriculture are boldly undertaking new forms of work, arming themselves with science and efficient technology, demonstrating a readiness to experiment, to search, even to take risks on behalf of the new cause and to exert themselves fully in working responsibly and skillfully for themselves and for the good of the fatherland.

Restructuring confirmed Lenin's well-known tenet on the intelligentsia's heightened social sensitivity and its responsiveness to social change. It has responded fervently to the party's appeals to place society's intellectual and spiritual potential fully at the service of restructuring. The intelligentsia sincerely supported the lesson of truth given by the 27th CPSU Congress, Party decisions over the last 3 years have met with deep understanding among it.

And so, the main political result of the post-April period has been a change in the entire atmosphere, in society, a start of the materialization of the idea of renewal and growing support by the Soviet people for the party's course of restructuring.

However, does this mean that changes for the better are taking place everywhere and at full speed, that revolutionary transformations have become irreversible?

No, it does not. If we wish to remain grounded in reality, we have to admit that so far this has not taken place, comrades. We have not yet overcome the profound causes of the obstruction process, and the mechanisms of renewal have not been brought in everywhere nor have some things been worked out completely. The capacity for action of many party organizations does not match the tasks of restructuring. Qualitative changes are needed in our development. This calls for fundamental decisions and for vigorous and innovative actions.

Today we are faced with many complex issues, but which of them is the key one? The CPSU believes that the reform of our political system is such an issue.

The Central Committee presented its platform in the theses for the conference. The task was not posed there of providing ready answers to everything. We considered that new ideas and proposals that can be taken into account by the conference will arise in the course of discussion and that its decision will then really be the result of the collective creativity of the whole party and people.

Thus, the political aim of our conference is to interpret the period after the April Plenum of the Central Committee and the 27th Party Congress in a comprehensive and critical manner, to enrich the strategy, to express in concrete terms the tactics of our transformations, and to define the ways, means and methods of work that will guarantee the steadfast development and the irreversibility of restructuring, in the spirit of Leninist traditions and relying on our accumulated experience.

I

Developing and Intensifying Perestroika

1. Self-Critical Assessment of Achievements

Comrades, the process of revolutionary renewal is increasingly penetrating the deciding sphere of life—the economy.

We have set about the profound reform, truly radical in its aims and scale, of managing the national economy. A considerable proportion of the economy's primary units have been converted to the principles of complete financial autonomy and self-financing in accordance with the Law on the State Enterprise. The law which was recently adopted on cooperatives in the USSR opens up a path toward establishing a major cooperative sector in the country's economy and toward the broad application of various cooperative forms in all spheres of the national economy.

Restructuring of labor and internal production relations has begun on the basis of contracting and leasing. This makes it possible to combine the advantage of public property with the proprietary interest of a person and his caring attitude to the matter in hand and civic self-assertion. Noticeable impetus has been given to developing individual labor activity.

Several major decisions of a fundamental nature have been made that have determined directions for restructuring for the basic sectors of the national economy and the social sphere, which are being implemented.

The economy is gradually gaining momentum. Last year for the first time the entire growth in national income was achieved by raising labor productivity. There has

been a renewal in the growth of the working people's real income. In the first 2 years of the current 5-year plan real per capital income increased by 4.6 percent.

By comparison with the 11th 5-Year Plan, annual housing construction increased by 15 million square meters. We have seriously set about reorganizing public education and the health service. The birthrate has risen and the death rate has fallen. That is to no mean degree connected with the campaign against drunkenness and alcoholism.

The tendency toward improving the social and economic situation has also developed this year. National income is increasing more rapidly than envisaged by the plan with an absolute reduction in the number of people employed in material production. Production of consumer goods is increasing at a fast pace, and that has made it possible to fulfill the 5-month task for the volume of trade. A total of 5.9 percent more food and durable products have been sold than in the same period last year. The volume of consumer services to the people increased by 13.5 percent.

The construction of housing and social and consumer facilities has been intensified; 6 percent more apartments and houses, 22 percent more general schools, nearly one-third more preschool institutions, clubs, and houses of culture, and twice as many hospitals have been built.

All these are the real results of restructuring. However, comrades, we must be self-critical and see clearly that despite all the positive aspects the state of affairs in the economy is slow in changing, especially if we judge by the final result, by the people's standard of living.

What are the reasons for this?

It must be said frankly, comrades: we underestimated the whole depth and weight of the deformations during the past years' stagnation. There was a lot we simply didn't know and are seeing only now. It turned out that the neglect of affairs in different areas of the economy was more serious than we had initially thought.

Just how serious the situation is can be seen in particular in the country's financial situation. For many years state budget outlays grew faster than revenue. The budget deficit applies pressure on the market, undermines the stability of the ruble and money circulation, and gives birth to inflationary processes.

Yet, I think that in speaking of the mistakes and bitter lessons of the past we must be no less exacting and no less principled in our attitude to ourselves and the present than we are to our predecessors. We must analyze not only our successes but also our mistakes, the lessons of our activity over the past 3 years, and the mistakes and blunders made during restructuring. From this viewpoint, it must be said self-critically that in 3

years we could have done much more than was done in the main sectors of restructuring, first and foremost in raising the efficiency of our economy and improving its final results.

It is a fact that even today the country continues to use too much fuel energy, electric power and metal per unit of national income. This is why there is a shortage of resources despite their high volume of output, which obliges us to allocate more and more money to increase the raw material, fuel, and energy base.

In order to break out of this vicious circle we have embarked on a radical modernization of Soviet machine-building as the decisive condition for accelerating scientific and technical progress and for reconstructing our entire national economy. We can say that this is an unprecedented program. It demands extraordinary efforts, not only in machine-building itself, but in the chemical industry, metallurgy, and other sectors, and of course in the sphere of scientific research and development. Work has started on this, but it is not yet on a level with the scale of the tasks that have been set. It is going slowly, especially in such vanguard areas as microelectronics, computer technology and the creation of advanced materials. Direct responsibility for this is borne by the Bureau of the USSR Council of Ministers for machine-building, the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, and the leading industry cadres. Structural advances in the economy are taking place slowly on the whole. This means that it still has most of the problems that have accumulated in the past. But this is also a reflection of today's approaches to economic management.

And another thing: the June 1987 Plenum of the Central Committee, as you will recall, spoke of the need to combine the achievement of long-term strategic aims with the maximum satisfaction of the vital needs of the people. Structural restructuring and radical economic reform are fundamental processes. They will require time, great efforts, and resources. In implementing these tasks, we must at the same time without delay also address the pressing problems of raising the people's well-being. This line stems entirely from the directives of the 27th CPSU Congress aimed at intensifying the social orientation of our development.

How are these tasks being addressed?

I will begin with the food problem, as this is perhaps the sorest point in the life of society, the most acute problem.

There are certain improvements here, but they cannot satisfy us. In essence, the increase in the food supply that we have attained has, to a substantial extent, been used to meet needs connected with population growth. This means, comrades, that we need a different, a higher pace of increasing food resources. We have neither a moral nor political right to tolerate a protracted resolution of the food problem.

A fair question arises: Why have we not been succeeding for so long in making any headway in this? Certainly, many causes trace their roots back into the past, when the foundations of the rural economy's development were seriously undermined. But this in no way justifies the current neglect in agriculture. It would appear that all the knots have been untied, the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the rayons, the oblasts, the republics, have been granted the most wide-ranging rights for increasing production of crop and livestock output, but the desired result is still lacking. More than that, many decisions of the recent period are coming up against incomprehension and procrastination in their implementation, against all manner of bureaucratic obstacles, and simply even reluctance to work in the new way.

The accuracy of that conclusion is confirmed by the differences in the results of the work of many regions, even under equal natural and climatic conditions. Where they have come to grips with the job energetically, where they are really using the new possibilities, the situation is noticeably improving. Take for example Belorussia, Lithuania, Altay Kray, and Belgorod, Volgograd, Zhitomir, Lipetsk, Orel, Khmel'nitskiy, and Tselinograd Oblasts. The output of livestock products is steadily rising there, which has made it possible to noticeably improve food supplies.

But how is it that they managed to improve food supplies to the population in Belgorod Oblast but not in neighboring Kursk Oblast? How is it that the farm workers in Tselinograd Oblast increased deliveries of meat, milk, and vegetables to the trade network, while in North Kazakhstan and some other neighboring oblasts they did not manage to do it?

Such examples, comrades, occur, as they say, all the live-long time. Moreover, Vologda, Kaliningrad, Kirovograd, Kurgan and Yaroslavl Oblasts, and the Kalmyk Autonomous Republic have even incurred a reduction in the production of many agricultural products. Instances of stagnation still persist in the agriculture of Uzbekistan, Moldavia and the Transcaucasian republics. So much lies in the attitude to the job, in the competence of the leadership, in their ability to run the economy in the new way.

I think the quest for ways of improving the job of food supply has to be continued everywhere, and primarily in those oblasts and republics where the situation is not changing, or is improving slowly. Moreover, this has to be done throughout the nation, on the basis of a profound analysis of the state of agriculture.

What should attention be focused upon? Experience indicates that the shortest and most reliable path to a sufficiency in foodstuffs is to introduce broad, general leasing and other effective methods of organizing and stimulating labor. This is a key link in present-day agrarian policy.

The results of work done by collectives working on the basis of leasing and contracting have demonstrated that over a relatively short period the level of crop yield and livestock productivity can be rapidly increased, labor productivity can be substantially raised, losses can be curtailed, and good-quality goods produced. It is precisely in this experience, comrades, that lies the answer to the major question of how long it will take the country to resolve the food problem. Everything depends on how quickly we get people interested and set up the work of leasing and subcontracting collectives, how broadly we involve rural workers in the process, and make the peasant the genuine master of the land.

It goes without saying that we must at the same time, pursue the course of strengthening the material and technical base of agriculture and the food industry. Measures for improving the transportation, storage, and processing of agricultural produce are urgently needed. If we manage to harvest, transport, store and process the crops in time, and deliver the goods to the customer promptly, then even at the present level of productivity of fields and farms it will be possible to increase the consumption of food products by 20-30 percent.

This obvious reserve must be used. We have worked out a specific program for improving the processing, storage and transportation of agricultural products and we have allocated 77 billion rubles for these purposes in the remaining years of the 12th and the 13th 5-Year Period. Now we must organize affairs ably and make efficient use of these resources so that we can decisively correct the situation in a short time.

The broad development of the cooperative movement, the introduction of cost accounting, leasing as well as other progressive methods of organizing and stimulating labor, objectively require radical changes in the management of the agroindustrial complex. Practice has shown that, in their present form, agroindustrial authorities in rayons and oblasts are making themselves redundant. Clearly we must follow the path prompted by life, upon which, following the example of Tula grain-growers, many rayons, oblasts, and republics have already embarked. I am talking about the voluntary association of kolkhozes and sovkhozes for the creation of joint services and management bodies. Agricultural workers are better judges of what forms of management and services they need.

As far as soviet and party agencies are concerned, their task lies in lending assistance and support to farms in restructuring in rural areas and radically changing methods of management. As for those workers who are holding things up and standing in the way of new developments, as was already stated at the Kolkhoz Members Congress, they must be decisively removed.

Another important problem is that no matter what resources we direct into agriculture, they will not give the necessary return unless we concern ourselves with the

individual, with the conditions of his labor and daily life. I would like to speak in particular about the social development of rural areas. Here, society has no small debt to repay to the rural dwellers. Housing, social and cultural conditions, and medical care provided in villages, are at a low level in many rayons. To this one must add the unsatisfactory way in which houses in the countryside are fitted out; difficulties with power supplies and the use of household appliances and the poor condition of roads.

This 5-Year Plan, more large-scale measures than ever before are being taken toward improving the social sphere in the countryside. A major program of transformation is being implemented in particular in that most important region of the country, the Russian non-Chernozem zone. Workers in the countryside should, in the coming years, already feel everywhere real changes in living and working conditions. This line must continue to be consistently pursued in the future. Gosplan and the USSR Gosagroprom should proceed from this when preparing the plan for the 13th 5-Year Plan.

In short, comrades, the essence of agrarian policy at the present stage amounts to ensuring a change in the production relationship in the countryside itself. We must restore the economic balance between town and country, comprehensively identify the potential of kolkhozes and sovkhozes through the development of various forms of subcontracting and leasing, overcome the alienation of the peasant from the land, make him the sole master and protect him against any commanding, and radically changing the living conditions of rural workers. Only on this basis can the effectiveness of agroindustrial production be sharply increased and a radical improvement in domestic food supplies be ensured.

On the housing problem. We have undertaken to solve a problem of exceptional importance, to provide virtually every family with a separate apartment or an individual house by the year 2000. As we know, in order to do this, over 35 million apartments and houses will have to be built. Although the situation in housing construction has begun to change for the better, it remains very stressed, and people wait years for an apartment.

We have set about unusual solutions in this regard. We have considerably increased the scale of building new houses and apartments at the expense of state resources, by reducing capital investment on industrial construction, and of the funds of labor collectives that have adopted cost accounting. Practical steps have been taken to develop cooperative and individual housing construction. Their essence is to meet the desires of people to acquire a cooperative apartment or home of their own. To this end, all bans and limitations on the dimensions of buildings and their number of floors have been removed. Let people put up what they need, with their earned resources, taking into consideration present and future requirements. The numerous proposals to provide

citizens with the opportunity to buy from the state the apartments they occupy, with the right to leave them as inheritance, are thought to be well-founded.

The decisions adopted to speed up the construction of housing has evoked the approval of the Soviet people. Everywhere things have begun to change for the better, but new problems are arising. The level of development of the base of construction organizations and the construction materials industry is not in keeping with growing demand. Here a great deal needs to be done, taking advantage of all the possibilities available in the oblasts, krays, and republics. Much depends on the machine-builders who must supply the most modern machines and equipment to the builders and the enterprises of the construction materials industry. All this needs to be resolved urgently and in a businesslike manner.

Finally, about satisfying the demand for consumer goods and developing the trade and service sphere. The changes that have taken shape here do not eradicate the main problems. The supply of goods and services continues to lag behind the growth in purchasing power of the population, something which is largely caused by neglect of this area and by the attitude toward it.

Much depends on the work of light industry. Today we are, as they say, reaping the fruits of the protracted disregard for the development of this sector. Obsolete equipment is being used at its enterprises. A great deal of the heavy work is being done manually. All this has an effect on productivity, the quantity and quality of output, and cadre stability. Measures have been taken now to correct the situation here. Substantial funds have been allocated. The enterprises are being modernized, using both Soviet and imported equipment.

But there are other reasons as well. The slow intensification of consumer goods output can largely be explained by our badly structured economic mechanism and poor incentives. Most of the union ministries' enterprises and departments that are called upon to provide the market with consumer durables regard this a secondary task. They are using all kinds of pretexts in an attempt to avoid tackling it. We are faced with the task of creating a modern and powerful industry to produce consumer goods within a short time. This not only applies to light industry but the defense factories and heavy industry enterprises whose contribution to the production and supply of consumer goods should be decisively increased. This is not just a question of quantitative but of qualitative indicators as well.

Special responsibility for the provision of goods and services lies with the local bodies. In the republics and oblasts there are quite a few examples of real initiative and enterprise, and in satisfying the market with goods by exploiting local potential. All the same, in many regions the free-ride mentality is too strong, as are attempts to wheedle funds even for those goods that could perfectly well be produced locally. Such a stance is

unforgivable, now that broad-ranging opportunities have opened up for developing cooperative and individual labor activity. In those places where this was understood in good time and the necessary conditions set up, the results are obvious: new goods and types of services are emerging as a result and this can only be welcomed.

In brief, attitudes to this matter, which affects the people's vital interests, should be fundamentally altered both at the center and at the local level.

2. Systematic Implementation of the Radical Economic Reform

Comrades, in reviewing the progress of restructuring, the issue of how the radical economic reform is being implemented needs to be singled out in particular.

The conversion of enterprises to cost accounting, self-financing and self-management, is giving collectives a chance to get a real feel both for their new rights and the difficult burden of responsibility. While the reform is taking only its first steps and the new economic management methods are only being mastered, they are already beginning to have a positive effect on the solution to many production and social problems and on the atmosphere as a whole within the collectives.

This year, the enterprises working in the new way not only ensured that the plan for production output was met, but also significantly improved their economic indicators. This is highly noteworthy.

However, today the main thing is to draw lessons from the difficulties of the initial stage of the reform. Practice has revealed problems leading to the new economic mechanism marking time. To a certain extent these are linked to the fact that not all its elements have yet been applied and that we began to implement the reform, as they say, on the move, during the 5-year plan, under conditions when the structural positions of the plan were already determined and when obsolete prices and the old centralized methods of distributing resources were being preserved.

This goes to explain a great deal—a great deal but far from everything. The difficulties that have arisen have been generated to a great extent by the tenacity of the stereotypes of economic management, the desire to preserve the habitual command-administrative methods of running the economy, and resistance to the new on the part of some of the management staff. In a number of cases we are coming up against direct attempts to distort the essence of the reform, and to fill new forms of management with the old content. Deviations from the letter and spirit of the Law on the Enterprise, because of which it is not being implemented to the full, as many economic managers admit, are being allowed quite often by ministries and departments.

The experience of drafting enterprise plans for this year, when the old system of binding targets for the production volume was effectively preserved under the guise of the state orders, tells us about this. This is nothing but the result of arbitrariness by ministries where proper control is missing, or with the connivance of Gosplan and the standing bodies of the USSR Council of Ministers.

It is quite unacceptable for enterprises to be ordered by the state to produce goods not in demand by consumers. They are forced to do it simply in order to achieve the notorious "gross output." This diktat was applied even to large collectives like Uralmash, Altayselmash, the Kurgan Wheeled Tractor Works, and the Baku Tire Works, not to mention a mass of medium and small enterprises. How great is the number of the people who are faithful servants of His Majesty "Gross Output!"

Is there any need to prove that this fundamentally contradicts the meaning of the reform and is the same as preserving those management methods that led our economy into a dead end?

It would seem that it must be clear to all now that there is not and will not be any return to the old ways. Nevertheless, you sometimes hear the opinion even now that if "pressure" is not applied on an enterprise with a plan, it will allegedly not aspire to improve its economic indices. At first glance, it might seem that there is some sort of justification for such views. However, real life says something else. I will cite just one instance in this connection. Many people were worried that expanding the rights of enterprises, and narrowing the circle of mandatory indices would lead to a lowering of plan indices and a need to reconsider the tasks of the 5-year plan. Indeed, the sum the plans for profit adopted for this year by industrial enterprises which have converted to full cost accounting, turned out to be 4.5 billion rubles lower than the control figures. Some zealous aficionados of the old methods rubbed their hands with a certain amount of gloating: This, they said, is what the desire to depend only on economic levers and stimuli leads to.

But how did things work out in practice? This is how: in 5 months of this year these enterprises overfulfilled their plans for profit by 2.5 billion rubles. And the increment among labor collectives working on the basis of full cost accounting amounted to 12.8 percent as against 10.2 percent at enterprises functioning in the old way. Here it is important that the increase in profit was achieved mainly thanks to lowering production costs and reducing expenditures on materials.

I will say outright that such recent results for our economy have been very unusual. They deserve to be interpreted attentively and comprehensively. What can be said on this subject? Obviously effective stimuli have not yet been created in the economic mechanism for enterprises to take on higher plan tasks. We need to think about this. But in the final analysis, what is important to

us, comrades, is the end result. If the economic mechanism has started to work and is ensuring an improvement in real results, then that is exactly what is needed. This is an instructive lesson. It should finally prompt the planning authorities to decisively reconsider their approach to planning, to transfer the center of gravity from exerting "pressure" with the plan to economic levers and incentives.

Experience shows, comrades, that the progress of economic reform requires the constant attention of the CPSU Central Committee and the government. It must be acknowledged that they uncovered the distortion concerning state orders only belatedly. The signals coming in were not appreciated in time nor as they should have been. This error is now being corrected. Government resolutions will be adopted very soon on procedures for using state orders.

Also at the center of attention for the working collectives and management bodies in the initial stage of reform were issues concerning the setting of economic rates. Here, too, there were attempts by ministries and departments to retain dictatorial methods regarding enterprises. Many ministries tried to establish rates by which they could retain the possibility of redistributing funds from enterprises working well to benefit inefficient ones.

No doubt today, taking into account the different starting potential of the working collectives moving onto the road of cost accounting and self-support, such a redistribution can, to a degree, be explained, but the main tasks of rates lies elsewhere: to establish a direct link between income and final results in such a way that any improvement in the collective's work is encouraged by an increase in its income. We cannot tolerate any open or concealed forms of the free-ride mentality or the possibility of living quite well while working badly. You know, comrades, the practice of leveling-off gained a very strong grip on our mentality and economic practice! Chase it out the door, as they say, and it will come in through the window.

We encountered the same problem in the wage reform. The initial results of this seem to be promising. In collectives that have converted to the new conditions, labor productivity has gone up and wages have increased. However, here, too, leveling is persisting. An enterprise gains the right of suitably rewarding good workers and lowering the wages of idlers, waste makers and loafers. Nonetheless, this rule is being used timidly and according to the principle of not offending anyone.

In the activity of labor collectives we have not yet overcome approaches inherited from the period of stagnation, whereby workers, technicians, and engineers, who set an example of creative, highly efficient and, on occasion, unique work have had artificially restricted wages. Certain regulatory documents about this also deserve a critical attitude. Surely it is not still necessary to prove that the most efficient way of eradicating

tendencies toward leveling is consistent implementation of the principles of cost accounting, not just in the activity of the working collectives but in all subdivisions and in every job.

Putting it simply: reform will not get off the ground or give the results we are banking on unless the personal interests of literally every worker are profoundly affected and unless it becomes a vital concern for him.

One of the main directions of the radical economic reform is the broad development of the cooperative movement. These issues were quite thoroughly discussed at the Congress of Kolkhoz Members and at the Supreme Soviet Session that endorsed the Law on the Cooperative. Thus, we have essentially completed the creation of the necessary prerequisites for its comprehensive development. The Central Committee proceeds from the fact that the rise of the cooperative movement opens up broad opportunities for resolving many vitally important problems of society.

We have ascribed to the development of the cooperative movement the same significance and the same role assigned to it by Vladimir Ilich Lenin. The center of gravity is now shifting to the area of practical matters, and it is the straightforward duty of the local soviets and the party organizations to support in every possible way the aspiration of the working people to make an increasing contribution to the cause of restructuring on the basis of the cooperative movement.

Comrades, the economic form would be implemented considerably better if conservatism were not so hardy within the management apparatus. The administration, by issuing injunctions and commands, is obstinately clinging to its positions. During the practical implementation of reform we have a real sense of the opposing forces of inertia and that sometimes leads to the adoption of ambivalent, compromise, and sometimes mistaken decisions.

It is indeed a fact, comrades, that under the guise of creating state production enterprises an attempt was made to revive the system of the former bureaucratic ministerial main administrations. Thus, it was intended to substitute the idea of the voluntary association of independent enterprises with rigidly centralized organization, while preserving departmental barriers and inflated management apparatus.

Both in the center and in the localities there are quite a few such workers who will not accept the new forms of management, consistent with democratization, and economic reform.

This manifested itself also during the reduction of the management apparatus of Union and republic ministries and departments and oblast and kray level management bodies. What must be said about this? For us this is a matter of principle. We must firmly pursue the line of

reducing numbers and cost of the apparatus, and raising the efficiency of its work. At the same time we must make sure that the people being released from their jobs as a result of these measures do not settle in other offices, but go into production, the service sector, cooperatives, commerce, municipal services, the places where there is a real personnel shortage.

We see that even a brief analysis of the processes connected with the start of reform embraces increasingly wide spheres of the economy and is demonstrating its vitality.

Taking into consideration the experience which has been accumulated, we must carefully prepare for completing the transition of all new enterprises in the material production sphere to the new economic conditions as of the start of 1989. That is a very serious matter. There is nothing trivial about it, for the reform will affect more and more millions of working people.

The biggest mistake of the past, which we must in no way repeat is office-based preparation of enterprises for work in the new conditions. It is indeed in those places where the working people and the councils of labor collectives have remained apart from the implementation of reform, where everything has been decided in secret from above, that the most serious blunders have been discovered and that many unforeseen difficulties have arisen. That has been reflected in the social well-being of people and their attitude to reform.

The experience of this year has confirmed our understanding of the need to accelerate the transition to wholesale trade in means of production. What are we seeing today? For those who have switched to cost accounting and self-financing, wholesale trade is not only desirable but also vitally necessary. From the start of next year all enterprises engaged in material production will use cost accounting, so that we must obviously adopt a new approach to dates for converting to wholesale trade in means of production in order not to drag this out over many years but to complete it within the framework of the current 5-year plan. I believe that both Gosplan and Gosstab will put forth concrete proposals on this account.

Of course, a great deal rests on the reform in price setting. By this I mean the review of wholesale, procurement and retail prices and rates. The fact that this problem is unsolved is greatly complicating the implementation of economic reform. Without price reform, we cannot, we will not be able to create normal economic relations in the national economy, ensure a well-founded evaluation of the costs and results of production and equivalence in the exchange of goods and services, stimulate scientific and technical progress and savings of resources, normalize the situation in the marketplace and implement a just distribution according to labor.

For instance, how can the economy be economically run when prices of raw materials and fuel are artificially reduced? This simply must not be done. Or another question: While earning high profits on one group of goods, the state is forced to pay out tens of billions of rubles in budget subsidies on another group of goods. At the same time, it is well known that both low subsidized prices and unjustifiably high prices do not stimulate growth of output and have an extremely adverse effect on scientific and technological progress.

It should also be stressed that reforming price setting will not in itself improve the economic situation if the questions of financial balancing, streamlining the credit-financing system and banking activity, the budget, and so on, are not resolved at the same time. Therefore, reforming price setting should be closely linked with implementing the program for financially improving the national economy. This, in its turn, is linked to the financial situation in every enterprise and with the work of every collective; this, too, must not be forgotten.

The price reform cannot fail to affect retail prices as well, since these are closely linked to the entire price system. Retail prices for many foodstuffs, particularly meat and milk, are considerably lower today than their actual production cost and procurement prices. The state is forced to make up this difference in the form of subsidies to the consumer. This situation is not normal. It undermines incentives to produce such goods and gives rise to thriftlessness toward them, particularly toward bread.

Comrades, we are aware of all this and it is therefore simply essential that we deal with this task, however difficult it might be and whatever doubts and fears it might arouse at first sight. The issue of retail prices is now being worked out in a serious manner. Proposals on this will be put to comprehensive discussion by the people.

There should be only one approach here: changes in retail prices should in no way be accompanied by a drop in people's standard of living. The issue is posed in this way: the funds currently paid out by the state in the form of subsidies will be given to the population in full in the form of compensation. Thus, the state will obtain no direct financial gain from revising retail prices and the public will lose nothing. What we are talking about is creating a healthier situation in the national economy and more favorable conditions for the action of economic levers and incentives; for increasing production and enhancing quality of output; for saturating the market as quickly as possible with food products.

In the framework of restructuring, and taking into account the implementation of the radical economic reform much work has been done on reinterpreting external economic policy. Here, too, the need has been felt for fundamentally new approaches which enable us to make better use of the advantages of the international

division of labor. The enterprises and associations now have possibilities of broad access to the foreign market, of establishing direct foreign economic links and setting up joint enterprises.

As before, we are giving priority to relations with socialist countries. Together with our friends, on a bilateral and multilateral basis, we are tackling the key tasks of scientific-technical progress and the development of modern forms of economic cooperation within CEMA. We see long-term prospects in the conversion to free convertibility of the ruble and in the shaping of a single socialist market.

We will also try to resolve the question of economic ties with capitalist and developing countries on a basis of mutual benefit. Here, too, a course has been set toward strong integrated cooperation in science, technology and production, based on various forms of international coproduction and specialization.

Comrades, in summing up the initial results of the economic reform, we must think not only of how to fulfill the current 5-year plan. It is of fundamental importance to make use of the lessons of the first years of restructuring in order to formulate a strategy for the future, above all for the 13th 5-Year Plan.

In the Central Committee and in the government, the common view is forming that in the concept of the 13th 5-Year Plan and subsequent development of the country the line of the April Plenum of the Central Committee and of the 27th Party Congress toward the social reorientation of our economy must be more strongly and consistently pursued.

That means, above all, satisfying people's requirements for fully adequate food products; saturating the market with consumer goods and services in the required range and of high quality; carrying out housing construction programs; and improving public health, education, and culture. The priority tasks include stepping up efforts to protect the natural environment and radically improve the country's ecological situation. Only with such an approach can we settle the debts remaining from the period of stagnation and steer our economy onto the tract of healthy development in the interests of the people.

The social reorientation of economic development and increasing the share of consumption in the national income must become the pivot of our entire structural and investment policy and the keystone for shaping the pace and proportions of the economy. Today it is clear that the profound changes are needed, taking in the national economy as a whole, beginning with services and ending with the heavy and defense industries. The CPSU Central Committee is counting on the conference supporting such changes.

In connection with this, we should discuss another matter. This concerns the criteria and indicators of economic development. It is not for the first time that we are saying that growth rates in themselves are not important, but it is fulfilling them in real terms, really satisfying the needs of the people that is.

What is the sense of an increase in the output from raw material production, and fuel and power generating industries if it is "eaten up" by irrational and wasteful use of resources? Or who needs an increase in the output of agricultural machines if they are not bought because of their poor efficiency? Light industry does not need "gross output," nor volume of production in itself, but the kind of goods that would meet the people's real demand.

We are still unable to renounce the old approaches. We do not need simply millions of tons of steel, millions of tons of cement, millions of tons of coal; we need specific end results. How long must we go round in a vicious circle of hopelessly obsolete ideas and formulas? "Production for the sake of production," and "the plan for the sake of the plan?"

It is essential for the State Planning Committee and the USSR Academy of Sciences to draw up proposals on this matter on the basis of the 13th 5-Year Plan, whereby planning would be conducted and the results of economic development assessed.

Such, comrades, are some of the results of our work in the socioeconomic sphere; such are the contradictions and problems of the initial phase of the radical economic reform; such are some thoughts for the immediate and more distant future.

3. Enhancing the Intellectual, the Spiritual Potential of Society

Comrades, restructuring, the renewal of socialism, are inconceivable without invigorating in every possible way the intellectual and spiritual potential of society contained in science, education, and culture. However, this statement means very little by itself. One has to act, and act vigorously and on a large scale, taking into account the fact that huge worldwide efforts are being concentrated precisely in this direction, and that the flow of capital investment into this is increasing appreciably.

At the very beginning of restructuring the task was set of drastically changing priorities, raising the role of the spiritual sphere, and overcoming the way it had been under valued. A lot has changed here. A new political atmosphere has arisen of openness, freedom, creativity, and discussion, of objective and unbiased analysis, criticism and self-criticism. A genuine revolution of consciousness is going on without which the creation of new life is impossible.

The party attaches great importance to our scientists' contribution to restructuring. The Central Committee stresses that the party's economic and social strategy is based on the acceleration of scientific and economic progress, primarily mastering the achievements of its present-day stage connected with the development of the vanguard technologies—microelectronics, robot technology, information science, biotechnology, and so on.

Positive changes have taken place in science and technology. The requirements concerning technical standards of production have been raised and the time frame for assimilation of new and progressive research has been reduced. Major steps have been taken to change the system of planning, financing, and material support of research and development, accelerated utilization of scientific achievements in practical work and stimulating scientific work. These measures have had a positive influence, but so far we have still not managed to change the situation radically.

This situation has proved to be particularly complicated in basic research, which determines the prospects for science and scientific and technical progress. As before, there is the effect of many impeding factors inherited from the time of the domination of command-administrative methods of management, when science often had imposed on it areas of research which did not stem from the logic of its own development but, conversely, many new and promising areas of research did not receive timely support or were even prohibited.

The way that a number of well-grounded goals were set did not provide for them materially or organizationally. This compromised scientific policy as a whole. Science was not included to the necessary degree in the nationwide planning system as an integral component, without which the development and implementation of socioeconomic policy in the broadest sense of that word is not possible. Scientists were rarely brought in to give expert opinions on projects, decisions, and plans, and their opinion, if it diverged from the interests of departments, was ignored and sometimes even persecuted.

As a result, the social status of science and the prestige of scientific work clearly declined in recent decades. The most disturbing thing is that in the years of stagnation Soviet science fell behind in a number of leading areas. Scientific development emerged as an attempt to "catch up." It is an abnormal circumstance that only 6.8 percent of all the funds allocated for scientific research go to the academic sector of science, which carries out the bulk of basic research.

This is why it is today insufficient merely to rectify all these mistakes and omissions in science policy. It is a question of profound restructuring, breaking up of many structures of the economic mechanism that have become fixed and improving internal relationships within science itself. We must create a qualitatively new Soviet scientific potential, without which it is not possible to

achieve a breakthrough in basic research on a short time scale, and on this basis successfully to implement the whole set of planned programs for the socioeconomic restructuring of our society.

Decisive measures are required in further improving the management of scientific-technological progress and in overcoming departmental barriers. One way is the formation of intersectorial scientific-technological complexes, engineering centers and ad hoc target collectives. Also of great importance is the organic involvement of scientific organizations in the system of cost accounting relations, which has begun, and the creation of a complete cycle of scientific research, technology and techniques, investment, production, marketing and services.

Understandably, the potential of basic and applied science accumulates over years and decades; however, factors also exist for accelerating scientific development. These are, above all, democratizing the atmosphere of science and overcoming bureaucratism, guidance by administrative order, conservatism and monopolism. It is necessary to provide scope for the greatest possible manifestation of talent, creative initiative, self-management, rivalry on the basis of equal rights and competition between scientific ideas and opinions. A number of scientists are also posing the question of the expediency of diversifying the methods of organizing science and adopting a sensible combination of state and cooperative forms.

The development of social sciences requires particular attention. It is precisely they which suffered most from the personality cult, bureaucratic management methods, dogmatism and incompetent interference. As we know, a noticeable revival in social science research occurred after the 20th CPSU Congress and new scientific areas and new cadres of scientists capable of conducting affairs in a new style appeared. However, self-willed approaches to the formulation of the tasks of thought in social sciences and dogmatic methods of solving them soon began to pick up again.

An urgent social need for research in social sciences has arisen with restructuring. We need a genuine upturn in social sciences on a Marxist-Leninist philosophical and methodological basis. There is a need for objective scientific research on such problems of restructuring as the economic reform and the reconstruction of the political system, democratization, humanistic renovation, relations among nationalities, new political thinking, and many others. In other words society, which is proceeding toward its qualitatively new condition, needs an integral concept for development, a vision of the dialectics of processes and the contradictory nature of their reflection in the mass consciousness, taking into account a pluralism of opinions, and the elaboration of scientifically-grounded prospects.

The party sees its task as continuing to stimulate a creative search in social sciences and encourage growth in the theoretical arsenal of restructuring. However, radical changes in the attitude to science are necessary. Science which finds no "appreciation" sooner or later dies; and practice, with such an attitude to scientific knowledge, grows blind and enfeebled. All this is unacceptable to us. So, when we make requests of scientists, we must show greater trust and create all the necessary conditions for creativity and the search for new things.

The problems of scientific and technical progress must be viewed in the general context of social development. Accordingly, primary attention should be paid, scientists believe, to analyzing the problems of the interface of various sciences—natural, technical and social. Close coordination among them is today ensuring revolutionary breakthroughs in all areas of the development of science and technology. Accordingly, there is a need for greater influence by social research over the whole range of scientific and technical progress and its human dimension. In drawing lessons from the past, we need to organize social examination of scientific technical and engineering projects in a real way and on a large scale, with the participation of broad public circles, in order to minimize or even exclude entirely the ecological and other costs, which are possible if these projects are designed and implemented without control.

In the last 3 years the process of growing awareness of the huge role of education as one of the basic factors in economic and social progress and spiritual renewal has been taking place actively in the party and in society. We have critically evaluated the situation in this field, too, and worked out a program for changes in the educational process. A great deal of additional funds are being directed into this and the computerization of the learning process is being developed significantly. The salary of teachers has been raised.

Of course, the cost of education and science is high, but the price for lagging behind would be incomparably greater. Without high quality education, scientific research, and general and professional standards, without all this we cannot achieve the aims of restructuring. We need to create all the conditions for the new generation of Soviet people to have, as they enter conscious labor and political life, a high degree of ideology and morality, a good knowledge of their profession and a wide cultural horizon and to be ready to assume responsibility for the country's fate.

Soviet cultural figures are called on to play a tremendous role in the socialist renewal of our society. Consolidating creative forces on the platform of restructuring has been the party's practical task in the post-April period. We can state today that the administrative direction of culture and edifying lectures addressed to artists are things of the

past. In the spiritual sphere, an atmosphere of competitiveness and of free creative search is gradually being built up, based on the civil responsibility of artists to their socialist society.

Artistic culture carries the living like and the continuity of generations. It helps a person to feel at one with his people, their history, and their hopes for the future, and it lays the groundwork for any practical activity and for lofty moral ideals.

Our journalistic, artistic, and scientific publications are conducting a discussion—unprecedented in scale, frankness, and intellectual saturation on the ways to renew socialism and on contemporary history. This is remarkable. The party highly values the growing contribution of the intelligentsia to the implementation of restructuring. We welcome the stepping up of public and political activity by representatives of science, education, and culture. We await new creative discoveries and a large breakthrough in all spheres of thought and spirit from them.

As a whole, cultural processes are developing on a healthy foundation. However, we would be guilty of lacking objectivity and sinning against the truth by saying that they are proceeding without contradictions and without costs which sometimes go beyond the limits of socialist values. Both in society as a whole and among the intelligentsia, conservatism and nonacceptance of innovations are manifested. There is also superficiality in assessing the events that are occurring and even irresponsibility in the approach to the complex problems of our development.

Unfortunately, one sometimes has to observe that some comrades, even at this fateful time for the country, are somehow incapable of giving up infighting, group passions, and personal ambitions. There are also quite a few who view the creative search with irritation and regard the growing diversity as a deviation from the principles of socialist art. This is understandable: for too long uniformity, monotonous sameness and mediocrity were presented as the yardstick of progress. We still do not have the habit of discussion, dissidence, and free contention. I would not like to dramatize the situation, and there are no particular grounds to do so. But it would not be reasonable to fail to note such phenomena and to pass over them in silence.

If we speak of the main trends in science, education, and culture in the period of restructuring, they are seen as a return to Leninist principles, a turning toward man, toward the spiritual enrichment of the people. The party sees its task in stepping up efforts for the sake of this humane goal.

4. Democratization of International Relations

Comrades, restructuring in the USSR has become a factor of world significance. The cardinal changes in our own house have also required new approaches to international affairs.

In assessing Soviet foreign policy in the postwar period, we do not forget that imperialism created around us and our allies an actual emergency situation. The Western military bloc led by the United States displayed open aggression toward socialism. The military threat to us was constant. It has not been removed to this day. The Soviet Union, however, together with its allies, simply could not but react to this, as well as to the single-minded psychological warfare, waged against socialist countries.

Nonetheless, in learning lessons from the past it is impossible not to admit that the command-administrative methods did not bypass the foreign policy sphere either. It even happened that decisions of major importance were made by a narrow circle of persons, without a collective, all-round examination and analysis, and sometimes without due consultation with our friends. This led to an inadequate reaction to international events and to the policies of other states, and even to erroneous decisions. Unfortunately, it was not always weighed up what one or another option for action would cost the people or what it could result in.

In response to the nuclear challenge thrown down to us and to the whole socialist world, it was essential to achieve strategic parity with the United States. That was done. However, having concentrated on the military aspect of confronting imperialism we did not always use huge funds and attention, in ensuring the state's security, reducing tension and promoting mutual understanding among the peoples of the political opportunities that opened up in connection with the fundamental changes occurring in the world. As a result, we allowed ourselves to be drawn into the arms race, which could not fail to have an effect on the country's socioeconomic development and on its international position.

The arms race, meanwhile, was approaching a critical point. Against that background our traditional political and social activity in favor of peace and disarmament began to become less convincing. To put it more pointedly, if this development had not been restrained by logic, we could indeed have found ourselves on the brink of a military confrontation.

This is why not simply an improvement in foreign policy was needed, but a decisive renewal of it.

For that a new type of political thinking was required. The foundation for this was laid at the 27th Party Congress. It provided our international activity, in the context of restructuring, with a new philosophical basis. The new thinking is not a closed and completed doctrine. It is dialectical. It allows policies to be constantly improved and developed in keeping with the course of real life, of course, with our socialist choice, with the Leninist principles.

In the same way, in internal affairs the Soviet leadership turned to Lenin, to his experience: everywhere, in any situation to act from a position of realism. Only such a

policy can effectively serve restructuring. Only in that case can it count on a realistic attitude on the part of those to whom it is addressed. Only in this capacity does it acquire the ability to assist in saving the world from impending threats.

In analyzing the contemporary world we realized more clearly that international relations, without losing their class nature, are becoming increasingly relations among people. We have taken into account the greater role in world affairs of peoples, nations and the new national formulations that are merging. Given that situation in international affairs, one cannot fail to take into account the variety of interest. This is an important element in new political thinking.

The growing nuclear threat and the increasing aggravation of other global problems are typical of the modern era. The increasing internationalization of all processes in the world is becoming increasingly integral and interconnected, despite its contradictory nature. We have tried to interpret in greater depth the idea initially founded in Marxism of the interconnection of proletarian and class interest with that common to all mankind. This has led us to a conclusion on the priority of values common to all mankind in our age. This is the core of the new political thinking.

It has allowed us to evaluate on a larger scale the vital significance, for contemporary international relations, of moral values, which have over the course of centuries been worked out by peoples and pooled and elaborated by the great minds of mankind.

In analyzing the fundamental changes in the world, many stereotypes that have fettered our potential and have, to a certain extent, provided opportunities to those who were engaged in distorting our real intentions are being overcome.

A major role was played by our establishing broad contacts with representatives of other countries, from heads of state and government to ordinary citizens, with universally acknowledged authorities in science and culture, with outstanding writers, with leaders and delegations of political parties, voluntary organizations and movements, with trade union and social democratic leaders and with religious figures and parliamentarians.

Such a richness of direct intercourse, as it were, "reopens" the Soviet Union to the outside world. And we, for our part, have obtained the possibility of better seeing and understanding the surrounding world, taking part in discussion of its problems and in the search for an approach to resolving them, deriving what is useful from ideas stemming from other cultures and spiritual traditions, which was reflected, for example, in the Delhi Declaration of 1986. With the aid of this feedback, it has become easier to find mutual understanding on the significance of such values as freedom and democracy.

All this has provided Soviet foreign policy with dynamism and has made it possible to advance a whole number of major initiatives.

These include the program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, the system for all-embracing security, freedom of choice, balance of interests, the "common European home," restructuring of relations in the Asia-Pacific region, defense sufficiency and the doctrine of nonaggression, reduction of the level of armaments as a path to the strengthening of national and regional security, the recall of troops and bases from other people's territories, confidence-building measures, international economic security and the idea of directly involving the authority of science in world politics.

Dialogue, and—in the sphere of disarmament—readiness for profound mutual control are at the heart of our contacts through intergovernmental channels. This has made it possible to extend the range of trust far beyond the boundaries of the normal world outlook. We have discovered considerable potential for mutual understanding and a readiness for coexistence and cooperation, even in influential circles that are very far from us ideologically.

Our sincere open invitations to engage in joint thinking and quests have received a major response throughout the world. Glasnost and restructuring are imparting "material" persuasiveness to our foreign policy ideas and initiatives.

This approach made possible major breakthroughs in world politics, above all in disarmament, such as at Geneva and Reykjavik, which truly moved the negotiating process ahead and predetermined the success of the summits in Washington and Moscow. As a result, the entire international situation is changing.

In the context of the new thinking there has been an examination of socialism's position in the world. Together with our friends, we have tried in a comradely way to free the internationalist essence of our relations from the accretions of the past. Personal contacts between leaders of parties and states have been revitalized and have become businesslike and frequent. Coordination of the socialist community's foreign policy is being perfected.

World socialism is living through a difficult and crucial period. The attainment of new frontiers by the socialist countries and the revealing of their potential in national and international frameworks are enhancing the prestige and role of socialism in world development.

A key place in the new thinking is held by the concept of free choice. We are convinced of the universality of this principle for international relations, when the very survival of civilization has become the main worldwide problem.

This concept has been brought about by the unprecedented and growing diversity in the world. We are witnessing a phenomenon such as the active inclusion in world history of billions of people, who for centuries remained outside its bounds. These billions of people are emerging on the stage of independent historical creativity in totally new conditions. In a setting of mounting national self-awareness everywhere, they will still have their say in seeking their own path.

In this situation, the imposition from outside by any means—not to mention military means—of a social system, way of life, or policy constitutes the dangerous armor of past years. Sovereignty, independence, equal rights and noninterference are becoming the generally acknowledged norms of international relations, which is in itself a major gain for the 20th century. Resisting freedom of choice means placing yourself in opposition to the objective course of history itself. This is why the policy of force in all its forms and manifestations has historically outlived itself.

In a word, we are profoundly convinced that the new thinking and the policies based on it correctly reflect the pressing requirements and imperatives of the world today. They have revived hope and opened the way to qualitative changes in mankind's awareness.

We can give an unconditional yes in answer to the question that worries Soviet people most of all and on which they wish to hear an appraisal of the result of work over the 3 years; Has it been possible to remove the threat of war?

How is this expressed? It is expressed above all in the fact that the axis of international life is moving from confrontation to cooperation, mutual understanding, and talks with the prospects of reaching specific results, primarily regarding weapons of mass destruction. Soviet-U.S. relations have improved. A treaty has been concluded to eliminate some nuclear arms. The all-European process has been revitalized on the international, and particularly, the social levels. The Geneva accords and the withdrawal of our troop contingent from Afghanistan, which has begun already, are important international landmarks in the political settlement of regional conflicts, which are fraught with danger for the world as a whole and hold up the peoples' progress.

From the rostrum of our party conference, on behalf of the party and the people, may I once again express profound gratitude to the soldiers, officers, and civilian specialists, and all those whose fate has been touched and who have been hurt by this war. (Applause). Our troops are leaving Afghanistan at the behest of the motherland which has shown wisdom, having over those years acquired new political and moral experience, a more profound understanding of the modern world, its contradictions and difficulties in marching toward the future.

All in all, comrades, the study of existing realities enables us to suppose that if it is possible to strengthen and develop these realities, the world at the turn of the century will be determined by the following trends:

Gradual demilitarization and humanizing of international relations, when reason, knowledge, and moral standards rather than egotistical striving and prejudices finally move states to resolve the many contradictions in the world and achieve a balance of interests, and when the right of everyone to freedom of choice is recognized;

Guaranteeing the security of states will move more and more out of the sphere of the correlation of military potentials to that of political interaction and strict compliance with international obligations; a comprehensive system of international security will be established, chiefly by increasing the role and efficiency of the United Nations;

The colossal growth of scientific and technical potential will be exploited in a more civilized way for the joint good of all mankind and to solve global economic, ecological, power, food, medical and other problems;

Varied and voluntary association between independent states and peoples will mutually enrich them reliably, materially, and spiritually, and will strengthen the structure of universal peace.

Are there no illusions here? Have imperialist sources of aggression and wars really vanished? No. We are not forgetting the threat to peace from imperialist militarism and we believe that for the moment no guarantees have been provided for the irreversibility of the positive processes that have begun. The new political thinking allows precisely for the spotting and discovery of new opportunities for opposing the politics of force on a political basis that is wider than before. These opportunities are strengthened by new objective factors that have emerged in the second half of this century.

It is this that determines our defense development, the efficiency of which must from henceforth be determined predominantly by qualitative parameters regarding both technology and military science and the make up of the armed forces. It should ensure reliable security for the Soviet state and its allies and be implemented in strict accordance with our defense doctrine.

We will continue to look for ways to secure peace and international cooperation through our practical international activity. Relations with the socialist countries will continue to be at the forefront in the future. We will consistently follow a policy of strengthening our relations with the developing countries and the Nonaligned Movement and pursue our active dialogue and talks with state figures authorized by their countries, above all on the focal point of world politics: disarmament. During

the years of restructuring, we have improved or established relations with a large number of states, both neighboring and very distant, and with no one have we spoiled relations. We will try to act this way in the future as well.

The CPSU regards itself as an inseparable part of the world communist movement, which is now conducting a difficult search for a way to reach a new stage in its historical development. Based on full equality and respect, we will actively participate in this search. There is a growing international potential in our new relations with numerous public forces, representing world science and culture, with political parties of different ideological tendencies, above all with socialists, social democrats, members of labor parties, and other so-called "left-wing" circles and movements. Our solidarity with the working people of the whole world, with those struggling against colonialism, racism, and reaction remains immutable.

Comrades, notwithstanding certain mistakes and errors in the past, Soviet foreign policy as a whole has rendered tremendous services to the country, to socialism, and to all mankind. Restructuring has demanded new qualities of it, both in essence and in form. Just as in domestic policy, it must in practice absorb the collective thought of the party and the people and directly take into consideration not only the changes under way, but also foreseeable ones. The objective processes in the world and our potential should become the subject of constant scientific and public discussion with the participation of the public and its organizations. The quality of information on international issues must be raised by an order of magnitude. Within the framework of reforming the political system, an effective mechanism with full constitutional powers for the businesslike and qualified discussion of international political issues must be created.

II

Reform of the Political System Is the Most Important Guarantee of the Irreversibility of Restructuring

Comrades, by presenting the program for radical democratization of public and political life and reform of the political system for discussion by the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, the CPSU Central Committee believes that this will make it possible to radically enhance the effectiveness of our political institutions and reveal the potential of socialist sovereignty of the people.

1. Why Is a Reform of the Political System Necessary?

We are beginning this work not from scratch, not out of nothing. Behind us we have the unique experience of the first socialist democracy in the world. The forms and methods of sovereignty of the people, engendered by socialism, have had an immense influence on the social progress of humanity and have become a part of contemporary political culture. It was precisely in our country that the power of the workers—embodied in the republic

of soviets, workers control, the right to work, and other most important social rights of the individual, and the equality of women and men, nations, and nationalities—was born. In other words, we were first in many democratic undertakings of the 20th century.

So why is the task of radically reforming the political system being advanced today? Comrades, above all, the fact of the matter is—and we must admit this today—that at a certain state the political system, created as a result of the victory of the October Revolution, was seriously deformed. As a result, the absolute power of Stalin and his entourage and the wave of repressions and illegality became possible. The administrative command methods of management which developed in those years had a pernicious effect on various aspects of our society's development. Many of the difficulties we are still experiencing have their roots in that system.

The decisions of the 20th Party Congress raised possibilities for overcoming the violation of Leninist principles of party and state life. Those possibilities, however, were not utilized, mainly because the significance of socialist democracy was underestimated and disparaged. This once again led to a recurrence of cult phenomena.

The existing political system proved incapable of protecting us from the build up of the manifestations of stagnation in the economic and social life of recent decades, and doomed to failure the reforms that were undertaken at that time. The ever greater concentration of economic management functions in the hands of the party political leadership became characteristic, while at the same time the role of the executive apparatus was hypertrophied. The number of persons elected to the various state and public bodies increased until it comprised a third of the adult population of the country; yet at the same time, the bulk of the population was removed from real participation in deciding the affairs of state and society.

In the period of stagnation, the administering apparatus proliferated to almost 100 Union ministries and departments and 800 republican ones, and in effect began dictating its will with regard to both the economy and to policy. It was precisely the departments and other administrative structures that had the responsibility of executing the decisions that had been made. It was their action or inaction that determined what should or should not happen. The soviets, and in many respects the party bodies, found themselves unable to control the pressure of departmental interests. It became a universal rule that the body that made a decision bore no economic responsibility for the consequences of its actions.

A further serious shortcoming of the established political system was that public life was excessively dominated by the state. Of course, the tasks and functions of the state under socialism are considerably wider than in the conditions that exist under capitalism. However, according to the thought of the founder of Marxism-Leninism,

that expansion of administrative functions must be achieved not by strengthening the power that rests on orders, on decrees, and on coercion, but above all by activating the democratic factor and involving the broad masses of the people in governing.

Let us recall Lenin's well-known definition of the socialist state as being no longer a state "in the proper sense of the word," (op. cit., vol 31, p 180) or even as a "half-state" which is gradually developing into public self-government. Unfortunately, after Lenin's death, what prevailed—in theory, and indeed in practice also—was the approach to the state in the "full," that is to say, the old sense of that concept. Regulation by the state was extended to an inordinately wide sphere of public activity. The striving to take detailed centralized planning and control into every nook and cranny of life literally swaddled society and became a serious inhibition to people's initiative and that of public organizations and collectives. Among other things, this gave rise to a "shadow" economy and culture, taking advantage of the inability of state bodies to satisfy the public's material and spiritual requirements promptly and completely.

The bureaucratization of state structures and the weakening of the masses' social creativity accustomed society to thinking in terms of a single option and to static thinking. An oversimplified, curtailed image of socialist people's power, whereby actual wielding of power is identified not with active political activity by the workers but first and foremost with executive bodies, has formed and so far continues to influence people's awareness.

Finally, the existing political system has for decades been adapting itself not to the organization of public life within the framework of the laws, but chiefly to fulfilling self-willed directions and instructions. The proclamation in words of democratic principles alongside authoritarianism in fact, incantations about people's power from the rostrum alongside voluntarism and subjectivism in practice, endless talk about democratic institutions alongside trampling of the norms of the socialist way of life in reality, and a lack of criticism and glasnost—all this became quite widespread and took root in society.

The price paid for such methods proved to be steep: indifference, weakening of the masses' social activeness, and alienation of the worker from social property and government. It is indeed in the ossified system of power, its command-pressure structure, that the fundamental problems of restructuring, economic reform, and development of the social-cultural sphere, of educating people in an attitude of an owner's commitment toward everything happening in the country, are today rooted.

In the spring of 1985 the party began a resolute struggle for renewing sociopolitical structures. The step-by-step development of the new economic mechanism is in progress. The nature of social relations is changing. The

legal foundations of restructuring are being strengthened. We are learning democracy and glasnost; we are learning to debate and hold discussions, to tell each other the truth. This, of course, is no small thing.

But the processes of democratization, both at the center and locally, are developing slowly. Today we must have the courage to admit: If the political system remains immobile, without change, then we will not cope with the tasks of restructuring.

When raising the issue of a radical reform of the political system, we must proceed first and foremost from a clear idea of which qualities have withstood the test of time and are necessary for us today, and which, on the contrary, must be reduced to the minimum or totally discarded.

It seems to us that we should be talking about accomplishing the following basic tasks:

First, to do all we can in order for millions and millions of workers to be involved in the government of the country—not just in words, but in actions.

Second, to provide maximum scope for the processes of self-regulation and self-government of society, and create the conditions for the full development of society, of the initiative of citizens, of representative power authorities, of party and public organizations, and of labor collectives.

Third, to perfect a system for the free formation and expression of the interests and will of all classes and social groups, and their coordination and implementation in the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state.

Fourth, to secure conditions for the free development of every national and ethnic group, and for strengthening their friendship and equal cooperation, based on the principles of internationalism.

Fifth, to radically reinforce socialist legality and law and order, in order to exclude the possibility of the usurpation of power or abuses, to counter bureaucratism and formalism effectively and to provide reliable guarantees for the protection of citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms, and also for the fulfillment of their obligations to society and state.

Sixth, to clearly delineate the functions of party and state bodies in accordance with Lenin's concept of the Communist Party's role as the instrument of people's power.

Seventh and finally, to create an effective mechanism to ensure the timely self-renewal of the political system, taking into account changing domestic and international

conditions, a mechanism which is capable of constantly and actively developing and implementing the principles of socialist democracy and self-government in all spheres of life.

Restructuring and Human Rights

The ultimate aim of the political system's reform, and the main criterion for how far we manage to implement it, is the comprehensive enrichment of human rights and the enhancement of the Soviet people's social activeness. This issue occupies a central place in the theory and practice of socialism. An impressive edifice of a citizen's guaranteed rights in many spheres has been built on the foundation laid in our country by the October Revolution. We enjoy them, and—why hide it—we rarely give a thought to the fact that all these rights to which we are so accustomed still remain only a hope for working people in many parts of the world and targets in their struggle.

Human rights in our society are not a gift from the state, nor are they a favor from someone. They are an inalienable characteristic of socialism; they are a gain of socialism. The individual and society, the citizen and the state, the person and the collective—all these are different planes of one and the same problem. The way in which it is tackled reflects the nature of a political system and to a large extent determines the results of people's activity and the whole tenor of public life. The socialist solution to this problem consists of an organic combination of the collective and individual principles. In this key question of the structuring of society, our philosophy originates from the famous formula in the Communist Party Manifesto—the free development of one is a condition for the free development of all. Comrades, it is important for us to understand that it is a person's position in society, the rights granted to him, and the obligations placed upon him, which, in the final analysis, determine his social, labor, and political activity. Moreover, we not only have to understand that but to act in that direction when implementing economic reform and the reform of the political system.

What are the specific tasks to be tackled here?

First and foremost, the social rights of the individual. In our country a ramified system of the concern of society for people has taken shape, but at the present stage in its development we see its weaknesses and deficiencies. We are striving to do all we can to improve working conditions, raise the quality of public education and the health service, and provide a better level of social security for the working people. All that is an expression of the firm aim of the party to provide Soviet people with equality and protection in society.

But here is what has to be said in this connection. We want to strengthen the guarantees of the social and economic rights of the individual. To do this, the relevant changes have to be wrought both in economic and political conditions. But both the nature of these changes

and the time needed to bring them about are closely tied to the labor activity of all members of Soviet society. The social blessings we get from society and our attitude to labor are inextricably linked. It is important that every person understands the need for a demanding attitude toward himself. Here yet again we come across the importance of principles of cost accounting in economic management. These allow not only earnings to be coordinated with the labor contribution of each person and every collective, but the satisfaction of social needs as well. Boons and blessings do not appear of their own accord. It is only labor that creates them. An unconscientious attitude to what one is doing, poor labor discipline, inertia, and living at others' social expense are unacceptable to us.

Yes, we know that during the years of stagnation quite a few problems in the sphere of labor activity accumulated. Now we have to correct matters and make up for what was left undone, and that is not so simple since it concerns the whole of society.

Restructuring raised the question of a person's political rights. Management methods of administration by injunction and the restrictions on democracy thereby involved had a particularly detrimental effect on the exercise of political rights. All this acted as a brake on and complicated the process of overcoming the alienation of a person from power, from politics, from the process started by the October Revolution.

The draft political reform which is being submitted to our conference for discussion is precisely calculated to speed up the process of achieving the broad involvement of the working people in managing the country's affairs. To do this actual conditions must naturally be created. The electoral system must be changed, the structure of organs of power and administration must be reorganized, and legislation must be updated. This does, of course, presuppose the relevant changes in the social awareness of millions upon millions of people.

Right now people at the local level are often saying and writing that restructuring has not reached them. They ask when this will happen. But restructuring is not manna from heaven and you must not wait until it is delivered from somewhere. You must create it in your own town or village, through your own work in your labor collective. Today as never before actions are needed, not talk about restructuring. A great deal here will depend on our cadres and leaders at rayon, town, oblast, republic, and Union level.

By no means are only the leaders to blame for the fact that we still have quite a few places where restructuring is marking time. As is well known, blaming those in charge is very easy indeed and, incidentally, it is something that is very widespread in our country. We could understand this habit somewhat, when the social atmosphere in the country, the activity of party and state organs, did not create the necessary prerequisites for

manifesting an active civic position. But now, comrades, everything is radically changing and many have become actively engaged in all the processes of restructuring. Therefore, we must ask a straight question of those who still complain and blame those in charge, the bosses: What have you done for restructuring then? **(sustained applause)**.

I want to especially dwell on the political freedoms that give a person the opportunity to express his opinion on any issue. The implementation of these freedoms is a real guarantee that any problem that is of public interest is comprehensively discussed and that all the pros and cons are weighed. This helps to find the most correct decisions, taking into consideration all the diverse opinions and the actual possibilities. In a word, comrades, what we are talking about is a new role for public opinion in the country. There is no need to be afraid of newness or the unfamiliar nature of the opinions. There is no need to shy away and go to extremes at each turn the discussion takes.

I also want to touch on such a fundamental issue as the freedom of conscience. Enhanced attention is now being paid to it in connection with the millennium of the introduction of Christianity in Russia. We do not conceal our attitude to the religious world outlook as an unmaterialistic and unscientific one, but this is no reason for a disrespectful attitude to the spiritual world of people who believe, and even less for the use of any manner of administrative methods to assert materialistic views.

The Leninist decree of the separation of church and state and of school and church, adopted 70 years ago, laid new foundations for relations between them. It is well known that these relations have not always developed normally, but life itself and history have united believers and nonbelievers as citizens of the Soviet country and patriots, both in the years of the trials of the Great Patriotic War and in the creation of our socialist society and in the struggle for peace.

All believers, regardless of their religion, are full citizens of the USSR; the overwhelming majority of them participate actively in our economic and public life and in restructuring. The draft law on freedom of conscience, which is now being prepared, is based on Leninist principles and takes into account all contemporary realities.

Now for the individual rights of citizens: Here, too, more precisely legislation is required. Some things have already been done. People have greeted with great satisfaction the decision to ignore anonymous letters, criminal prosecution for persecution for criticism, the procedure for lodging a complaint with the courts regarding unlawful actions by officials, the payment of compensation for damage caused by such actions, and strengthening the protection and rights of the mentally ill. Law and order is meant to guarantee a strict observance of the

rights of citizens to the inviolability of their personal lives, dwellings, telephone conversations, correspondence, mail and telegraph. The law must reliably protect the personal dignity of the individual.

In fully protecting and guaranteeing the rights and freedoms of Soviet people, we cannot examine them separately from citizens' obligations. Democracy presupposes reasonable social order, without which there cannot in fact be any personal freedom. Our legislation has as its aim to resolutely defend society from all sorts of self-seekers, scroungers, pilferers, hooligans, slanderers, and louts. Society must have at its disposal effective means to act against antisocial elements, re-educating them and involving them in a normal working life.

Another problem: The assertion of personal rights and freedoms and the overall expansion of democracy and glasnost must go hand in hand with the strengthening of legality, with instilling unflinching respect for the law. Democracy is incompatible with willfulness, irresponsibility, or with lack of discipline **(applause)**.

As you know, we have on several occasions recently run up against attempts to use democratic rights to antedemocratic ends. Some people think it is possible to solve any problem by such means, from the redrawing of borders to the creation of opposition parties. The CPSU believes that such abuse of democratization runs fundamentally counter to the tasks of restructuring and are contrary to the people's interests **(sustained applause)**.

The human rights problem also has an important international aspect. We are deeply convinced of the correctness of our socialist choice and firmly intend, removing all distortions and deformations, to enrich the rights of the individual precisely on socialist soil, acting within the nature of our system. However, under contemporary conditions human rights, and above all the right to life, are becoming an object of concern for the whole world and are becoming internationalized like many other aspects of social life.

We are ready to actively cooperate with all other countries, to exchange experience, and to scrupulously fulfill the obligations we have undertaken.

We are convinced that restructuring will make it possible to show the indisputable superiority of socialism in guaranteeing all human rights—social, political, and individual **(applause)**.

Improving the Organization of the System

Comrades, it is well known that our state was born as a tool of the working class dictatorship. On the threshold of the sixties the conclusion was drawn that it would gradually grow into a state of the whole people. This conclusion was correct in principle. But the deeper we grasp the content of the political process, the more obvious it becomes that we must raise our statehood to

one belonging to the whole people in the full meaning of that concept. For this we need the type of organization of authority and management in which the final decision will always belong to the people, in which the process of self-regulation and self-management of society has reached its maximum scope. A correct distribution of authoritative power between the main links of the political system, first and foremost between the party and state, is of principle importance.

Life is setting before us in all its urgency the task of resurrecting the full authority of the soviets of people's deputies, and we cannot get away with half measures here. We must have a comprehensive approach to the problem and find a radical solution to it.

The discussion before the conference indicated that the measure proposed by the Central Committee for restructuring the soviets are meeting with support and approval. The basic principle can be formulated like this: Not a single state, economic, or social can be solved bypassing the soviets. The party's policy—economic, social or national—must be conducted first and foremost via the soviets of people's deputies as the problem agencies of people's power.

The need to reorganize the management of local affairs on the principles of self-management, self-financing, and self-sufficiency cannot be postponed.

It must become the organic extension of economic reform, linking together the interests of society as a whole and the demands of each of its territorial cells and labor collectives, putting an end to poor interdepartmental liaison and the fragmentation of the local economy. It is necessary to give total responsibility and independence to the soviet in solving the problems of developing the territories under their jurisdiction, to increase withholdings for their budgets from the profits of enterprises, regardless of their subordination.

The soviets must have firm sources of income, based on long-term standards, including income from all enterprises located in their territory, and accumulate the means to implement large-scale tasks. They must also have the right to draw on population funds in solving problems of social, cultural and consumer development, which are general for the inhabitants of this or that town, rayon, or settlement.

Placing under the jurisdiction of local soviets enterprises whose output is connected with satisfying the people's demands must be intensified, as must giving them the possibility of placing orders with enterprises subordinated to superior organizations. It is necessary to precisely and clearly define the legal relations between the soviets, enterprises, kolkhozes, and their labor collectives. We must decisively update the very organization of the work of representative bodies, expand the range of issues that are decided exclusively at their sessions, make provisions for some of the delegates to be released from

time to time from their official and production duties to work in the soviets in constituencies, and make the specific control functions of the soviets and their standing commissions more effective. At sessions during the election of executive committees and approval of the heads of departments and administrations, the nomination of alternative candidates, secret ballots, competition, and other democratic forms should become the rule. We have to guarantee that the work of soviets on all levels is conducted in public, and constantly in the electorate's view.

The soviets according to the Leninist idea combine legislative, executive and control functions. However, this does not negate the rational division of labor between state bodies, which is particularly important for interrelations between the soviets and their executive committees. In the interests of the correct demarcation of functions and the reinforcement of the control by representative bodies over the activities of executive committees, many participants in the discussion voiced the proposal that local authorities should have soviet chairmen and soviet presidiums working full time. They would make preparations for sessions, and coordinate the work of standing commissions and deputies' groups; in a word, all that is connected with organizing the intensive work of a representative authority.

In present-day conditions, the task is being set of enhancing the role of elected bodies. Therefore, the view of those comrades who believe that, taking into account the new tasks, it is very important to back the role of soviets as the representative bodies of the people with the authority of the party, seems well-founded. But this has to be done on a strictly legal basis.

The most realistic path here as a rule is to recommend the first secretaries of the relevant party committees to the position of soviet chairmen. In heading the soviets and their presidiums they will in the most active way possible assist in improving all aspects of the activity of bodies representing the people.

This is a matter of great importance. It ought to be examined in greater detail. Currently, first secretaries are usually ispolkom members. Many years of experience indicate, intentional or not, a strengthening of the prerogatives of the ispolkoms and their apparatus, to the detriment of the authority of the soviets as representative bodies.

If the first secretary of the party committee is elected chairman of the soviet, this will enhance the authority of the soviet and increase control over the activity of the ispolkom and its chairman and make it possible to delimit more precisely the functions of party and local soviets, under conditions in which the center of gravity of administrative activity shifts to the soviets.

On the other hand, comrades, recommending party leaders for the positions of chairmen of soviets will place them under more effective control by the working people, since the election will take place at sessions by secret ballot. This means that a party leader's mandate which the communists entrust to him will each time be checked and confirmed by the representatives of the people at all levels of soviets. Of course, it is possible that the recommended candidate for party secretary will not be supported by the deputies. Understandably, in that case the party committee and the communists will have to draw appropriate conclusions.

The establishment of a rule, according to which members of an ispolkom and the leaders of its departments and administrations cannot be members of the relevant soviet, must serve as the best delimitation of powers between representative and executive bodies. As deputies to the soviet, they now take part in sessions and give instructions to themselves. It is obvious that they have an interest in those instructions being fewer and weak.

It is expedient to extend this principle to judges, prosecutors, arbitrators and—in the USSR and Union and autonomous republics—to members of government and leaders of departments as well.

The need to introduce a number of democratic restrictions on holding elected positions has also fallen due. Past experience shows that the absence of such restrictions has been one of the main causes of abuse of power, both at the center and in the local areas. We know many examples where perfectly worthy and capable leaders, having spent decades in their posts, have outlived their usefulness and, continuing to occupy the leader's chair, have turned into a hindrance and a burden.

The material from the discussion held before the conference shows that a change in such a situation has, essentially, become a demand of the party and the people as a whole. To be sure, different points of view were expressed here. Some doubted whether a stipulation was necessary regarding the possibility of election for a third term in a row, even if only in exceptional cases. In the opinion of others, a third term must be permitted only for the highest tier of authority. Let us discuss these proposals.

There is one more thing: If in the theses the restriction on terms is made to apply only to elective offices, many participants in the discussion proposed that it be extended to officials appointed and confirmed by the soviet. In our opinion, that is a correct observation and it should be supported.

There was also discussion of a proposal restricting the tenure of elected offices past a certain age. There were also votes against, which held that this would mean restricting the sovereign rights of the electorate. I think that, with due account for the broad democratization of the whole process of forming the agencies of power and

management, this problem will lose its urgency and will be addressed by the voters and deputies themselves with the aid of democratic procedures.

A necessary condition for raising the activity of the soviets is the real political weight of the people's deputy; this is directly related to the whole process of setting representative authorities. Hence the need for a resolute renewal of our electoral system.

We have already embarked on implementing the decisions of the 27th Party Congress. During the last electoral campaign, elections were conducted in some of the constituencies according to the multi-candidacy system, and in many constituencies two or more candidates were proposed. The overall number of candidacies discussed in the country as a whole was almost twice the number of seats. Competitiveness breathed life into the elections, intensified the voters' interest in them, and raised the deputies' sense of responsibility. Now we have to go further, mastering and consolidating new approaches to the electoral system.

In forming the soviets it is necessary to guarantee the right of an unrestricted nomination of candidacies, broad and free discussion of them, rigorous compliance with the democratic procedure of election, regular reporting back by the deputies, and the possibility of their recall. Broader powers must be granted to constituency preselection meetings, which should become democratic forums for the competitive selection of candidates.

In general, comrades, our corps of deputies should henceforth be formed not by quota but primarily on the basis of the vibrant and free will of the electorate. The first condition for the effective work of the soviets is the election of people who are principled, vigorous, and experienced, with a mind for state affairs, capable of worthily representing their electorate, and vigorously acting in the power bodies.

One should not be apprehensive of the disproportionate representation of various strata of the population. We have militant, politically literate, vigorous people in the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia. It is only necessary to create a well adjusted competitive mechanism which will guarantee their optimum selection by the electorate.

Then all main groups of the population and their interests will be reflected in the composition of the soviets. As we understand it, there is agreement in society on the question of reducing the size of local soviets.

When the Central Committee theses for the conference were being discussed, there was wide support for the proposal that a single 5-year term of office should be set for all the soviets. Under those conditions, the local soviet deputies will work with greater confidence. They will have enough time to fulfill their plans, but the voters

will always retain the right either to recall a deputy who is remiss or has proved incompetent, or to enlarge the membership of the soviet, should the need arise.

Of decisive importance to the effective work of the soviets are the powers and structure of the supreme organs of the Soviet system. As everyone can see, despite the fact that the deputies, Presidium, and USSR Supreme Soviet commissions are doing useful work, the structure of our supreme power authority and its working procedures need substantial changes. In the discussion which has started on the Central Committee theses, particular interest was shown in this question.

Numerous proposals were forwarded, suggesting that we turn to the experience of the first few post-October decades, when we had a system of soviet congresses in operation. These were broad and plenipotentiary people's gatherings, between which central executive committees were in operation. The massive scale of representation was combined with constant work on legislation, administration and control. Also expressed during the discussion was the idea of the need for direct representation in the country's supreme authority for our public organization.

Generalizing these opinions, the CPSU Central Committee is putting the following proposals forward for examination by the conference:

First, to considerably extend working people's representation in the highest echelon of state power.

For this, the territorial representation of the entire population in the Soviet of the Union and of nationalities and ethnic groups in the Soviet of Nationalities, currently in existence, will be supplemented by direct representation from public organizations included in our political system. In this way, 1,500 deputies would be elected, as is the case now, from territorial and national districts, and approximately 750 more deputies would be elected at congresses or plenums of the central organs of party, trade union, cooperative, youth, women's, veteran, scientific and creative organizations and the criteria for representation could be listed in the Constitution.

All the deputies taken together, and elected for a term of 5 years, would constitute a new representative supreme organ of state power—the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. It would assemble for its session once a year, deciding the most important constitutional, political, and socioeconomic questions in the country's life.

For the purposes of discussing and resolving all issues of a legislative, administrative, and supervisory nature, and for directing the work of accountable bodies and lower soviets, the Congress of People's Deputies would elect from its composition a relatively small—say some 400-450 persons—USSR Supreme Soviet, consisting of two chambers. This would be the permanently functioning supreme body of authority accountable to the Congress

of People's Deputies. In this way, all work on legislation and control would be concentrated directly in the Supreme Soviet and its commissions, which would be a new step on the way to democratizing the higher state structures. Periodic renewal of part of the composition of the USSR Supreme Soviet could also be contemplated.

Second, the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers should be stepped up transcending their present lack of functional distinctiveness.

It stands to reason that draft laws and decisions on key issues of state life should, as before, be discussed and adopted by the members of both Supreme Soviet chambers.

At the same time, the Soviet of Nationalities, representing all national-state and national-administrative formations of the country, could examine issues of economic and social development, interethnic relations, observance of legislation in this sphere, supervision of the activity of Union ministries and departments affecting the interests of the republics, autonomous formations, etc.

In turn, the Soviet of the Union, reflecting the interests of the people as a whole and the requirements of all classes and social groups, could concentrate on drafting major social and economic programs and plans and work on policy issues in the areas of price setting, taxes, labor relations, protection of citizens' rights, the strengthening of the country's defense capacity, ratification of international treaties, and other matters.

At our conference here we must agree on the essential delimitation of the chambers' functions. This should be specifically reflected in the USSR Constitution and in other legislative acts.

Discussion of the theses has brought out one more topic that has been energetically debated: The correlation of higher party and state posts and their place in the structure of the supreme power. In this connection, some believe it proper to return to the practice in existence under Lenin when the leader of the party was also head of the government. Others consider combining party and state posts to be undesirable in general. Still others favor instituting the office of president of the USSR, and then there are those who point to the incompatibility of the concept of a state accepting the rule of law and a situation in which the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in effect fulfills the role of the country's supreme representative. Many other views are also being voiced.

Comrades, this is a serious issue and one that we must discuss at our conference in detail and, moreover, in such a manner that it be given an optimum solution during the reform of the political system.

In the view of the CPSU Central Committee, enhancing the role of the higher representative bodies and the entire system of soviets of people's deputies, strengthening the legal nature of power, and a better representation of the Soviet Union in world affairs would be satisfied by instituting the office of chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It would have to be stipulated that he is elected and recalled by means of a secret ballot of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies of which I was speaking, and that he is totally responsible and accountable to it. In conditions of an overall increase in the role of the representative bodies, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet should be endowed with sufficiently extensive authority. He could, inter alia, provide overall leadership in drafting laws and the more important social and economic programs, decide key issues in the country's foreign policy, defense capacity and security, head the Defense Council, propose candidacies for chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, as well as carry out a number of other obligations traditional for such a state office.

We are proposing that there should also be, within the structure of supreme power, a Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet which would work under the leadership of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. The make-up of the Presidium could include two first deputy chairmen, one of whom would be chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee; 15 deputies, one for each of the Union republics; and representatives of the chambers, standing commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet. It would be the responsibility of the Presidium to convene sessions and coordinate the work of commissions of deputies of the Supreme Soviet. It would also have certain representative and other powers.

It would be expedient to strengthen the status of the standing commissions of the supreme power authority which would be made up of members of the Supreme Soviet and deputies to the Congress of People's Deputies. They may be set up both separately for each chamber or jointly as joint committees.

The powers of the commissions and committees should be substantially expanded in view of the new tasks. In particular we must envisage that only after they have discussed the matter beforehand can decisions be made on major questions of domestic and foreign policy or appointments be made to the positions of heads of ministries and departments and others. There should be greater recourse to open hearings in commissions and committees and to the establishment of special groups of deputies to study problems which trigger sharp public interest.

The question also arises of establishing within the structure of supreme power an authority such as a Committee for Constitutional Supervision elected by the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. It would monitor the conformity of our laws and other legal acts with the Fundamental Law of the country, and would be granted

adequate powers for this purpose. Incidentally, the existence of this committee would be an extra guarantee of democratic control over the activity of all officials, including those who occupy the highest positions.

Third, the new forms of organizing the supreme authority still do not in themselves guarantee its effectiveness. What is needed to achieve this is significant change in the very nature and work style of the Supreme Soviet. The sessions must be relieved of long speeches and reports, over organizations, and formalism. They must become lively and demanding, and they must compare different versions of proposed decisions and discuss amendments, addenda, and objections. It would be worth introducing days for the government to answer deputies' questions and expanding the practice of deputies' inquiries.

Of course, it could also happen that we do not have complete unanimity in adopting one decision or another. But this is a normal phenomenon in the democratic process. Anyway it is high time for us to learn to listen carefully to the voice of our opponents, and not to regard them with strong prejudice. Socialist pluralism of opinion, arguments, discussion, and comparison of views are the way to finding better, the optimal solutions.

In proposing these changes in the structure and organization of the work of the highest organ of power of the USSR, the CPSU Central Committee considers that many of them are acceptable for the supreme authorities in the republics. These steps would help to enhance their role and authority, and would mean as a whole a further extension of the rights of the Union republics. Furthermore, unity in the structure and system of the democratic functioning of Union and republic organs of power would ensure the efficiency and smoothness of the work of the entire system of soviets.

Taking into account the intended changes, it is also essential to consider the questions of the formation, structure and functions of the authorities in the autonomous republics.

If the delegates agree, all of these proposals can be formulated in a special conference resolution. Restructuring of the soviets must not be delayed for long. In particular, as early as this autumn it would be possible to discuss the relevant legislative acts in the USSR Supreme Soviet and then, after the next elections, to carry out a reorganization of the all-Union state power bodies next spring.

While strengthening the soviets as the foundation of representative democracy, it is essential to create conditions for the comprehensive development of direct democracy: at work, in places of residence, at gatherings and rallies of citizens, and in the process of discussing the most important general state and local decisions.

The experience of the past few years has shown the effectiveness of nationwide discussion of drafts of major nationwide decisions: on state enterprises, the cooperative movement, school reform, the organization of health care, and others. We must make decisions much more frequently than we do now, with voting by citizens in villages, rayons, and towns, especially on questions which affect people vitally, and on which there is no unity of opinion. In such cases, let all problems be decided by the majority.

There are huge reserves contained in the development of all forms of the socialist self-management by the people. We already have a legal, a political, and to some extent a psychological basis to develop them widely, particularly in labor collectives. Comprehensively evaluating our own experience and the experience of our friends in the socialist countries, we will have to constantly think through the questions that arise here related to the expediency of the total or partial handing over of certain functions of state bodies to specific self-governing organizations. The main thing is that this should be done not formally, but in essence.

We are all living witnesses of how the initiative of the working people is manifesting itself in the most diverse forms under restructuring and the development of democracy and glasnost. Although, to be frank, by no means everything here is straightforward, comrades. Take for example the labor collective, working under cost accounting. It can function on the principle of self-financing only as a self-governing body. This means that new questions arise concerning the interaction between the general meeting and the council of the collective, between the party, trade union and Komsomol organizations and the administration, and relations between this whole complex and the soviets of people's deputies. We may as yet have little experience, but every day it is becoming greater, and we must handle it carefully in the interests of developing the self-governing process.

And lastly, about one other most important form of socialist sovereignty of the people: control.

The idea of workers' control goes back to the October Revolution. As we know, it was thoroughly studied by Lenin in his last works. It was precisely in control by the masses that he saw one of the decisive guarantees against arbitrariness, subjectivism and the abuse of power, a means for ensuring firm socialist discipline, be it labor, state, planning, economic or financial.

Control by the working people is a specific feature of the political system of socialism, organically inherent in our social system. And now, when we are unfolding the processes of democratization and self-governing, we must use this instrument of people's sovereignty to the full.

As the theses of the CPSU Central Committee state, it is necessary to create a single system of public and state control, subordinated to the elective bodies. In order to impart the due weight to this system, the chairman of the Committee for People's Control could be, as has already been said, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. This kind of control system, in which state and public principles are combined, and which is based on a broad network of people's controllers working in labor collectives in reality with citizens' letters and appeals, will become a truly powerful force for cleansing society of negative phenomena, and be a mass school for self-governing.

In other words, on the one hand, we must restore the fine tradition of workers' and peasants' inspection of Lenin's time and, on the other, raise the entire work of control to the level of contemporary tasks.

4. Democratization of State Management

Comrades, now that the task of comprehensively expanding the participation of the working people in governing is being brought to the fore, we must comprehend how under specific conditions the principle of democratic centralism should be applied. Analysis of this question brings us to the conclusion that the main tendency which meets the demand for the development of society is decentralization, naturally carried out while preserving those functions of the center without which the realization of the advantages of socialism and the guaranteeing of interests common to the whole people are impossible.

An objective analysis shows that at the present scale of our national economy and the diversity of problems of public life, all the problems that arise cannot be resolved correctly and in good time by a single center. Hence the need for many rights to be handed over to local bodies: republics, krays, oblasts, rayons and labor collectives.

For the moment, comrades, the situation looks like this: Not only the government but also the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Secretariat must solve dozens and hundreds of problems, most of which could be passed on to lower local soviet, management, and other bodies without the least detriment to the matter. Everyone has gotten used to that order of things. Leading cadres send telegrams, with or without reason, containing various requests to the Central Committee and to the government. Citizens submit many applications regarding issues which should in essence, be resolved locally, in the town or rayon and even the village.

Naturally, the redistribution of functions, of authority, is an extremely responsible matter. It cannot be allowed to drift. A strong political impetus is required here and so is a precise legislative basis. Carrying out extensive decentralization means supplying a life-giving flow of blood into the capillaries of our political and economic system.

But it is understandable that, in so doing, in no way must the blood supply to the brain and heart of our own organism, the organism of our society, be disrupted.

An important place in this belongs to the USSR Council of Ministers which is the highest executive power body accountable to the USSR Supreme Soviet. In the context of delimiting the functions of party and state bodies, the responsibility of the Council of Ministers for implementing domestic and foreign policy, the drafting and implementation of plans and long-term programs for economic, social and cultural development increases immeasurably. In order to fulfill these functions, the Council of Ministers has at its disposal broad powers envisaged by our Constitution.

While recognizing the exceptional important of decentralization and the fight against departmentalism, we should state clearly that they have nothing in common with encouraging parochialism. Since such a threat is quite realistic, we need serious counterbalances. The center should retain the right to have its say. The main thing is that democratic control from below, from the working people, should be resolutely strengthened. We all, I think, will vote for self-government, but against arbitrariness, for taking local interests into account, but also for them to be unfailingly combined with the interests of the whole of society. In a word, those who think that the course of decentralization is opening up the floodgates for parochialism or regional egoism are making a gross mistake.

The problems of combining centralism with decentralization in a rational way also arise in connection with aspects of the Law on State Enterprise (Association) the Cooperatives and individual labor activity. The point of departure in determining the functions and structure of management bodies should be the principles formulated in these documents. They can no longer give orders to the labor collectives as they did previously.

In general, comrades, democratization on the level of the cost accounting team, of the individual labor collective or the cooperative will not provide the result it should—and we have already become convinced of this at the first stage of reform—if it is not supplemented with democratization of management on the level of ministries, territorial bodies, and central economic departments.

That means that we must consistently pursue the line of simplifying the structure, combine bodies which administer homogeneous sectors of industry and spheres of activity, reducing the number of ministries and departments, abolishing superfluous levels and intermediate and transmission structures.

We all understand comrades, that now that the exceedingly complex tasks of restructuring—democratization of society and broad involvement of the people in government—are being tackled, we cannot do without

the apparatus, and we must not take a disdainful attitude toward its cadres. We need the apparatus of administration, but it must be different from what it is now.

We must struggle for an apparatus of a new type, based on high professionalism, having a command of modern information technology, democratically controlled by the people, capable of moving economic and social progress forward. And working in that apparatus, we must have people with a good knowledge of the fundamentals of the science of administration. Hence the task of organizing the training and retraining of the appropriate cadres in a new way and to modern standards.

The work of streamlining the administrative structure has now begun on all levels. Some ministries and departments have been abolished in the center and in the republics, as have some administrative subdivisions in the localities. We have examined and approved new general schemes of administration. The apparatus of Union departments falling within their scope has been cut by 40 percent. In the republics it is being halved. And in the autonomous republics, krais, and oblasts, it is being reduced by a third. Within the framework of the economic reform which is under way, the enterprises have also begun to rid themselves of superfluous administrative personnel.

This is not a painless process: It is meeting with resistance. But it has to be said that both the CPSU Central Committee and the government are being justly criticized by the working people for the fact that this is going too slowly. In the third year of restructuring, we are still stuck with an unwieldy administrative apparatus, a considerable part of which is fighting tooth and nail to hold on to its positions, without regard for the interests of society. And here, of course, we ought to be guided by the entirely justified demands of the people.

As to the need for radical improvement in the efficiency of the administrative system operating in our country, it is necessary to take it as a whole. Not one of its levels can remain outside restructuring on the principles of democratic renewal. That fully applies to the institutions having to do with the exercise of foreign political and external economic functions. The substantial reforms that are being carried out in them of late are a normal process in keeping with the spirit of the times. We must also support the purposeful work of the leadership of the KGB, the Defense Ministry, and the General Staff, aimed at improving their activities in the conditions created by the present development of society and of the unfolding of democratic processes.

In a word, comrades, the process of democratization acutely confronts us with the task of qualitatively improving the system of administration by establishing the correct correlation between the center and the localities and between the elective and executive bodies, and of expanding in real terms the participation of the

working people in government. It follows that the question cannot be reduced to purely organizational changes; this is very important in understanding the nature of the forthcoming work.

5. Development of Interethnic Relations

Comrades, one of the greatest gains of socialism has been the establishment in our country of a union of equal nationalities and ethnic groups. This enables us to say today with great conviction that in the future, as in the past, the consistent pursuit of a Leninist nationalities policy can be the sole healthy basis for our development.

Life has confirmed the correctness of the idea enshrined in the organization of our great union: the cumulation and combination of our efforts have made it possible for each nationality, and for society as a whole, to significantly increase the speed of their movement and reach new frontiers of historic progress. For all the difficulties that faced us on our path, today we note that this union has withstood the test of time. It continues to remain the decisive prerequisite for the further development of all our peoples.

As we know, a special Central Committee Plenum on the development of relations between nationalities will be held. However, we must address this exceptionally important and topical problem right now, at our conference. It is important to see whole, real pictures here, both the undoubted achievements and the obvious shortfalls, omissions, and difficulties connected with the unresolved nature of specific socioeconomic issues as well as the occasional inability to link the interests of individual nationalities with those of the entire people.

We shall have to undertake thoroughly further developing and improving existing interrepublic economic and scientific-technical links and apply more fully the advantages of the division and coordination of labor within the Union and of a scientifically based regional policy. Glasnost means a lot here. The working people should be fully informed about how their republic is developing and about what place it occupies in the complex of the national economy. They must know not only how their neighbors but how all the country's republics are living and developing. This should also be done because at times one comes across talk and judgments on interrelations between republics, based on insufficient or even biased information.

It would be right for our party conference to voice, in the form of reliable guidelines for relations between the nationalities in the economic sphere, support for the principles of fairness and fraternal reciprocal international aid, and cooperation which ensures both an overall upturn and an improvement in the economic and social living conditions of all the country's nations and ethnic groups.

In the present situation, the rights of the Union republics must be reinterpreted and brought into accordance with the radical economic reform. Obviously, it would be expedient that, having fulfilled their obligations to the all-Union stocks, they should be able to increase production for their own needs through skillful and enterprising management. This also would correspond to the demands of social justice in the development of relations between nationalities and would stimulate our common advance.

Problems that have not always been sufficiently taken into account also have had light shed on them in recent years in the process of democratization and glasnost: issues related to language, culture, literature and art, historical monuments, and environmental protection, for example.

The development of our multinational state naturally is accompanied by increased national self-awareness. This is a positive phenomenon, but since due attention has not always been paid to the new needs arising in connection with it, some issues have started to grow more complex and to acquire a nationalist slant in a number of cases, although it would be possible in principle to solve them calmly, without giving cause for various sorts of speculation and emotional excesses.

We recently have seen with our own eyes the knots into which the problems of relations among nationalities can get tied. We must protect the fraternity and friendship of our peoples as the apple of our eye. Another way or a sensible alternative simply does not exist, comrades! **(applause)** Who ever tries to prove anything else deceives both himself and others. Moreover, trying to cause clashes between people of different nationalities, to sow discord and hatred between them, means assuming a heavy responsibility before one's own people and before socialist society, not to mention the law. Objectively, such actions hamper both the process of democratization and the cause of restructuring.

We should also look at the issues of relations between the nationalities within the context of the present stage of development of the Soviet multinational state. The experience we have built up must be summed up. Everything that is valuable must be used, while everything that has to be got rid of must be exposed. Let's be frank, this is worth thinking about; first and foremost we have to assess many laws which regulate interaction between the Union and the republics, and see how far they correspond to present conditions, the tasks and requirements of our multinational society and its level of development and democracy. Clearly this is going to require establishing the status, rights and obligations of the Union and autonomous republics and the other national formations.

While pursuing this line, the following question must also be examined: Our society is distinguished by the high level of mobility of the population. Many people

live outside the boundaries of their national areas, and there are ethnic groups without any territorial autonomy. All these are realities of our multinational state. Certain collisions are possible here, and we have only one way for resolving them: By ensuring, within the framework of the structure of the Union that has come into being, that the interests of every nation and ethnic group and of the whole community of Soviet peoples are maximally taken into account. Any other approach is simply impossible in our specific circumstances. Any attempt to embark upon a different road would be disastrous.

Let us take Kazakhstan, for example. A huge republic, possessing great possibilities for development, a true international community, the achievements of which are the result of cooperation by all our people. That land was jointly developed by Kazakhs, Russians, Ukrainians, Germans, Kirghiz, Tatars, Uzbeks, Turkmens, and members of many other nations and ethnic groups, and they live there together. At the same time no one is casting doubt on the integrity of the Kazakh Republic. To some extent the same picture may also be observed in other republics.

Internationalization of the economy and of all public life cannot be avoided by us, and any striving for national exclusivity can only lead to economic and spiritual impoverishment. Our socialist approach is different. We strive to see that an individual of any nationality has full rights anywhere in the country and that he can (exercise) his rights and legitimate interests anywhere.

In advocating a further strengthening of internationality relations, we proceed from the position that the development of the Soviet state and the international ties and fraternity of our peoples are living and dynamic issues. They must be constantly within the field of view of both republic and Union bodies. The problems connected with them need to be resolved by relying on the will of the peoples and mutual agreement, with account being taken of the interests of all Soviet people.

It is very important to have within the framework of our political system permanent state and social institutions that deal with the whole complex of internationality problems. I said earlier that this should become one of the main tasks of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Altogether, comrades, the USSR is our common home, and we, its masters, are obliged to show constant solicitude for it, to guard and embellish it and endeavor to act so that all Soviet people living in it feel pride in their socialist fatherland (**sustained applause**).

This obviously needs to be stressed particularly in the resolution of our conference on improving national relations.

Forming a Socialist Legal Strata

I cannot fail to note the interest triggered by the proposition in the CPSU Central Committee's theses that the process of consistent democratization of Soviet society should bring to completion the creation of a socialist legal state. In brief, the most important thing characterizing a legal state is ensuring in practice the supremacy of the law. No state body, official, collective, and party of social organization, and no individual is freed from the obligation to obey the law. Just as the citizens bear responsibility to their state of the whole people, so does the state system bear responsibility to the citizens. Their rights must be reliably protected from any arbitrariness by the authorities and their representatives.

Restructuring has revealed with particular clarity the conservatism of our country's legal system, which, is largely oriented not toward democratic and economic methods but toward the command and injunction methods of leadership with their numerous prohibitions and petty regulations. Many of the existing laws have therefore become a hindrance to social development. This is why Soviet legislation needs to be reformed. It must encompass a vast array of legal norms, first and foremost those relating to socialist property, planning and economic, labor, tax, pension and other relations. In the renewal of the legislation, we must strictly adhere to the principle that anything not prohibited by law is allowed.

The work of the judicial bodies is of enormous importance. The fate of many people, the defense of their rights, and the inescapable punishment of those who have broken the law depend on how accurately the scales of justice function. Under these conditions, it is extremely important to restore the Leninist vision of the role of the courts in our system of democracy and strictly to observe the principle of the independence of judges and their subordination only to the law. The election of judges by superior soviets of people's deputies for a longer term, say 10 years, could become one of the important guarantees of this.

The public demands stricter liability for contempt of court and for interference in its work, and a guarantee of the most rigorous compliance with such democratic principles of court proceedings as competitiveness and quality of the parties, glasnost and openness, the exclusion of all bias and prejudice on the part of the prosecution, and the rigorous implementation of the principle of presumption of innocence.

The question is justifiably raised of enhancing the role of the people's assessors. The proposal of increasing their number in examining the most complex category of cases is particularly worthy of attention.

Thus, we are faced, comrades, with the need for a major legal reform.

Special mention must be made of the role and responsibility of the prosecution. Over the last 2 decades, a large number of supplementary commitments have been placed upon it which, one way or another, have pushed its functions in supervising legality to a position of secondary or even tertiary importance. The CPSU Central Committee has recognized the need to correct this distortion, and has set the task of returning to the Leninist position and asserting as the main function of the prosecutors the supervision of the universal and precise understanding and application of Soviet laws.

An important condition for the intensification of the struggle against crime is the work which has been begun on amending the criminal law, followed by the procedural and corrective labor legislation, and bringing its norms into line with the needs of society at the current stage of its development.

Great attention must be paid to improving the work of the militia. Over the last 2-3 years, tens of thousands of communists and members of the Komsomol, the best representatives of the working class and of the peasantry, have joined the militia on the recommendation of party committees and labor collectives. This will serve to clean up the organs of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, where, as is well known, serious disruptions are allowed to occur in their work, and, unfortunately, abuses. The main thing that should help us to resolutely raise the level of work of the militia is work with the cadres, their political education, their legal training, and enhancement of their professional skill.

The proposal for transferring in the very near future the investigation of the bulk of criminal cases to the investigative apparatus of the Ministry of Internal Affairs is worthy of attention, as is its detachment into a separate structure, not subordinate to the local militia authorities. This will make it possible we believe, to make better use of the possibilities of the Soviet militia in the struggle against crime and in maintaining public order.

With a view to strengthening the defense of citizens' rights, it is legitimate to raise the question of enhancing the role of the legal profession as a self-managing association, and also of a more active part to be played by lawyers in examining criminal and civil cases.

In connection with the changeover of our economy to the principles of economic reform, it is essential to strengthen significantly the juridical service of soviets, ministries, departments, and economic and other organizations, as well as the state arbitration. In conditions of cost accounting and self-management, when contract relations will increasingly penetrate the whole fabric of production relations, reliable work by the legal services assumes prime importance. Without this it is difficult to speak of a competent solution to the mass of legal and other problems that arise during restructuring.

The planned legal and court reform, the main trends of which our conference proposes to define in a separate resolution, undoubtedly need to be well supplied with cadres. There is no getting away from working out a special program for the training or retraining of lawyers. At the same time, it is also necessary to solve the urgent questions of the material provision for legal cadres. Universal legal education must be started at school and continued at technical colleges and VUZes, at enterprises and institutions. I think that increasing the material incentive and the conditions of cost accounting themselves will to a large extent help the broad masses of workers to master the basic legal knowledge and to strengthen law and order in our country.

Public Organizations in the Political System

Public organizations which reflect the interests of different strata are an important component of the social Soviet political system. Trade unions, the Komsomol, cooperative, women's and other organizations have played an important role in the history of socialist building. Today, too, they are searching for ways to step up their activity and increase their contribution to the revolutionary renewal of society. But the restructuring of public organizations, with all their differences, is slow and painful. The habit of doing things in the old way, looking over the shoulder at party and state organs, is too strong.

Both the general atmosphere in the country and a number of political decisions and legislative acts which have been adopted make it possible for public organizations to project their creative potential more energetically into the process of restructuring. Incidentally, coming up are laws on the rights of trade unions, on youth, on voluntary societies and on independent public associations. Therefore, good prerequisites for the restructuring of the activities of public organizations (consistent with) the new conditions have been created.

However, it is not merely a matter of decisions and legislative acts. Most important is how the public organizations themselves see their role and place at the present stage. Obviously, we must have a comprehensive discussion at our conference of the problems linked to stepping up the activity of public organizations. In this connection I should like to express a few ideas.

First of all, I shall talk about the trade unions. It goes without saying that, out of respect for their independence, we should not be giving them specific prescriptions as to how to restructure. Moreover, this was already discussed at the 17th Trade Unions Congress. The most important thing is the democratization of the very life of the trade union organizations and their taking into account the new situation generated by the process of a democratic renewal of society, particularly at the level of the labor collectives.

A favorable opportunity is now opening up for handing several functions carried out by state bodies over to the public organizations. We have the right to expect the trade unions to be active champions of strengthening self-management principles. Self-management of the working collectives increases the significance of such trade union functions as the defense of the working people's democratic and human rights. By more confident action in favor of democratism, the trade unions can have a considerable effect on the people's frame of mind, help them to overcome inertia, and more widely involve the working people in managing the affairs of the collective and society.

Of course, the trade unions' defense of the working people's social and economic interests, primarily in the sphere of labor safety, safe equipment, social insurance, and the organization of people's leisure and daily life, is in no way diminished but acquires still further significance. Therefore, the trade unions must find their real place and play a far more active role in implementing economic reform, since it is only thus that we can attain tangible advances in improving the living conditions of the working class and the working people as a whole.

Enhancement of the role of the trade unions, like that of other public organizations, will be facilitated by their direct representation in the supreme state authorities.

We can see today how all generations of Soviet people are rallying around the idea of restructuring. Its concepts correspond equally to the interests of older people, those who shouldered the burden of the first decades of socialist development, defended the country's independence in the Great Patriotic War, and raised it up in the postwar years, and those who are only now entering conscious life and who are to take our motherland to new frontiers of progress.

Each generation must have its say in our common history. All of us participate in and create it. But it is the young people in particular who are to open fully the great economic, scientific, technical and intellectual potential that has built up over the years of Soviet power, to multiply it many times over, and implement the great aims of restructuring. We can see that young people are increasingly becoming not merely participants in the people's struggle as a whole, but its strike and innovative force.

The political and labor potential of Soviet young people is tremendous, but realizing it to the full and channeling the energy of young people into restructuring can be accomplished only when we have decisively overcome serious shortcomings that have occurred in our work with young people in recent decades, when many fine-sounding words were addressed at them, but genuine steps to prepare young people for life and to involve them in society's political and economic spheres were lacking.

The CPSU Central Committee approves of the correct ideas voiced on this issued by the Komsomol Central Committee and the Komsomol organizations.

We believe that under present-day conditions, the CPSU Central Committee and the state should have a well thought out and integral policy regarding young people. At the same time, the legal, economic, and political mechanisms for implementing it should be worked out. The purpose of this policy, as a special area of the activity of the party and of state organs, of all public organizations, is to create the conditions and incentives for young people through which they are able to develop their thinking and energies to the greatest extent, and to develop and realize their creative potential for the sake of socialism.

We must demonstrate total political trust in our young people in fact, and change the very type of relations with young people. The attitude of "fathers" instructing their "children" must give way to communicating with them, and to dialogue. If we want to fully restore the trust of young people, we must learn to talk with them and talk with them as equals, openly, honestly, remembering meanwhile that it is only the truth that will help us. There will be as much trust as there is truth (**apause**).

We must teach young people to be selfless in the struggle for the achievement of our ideals; but at the same time we must create the conditions for a joyful, attractive, and saturated life. In speaking of all this, comrades, I want to say clearly that the matter is not one of somehow playing up to young people, of new forms of tutelage and total forgiveness, that is rejected by young people themselves. No, we must build our relationship on the principles of trust, comradeship, respect, mutual exactingness and active cooperation in tackling the tasks of renewing our socialist society.

The question of the Komsomol's role today also has immense importance in this connection. The Komsomol is the political organization of Soviet youth, working under the guidance of the party. Today as well, the main task in its work is to point out the Leninist way, to prepare young people to become communists and to take an active part in implementing the policy of the Communist Party.

We all wish to see the Komsomol as a school for the communist upbringing of boys and girls, a true school of democracy, an innovative organization where creative people with initiative can find support, where glasnost, openness in expressing one's position, and a spirit of debate are combined with the practical realization of the interests of young people and the latter's active involvement in social and economic change. What we are talking about is the chance for the Komsomol to carry out its work without interference, not waiting for instructions from above, but realizing to the full the potential of youthful energy and initiative.

As far as party committees are concerned, they should respect and comply with the organizational independence of the Komsomol, its right to tackle independently all issues of life within the USSR without exception, to participate in the elaboration and implementation of the party's policy, and to defend the interests of young people in party, soviet, and economic bodies. Restructuring demands that the young generation should be broadly represented in soviets, trade unions, and other public organizations, that young people should master the science of management and boldly take state and public affairs into their hands.

Comrades! before our eyes a new generation is growing and developing—the perestroyka generation. The training of the new replacements is one of the most responsible tasks of our entire party and society. Obviously it is such an important question that it should in the very near future also become a topic for special discussion at a plenum of the party Central Committee.

In connection with the problem of social interests, let me dwell on another question of state significance: the question of women. It has been asserted repeatedly that it has been resolved in our country once and for all. We indeed proclaimed the equality of rights of women with men, and guaranteed equal access to almost all professions, established equal pay for equal work, and guaranteed other rights for women. All that is true. But things have turned out in such a way that alongside unquestionable gains, women have been left with concerns which still in many ways prevent them from taking full advantage of opportunities. The disordered state of everyday life, shortage of institutions for children, shortcomings of work in the service and trade sectors all affect first and foremost the lot of women.

Here the residual principle in the development of the social sphere has also had its effect. But this situation could have lasted for years to come because the opinions of women have been taken little into consideration. They do not have the representation they should have in the leadership bodies. On the whole the women's movement which developed after the October Revolution gradually died away or became formal in nature.

Restructuring has urgently posed these questions. A mass organization of women has been created, or rather revived. But this is only the organizational side of things, albeit an important one. We must try to change the situation in essence, to open up for women a broad road into the leadership bodies from the bottom to the top, to ensure that questions which touch directly upon the interests of women are not resolved without their participation and deciding views.

Another remarkable feature of restructuring is the stormy growth of public associations, reflecting all the diversity of social interests. This includes organizations for war and labor veterans, unions of scientific and engineering societies, theater personalities, the Soviet

Culture Fund, the Children's Fund, various societies engaged in the preservation of nature and historical monuments, and the charity movement. On the whole this is a remarkable manifestation of the people's independent action which deserves every kind of support.

Of course one should not close one's eyes to the fact that in the course of the public upsurge, individual groups have appeared whose interests are far from the aims of restructuring and the interests of the people. But it is not they who determine the general atmosphere, and it is not they who are the point now. I believe that the party organizations, the working people, can distinguish the true enthusiasts for the renewal of socialist society from those who are guided by aims alien to socialism.

Under the one-party system, which developed historically and was established in the country, we need a permanent mechanism for juxtaposing opinions, criticism, and self-criticism within the party and within society. In conditions of growing democratization, this is an issue of vital importance. This is precisely how the essence of internal party democracy was understood by Lenin, who, in condemning fractionalism, was resolutely opposed to persecuting his party comrades for thinking differently. Constant constructive political dialogue and the practice of discussion and study and taking account of public opinion should become integral features of our way of life.

Conditions for this are being created now. In fact, a nationwide patriotic movement for supporting the party line of restructuring is taking shape in the country. It includes all forces in favor of making society healthier—communists, Komsomol members, nonparty members, believers, women, veterans, young people, and representatives of all the main public organizations. This movement reflects the profound processes occurring in contemporary public and political life and strengthens confidence in the success of the cause of perestroyka. Various proposals are being expressed at meetings, gatherings, and in the press about the prospects for this movement and the possible forms its activity could take. Let us discuss this question also.

III

Democratization of Leading Activities and Internal CPSU Life

Comrades, in implementing perestroyka again and again we turn our thoughts to the party, to its position and role in this revolutionary process. It is significant that it is precisely issues which concern the activity of the party and its leading role that have been at the center of our society's attention recently. This is one of the most convincing confirmations that the people associate both the progress of perestroyka and their hopes for the future with the party. Even purely internal party problems have become the object of general popular interest.

Having proposed a new course in April 1985, the CPSU has confirmed that none but itself is the bearer of society's program targets. It is precisely the party that is the political force that can lead the country along the path of renewal. Boldly revealing the reasons for the pre-crisis situation of stagnation, the party assumed responsibility for the existing situation. It has examined its activity objectively and its methods of leadership, and consciously drew public criticism upon itself.

At the 27th CPSU Congress, and particularly at the January 1987 Central Committee Plenum, the negative processes occurring in the last decade—not only in society as a whole but also in the party itself—were subjected to critical analysis. We had to give an answer to questions of principle: Why was it that the CPSU, created as a truly democratic organization—of one flesh with the working people—did not manage to stand in the way of the processes of deformation of socialism related to Stalin's cult of personality? Why also, after that, having exposed and condemned the departures from Leninist principles, did it limit itself to superficial changes, as a result of which serious stagnation phenomena were allowed to occur in the country's development?

The answer lies above all in the fact that certain deformations occurred within the party itself, in the content of its activity and ties with the working people. This brought the loss of many democratic bolshevik traditions which were inherent in it from the outset and which had been instilled through many years of effort by Lenin and by his comrades-in-arms.

The 27th CPSU Congress set the task of radically restructuring party work and the aim of democratizing intraparty life. Lessons from truth have prompted the growth of self-awareness and self-purification in our ranks. Communists, party organizations, and the party press have assumed a more active role in society and formulated and resolved outstanding issues more boldly. The process of renovation—though not easily and not without difficulties—is growing. But having noted truly profound changes in the life of the party we would not have been sufficiently open if we did not say that as yet not everything goes well. Not every party organization is restructuring its work taking into account new requirements. Some party workers, and even committees, are speaking from conservative positions. Many are finding difficult the art of mastering new work methods, the ability to act in an atmosphere of glasnost and democracy.

Yes, this is so, but I want to tell conference delegates and the whole people the main thing: without the guidance of the party and the implementation of its political course, the tasks of restructuring cannot be resolved (**stormy applause**). Restructuring would be doomed politically, ideologically, and organizationally.

At the present crucial stage, the CPSU must totally fulfill its functions and tasks as the guiding force in society. However, it is precisely the decisive significance of political leadership that dictates the need to discuss thoroughly the specific content of party activity in the present conditions.

1. Full Restoration of Intraparty Democracy

What is the main thing here? The CPSU Central Committee's principle is set out in the theses. I shall refresh your memory: "The party, proceeding from Marxist-Leninist teaching, is destined to develop theories and strategies for social development, domestic and foreign policies, to develop the ideology of socialist renovation, to conduct political and organizational work among the masses, and to train and place cadres."

The functions of the CPSU as the political vanguard have been defined by us. But in order to put those functions into practice, the party must restructure its activities, the style, methods and forms of work, from primary organization to Central Committee. Each communist must really fight to implement policy and fight for the interests of the people.

And here it is important to try to understand why we are dissatisfied with ourselves and why we are being very sharply critical of the state of affairs in our party home. What has happened here?

The point is primarily that the principle of democratic centralism which lies at the basis of the CPSU's activity was largely replaced at a certain stage by bureaucratic centralism. This happened, in the first place, because the primary party organizations and the rank and file communists to a large extent lost effective opportunities to influence the nature of the party's activity. There was serious violation of the very important Leninist demand in accordance with which all party bodies and their cadres should be constantly monitored by the party masses. Many negative phenomena in the party are also related to the weakening of the role of the elected bodies and the excessive growth in the role of the apparatus at all levels.

There is something else, too, which must not be left unmentioned. Our party was built by Lenin as an organization of like-minded people. A law of its life was the free discussion of all problems and unity of action after a decision had been taken. However, with the establishment of the command and administrative system, the atmosphere of party comradeship gradually gave way to relations based on orders being given and carried out, to the division of party members into superiors and subordinates, to the violation of the principle of equality among communists. And although the intolerability of the situation was recognized from time to time, in real life everything continued to go on in the same way.

Let us recall that the October 1964 Central Committee Plenum was held essentially under the slogan of restoring the Leninist principles and standards of party life. But the actual processes went a different way and, in the years of stagnation, at times even became deformed. The activity of primary party organizations and of members of elected bodies was affected by delays in the process of replacing cadres. Entire generations of communists were unable to play a real part in the life of the party. The other side of this is that many of those who remained for years in leading positions in accordance with the cadre nomenklatura considered themselves to be infallible and irreplaceable. The lowering of the responsibility of a large proportion of elected officials and the party apparatus, their loss of contact with the party masses and the working people frequently ended, as we now know, with political and moral degradation. These are the roots of the shameful facts of abuse of power and moral degeneration discovered during restructuring.

I speak of these phenomena with bitterness. They had a serious effect on the activity of the party and of its organizations. We must never forget this aspect of the matter. But there is another aspect of this, too, one which is very fundamental for us. During all these years, millions of party members and thousands of party cadres honorably fulfilled their party and civic duty under conditions which were both objectively and subjectively difficult. They worthily bore the banner of the revolution and did everything possible in their fields for the development of the country and for socialism. The same can also be said of many of our leading cadres, economic managers and experts, scientists, and cultural figures.

Leninist traditions ran deep in the party environment. In spite of everything, it was precisely in the party that there accumulated and took shape forces which proved capable of making a sharp turn in socioeconomic policy and embarking on the road of restructuring and renewal.

The Central Committee April Plenum spoke up resolutely for democratization of the CPSU, for openness in its work, for full restoration of the Leninist norms of party life, and first of all of the activity of the primary party organizations in the work of the party's elected bodies.

The ideas expressed regarding this in the Central Committee theses provoked lively discussion not only in the party but in society as a whole. All Soviet people have an interest in seeing in every communist, in each primary party organization, in the party committee, a really dynamic political force. In the discussions on the eve of the conference, the questions of the role of party meetings, of the forms of activity of party organizations and party committees, of each communist, were reformulated. This is understandable, for the primary party organizations are precisely an organic part of each labor collective, embodying the continual presence of the party in the life of society.

To this purpose it is necessary to fully revive in the party an atmosphere of principle-mindedness, openness, discussion, criticism and self-criticism, conscientious discipline, party comradeship, and an unconditional personal responsibility and businesslike character. It is in this direction that processes in party organizations are now unfolding, and it is the task of the conference to resolutely support them, and to open unlimited scope for them.

It is now necessary to formulate in a new way the question of each communist's responsibility for the state of affairs where he works, for his personal contribution to restructuring, for the activity of his collective. This is important, furthermore, because many people have been complaining that restructuring has not reached the primary party organizations. But who is to blame for that? Let us investigate: The political life of restructuring was defined and approved by the congress. The most important directions of work were formulated in the decisions of the Central Committee plenums. Legislative bills were adopted regarding various spheres of life. In the party and in society an atmosphere of glasnost was created. Initiative, independence, and a civic stance are being welcomed and encouraged. Many communists, Komsomol members, and nonparty members are acting vigorously, at the call of conscience, in various sections of the struggle for socialist renewal. But the others are waiting for something. It is the old endemic disease at work: They are waiting for instructions. Well, there are indeed instructions, comrades, but it is not fitting to lead communists by the hand.

It is in precisely this connection that the question, raised in the theses, of holding a kind of review of party ranks, is of urgent significance. Now, action is demanded of every one of us, real action toward carrying out the tasks of restructuring. The vanguard role of the communists today must be proved, comrades, through deeds **(applause)**.

The Central Committee has called for the certification of sociopolitical competence of communists, and we have in principle sensed an approving attitude to this proposal **(applause)**.

It is true, however, that misgivings have also been expressed, what is more of a twofold kind. Some believe that certification will not yield anything, that we need, so they say, a purge of the party, to rid it of ballast. We in the Central Committee regard this approach as unwarranted under conditions of restructuring and democratization, and this is why: Many of those who not so long ago were regarded as not very active and as having lost contact with the party organization, and who were included in that ballast, are now trying to find their place in life. We must treat our party comrades with extreme respect. Not one honest worker should be left outside in restructuring. Let us proceed from this. This is in accordance with Lenin, in accordance with bolshevism **(applause)**.

Other comrades are afraid in case certification should turn into reprisals, into the settling of accounts precisely with those who today are demonstrating their active stand. It does not suit a certain group of individuals who are pursuing egotistic interests.

I think that if we treat this serious matter seriously, both the former and the latter misgivings will be in vain. By putting forward the idea of the self-cleansing of the party, we reckon on certification being in line with statute regulation, in the framework of a normal democratic process, at open party meetings, and not with the participation of any special "threesome" or "fivesome," and not on the basis of secret investigations and the compiling of closed references. The very process of certification should be a school for the education of communists, so that, having gone through this school, they come out tightly welded by the bounds of party comradeship, united by the common goals and tasks which restructuring has placed before all of us.

Another and very essential question is admittance to the party. We need to rid ourselves decisively of all kinds of prearranged instructions and bureaucratic approaches to this question which is so vitally important for the party. The main criterion in appraising the qualities of someone entering the party is his position and real participation in restructuring. This requirement must apply to all—workers, peasants and members of our intelligentsia alike. We are all well aware that people can best be seen in their labor collective; that is where those who are going into the party at the prompting of their heart and those who are seeking personal advantage can be distinguished.

A proposal is being made, that the best people should be nominated to the party directly by the labor collective. Experience confirms the expediency of preliminary discussion of applications for admittance to the party at working people's meetings. Of course the opinion of the collective should be attentively examined by communists in admitting people to the CPSU.

Now, about the party's elected bodies. Here we must change much, radically at that. First of all, the authority of the elected bodies must be restored as plenipotentiary representatives of communists. Secretaries, buros and the party apparatus especially must all be under the supervision of the elected party body. Henceforth a situation must never arise in which members of the bureaus or workers of the party apparatus permit themselves a command style toward members of the elected committees.

It is no less and perhaps even more important, that the biggest questions of principle connected with implementing the vanguard role of the party in new conditions and of organizational and political work among the masses should be submitted for discussion at party committees. The practice in which the agendas of party

meetings are cluttered up with dozens of petty, insignificant matters has to be resolutely stopped. In preparing a discussion on an issue, the merest hint of over organization, glorification, and empty verbiage must be excluded. Openness, a critical approach, and a business-like attitude must reign supreme in all elected bodies. The same should also be inherent in the activity of the party apparatus, excluding secrecy in its work and the unjustified suppression of information.

All of this fully applies to the activity of the CPSU Central Committee, which occupies a special position in the party and in society. It is precisely here that highly important issues of domestic and foreign policy are solved in the periods between congresses. How the Central Committee works, what issues it discusses, what decisions it makes, and how democratic is the atmosphere of its activity are of enormous importance for the whole party and our entire society.

We have already had occasion, at the January Plenum of the Central Committee, to discuss what the situation was like in the Central Committee over a number of years. I will not repeat it; I will just say that many blunders could have been avoided had the problems that came to a head in governing the country been solved in good time and in a well-considered manner, and had the work of the party Central Committee always been full-blooded and democratic.

The situation has begun to change now, especially since the 27th Party Congress. I would say this: the Central Committee is reviving and gaining strength, and Central Committee Plenums now take place in a different style. Nonetheless we still must be cautious in our assessments and not fall into exaggerations.

Problem number one is the active work of the Central Committee members not only at their place of work but also during the preparation, discussion, and adoption of party-wide decisions. Speaking of this, I also have a definite experience in mind. On the even of the most recent plenums it became the practice to hold preliminary consultations with Central Committee members and party committee secretaries, to distribute documents relating to the agenda, and so on. All of this had an effect on the vigor of the Central Committee members themselves, and on the quality of their decisions. This, incidentally, is a definite guarantee against mistakes in work; the price of such mistakes, as we well know, is too high.

We have to think also about new forms of work organization in the periods between plenums, and at plenums themselves. Should we not have commissions in the Central Committee dealing with areas of major importance in domestic and foreign policy, in which members of the Central Committee would work on a regular basis? In that case the party apparatus, too, will assume its proper place.

The participation by Central Committee members in the Politburo's work must probably also be widened. I won't say that this is not happening but, so far, this participation is largely restricted to officials in the apparatus, departments, and scientific institutions of the capital.

Politburo reports and information about its activities submitted at Central Committee Plenums, must become a regular feature.

In order for the party committees and elective bodies to function at full capacity and be able to use everything that is stipulated in our statutes, the procedure for forming them should resolutely be renewed. This is a decisive factor for the involvement of any elective, including a party body. Elections at all levels must take place in a democratic atmosphere, ensuring a wide discussion of the nominations, competitiveness and, as a result, the election of people who are really dedicated to the cause, talented and worthy people who enjoy absolute authority and are capable of pursuing the policy of restructuring.

We will evidently not succeed in achieving this by using the old approaches when nominations for possible discussion and then balloting were essentially put forward by the secretary, at best with the participation of the members of bureau of the oblast, town, or rayon party committee, etc.

In this connection, comrades, the following consideration is being submitted for examination by the conference: While leaving the last word to the general meeting or the delegates of the conference, the right of lower-ranking organizations at the same time as electing delegates to the conference or the congress to put forward proposals regarding nominations to the higher-ranking party body should also be recognized. As the discussion has shown, the majority resolutely supported the proposal to the effect that during elections to all party committees, right up to the CPSU Central Committee, communists are entitled to nominate more candidates than there are mandates and to be guided in this not by what post is held by a person but by his stance on restructuring (**applause**).

Had such a procedure followed, the questions which arose in a number of cases during the election of delegates to our conference would not have existed.

The proposal to establish a single 5-year term of office for all party committees, to limit the tenure of elected CPSU office holders to two successive terms and to permit the election for a third term only in exceptional cases has attracted attention. The interest in this is not fortuitous. It expressed the anxiety both of communists and nonparty members regarding the violations perpetrated in the past, connected with lengthy tenure in leading positions. In principle, as we understand it, three points of view have become apparent. Some comrades support the proposal contained in the theses. Others are

in favor of limiting tenure in elective positions at all levels of the party to two successive terms. Finally, yet others speak for making an exception for the election for a third successive term only for the highest echelon. Well, comrades, let us consult together once again and make a decision.

2. Delimiting the Functions of Party and State Agencies

Enormously important in today's conditions for the interpretation of the role of the party as a political vanguard is correctly solving the question of the precise delimitation of the functions of party and state bodies. The position of the CPSU Central Committee on this matter is set out in the theses of the Central Committee and has aroused very keen discussion. No wonder: The solution of this question depends, in effect, both the restructuring of our political system and the success of restructuring as a whole.

Why am I saying this with such certainty? Our society is at a very crucial stage. It has started a process of profound transformations, and it stands in greater need than ever before for reliable political and ideological guidelines. The elaboration of such guidelines, the strategy of social development and its embodiment in policy, are tasks that can be performed only by a strong party possessing a vast potential of theory and of cadres—closely linked with the people, and constantly checking and enriching its experience by the experience of the people's masses. V.I. Lenin pointed out repeatedly how harmful it is to imagine that the ruling party must lead directly, ignoring or claiming to be a substitute for other organizations of the working people. He demanded that we "distinguish much more precisely the functions of the party, (its Central Committee) and of Soviet power," (op. cit., vol 45, p 61). He sharply criticized attempts to shift onto the party the responsibility for solving every specific problem. He condemned the practice of "dragging some small specific matters all the way to the Politburo" (ibid, p 113).

It is necessary to say that the issue of the demarcation of functions between party and state has been raised more than once, at various stages of the history of our society, and that at such times it has been acknowledged that the existing situation was abnormal and must be changed by appealing to Leninist principles.

Yet matters not only did not change for the better, but worsened increasingly over the years. As the problems of economic development increased in complexity, the party found itself drawn into solving a great variety of administrative problems, and its apparatus grew accordingly. The logic of the administrative and command system dictated that such a policy should be retained and reinforced. Furthermore, there were those who, by reference to the experience of particular stages of our history, sought to prove that this was the most effective way to

solve various problems of our development. It was with them that the thesis of the growth of the leading role of the party was primarily associated.

I think you will agree, comrades, that in tackling the problem of the demarcation of functions, we must begin with the upper echelons of the country's leadership. I have already spoken about enhancing the role of the highest state and government authorities. But what is the implication of this for the party, its Central Committee and its Politburo? Above all, it presupposes that the Central Committee and Politburo must act and function as organs of political leadership. Of course, we must resolutely set a course of not allowing substitutes for the supreme agencies of power and government. Everything that the USSR Supreme Soviet and USSR Council of Ministers must do, must be done precisely by them.

The question arises: What mechanism and what possibilities should the Central Committee and its Politburo employ in order to pursue through the Soviet system the political line elaborated by the party and the decisions of the congresses and plenums of the Central Committee? Here we must fully implement the Leninist principle that the CPSU pursues its political course through the communists working in the state bodies in all spheres of life of society. All party organizations must act strictly within the framework of the USSR Constitution and Soviet laws. We must exclude the passing of resolutions of party committees containing direct instructions to state and economic bodies and public organizations.

In relation to increasing the role of the elective colleges and of delimiting the functions of the party and state bodies, the issue of changing the structure and composition of the party apparatus has moved onto a practical plane.

We shall have to reject the present fragmentation of the CPSU Central Committee apparatus—and the corresponding fragmentation of the apparatus of subordinate party bodies—right across the branches of administration, and rearrange its structure in accordance with the functions of the party in the contemporary conditions, as well as reduce the size of the apparatus.

I should particularly like to speak about rayon and city party units. Their role always has been and remains a very important one. While taking account of the new requirements, one must be attentive toward the structuring of their apparatus so that it might better assist the party committees to carry out their direct political, organizational, and educative functions. The raykoms and gorkoms must operate on the basis of the main thing: to rely constantly on the primary party organizations in all their work. This requires a decisive change in the style and methods of their activities.

Evidently, taking into account the discussion at the conference and the shaping of our common stance on these issues, we could in the very near future set about drawing up a new structure for the party apparatus.

Comrades, the goal of all these proposals is consistent observance of the democratic principles in intraparty life; an increase in the party's combativeness and in its capacity to head the process of the revolutionary renovation of Soviet society, and to set the tone for restructuring.

We are saying that the party's capacity for self-control and critical analysis of its actions depends first and foremost on how fully the principles of democratic centralism, the collective and corporate nature of its work, and glasnost are embodied in its activity.

Something else, comrades: We are relying on the fact that in this way we will inflict a decisive defeat on bureaucratism—the disease that has, most unfortunately, affected a sizable proportion of party bodies and party cadres and that is expressed in their alienation from the working people and in the fact that they have ceased to live by the interests and concerns of the people. Of course, there is no single remedy—nor can there be—to resolve all problems at a stroke. We must firmly follow the path of reviving the Leninist principles for intraparty life.

In this connection I would also like to speak about control and auditing work in the party. As the discussion showed, there is support for the proposals contained in the CPSU Central Committee theses on the creation of a single control and auditing body that would be elected by the party congress and that would keep an eye on the observance by communists of the requirements of party discipline, the CPSU Constitution, and the financial and economic activity of the party organizations.

Comrades, the February Plenum of the Central Committee set the task of renovating our ideology together with radical economic reform and democratization of party and public life. This underscores the active role which the party assigns to ideological work in attaining the goals of restructuring.

The retreat from the principles of creative Marxism-Leninism has left a painful mark on ideology. Its theoretical level has dropped, and propaganda has, not infrequently, run counter to the realities of life. The essence of ideological work has come to serve the dogmatic concepts of socialism, has lost its critical attitude toward present-day reality, and has thus contributed to manifestations of stagnation. While bypassing the topical problems of life, propaganda degenerated into rhetorical idle talk and eulogy, and acquired a purely ritual significance. Loss of intellectual initiative, dogmatism, and a gap between words and actions led to a weakening in the party's ideological influence.

The last 3 years have been marked by intensive work to promote public awareness. An honest and critical discussion on the state of affairs in all fields of our life was held. Indeed, for the first time in many long years, decades even, we took a look at ourselves, not only frankly and without preconception, but in relation to all sides of our development.

Once again the search for right and truth and not advantage, is honored. Once again it is boldness of objective research and not a passing fad, which is valued. Here is an instructive conclusion for all of us for the future: Without the truth of life, without the truth of scientific facts and artistic discoveries there is not and cannot be a complete and varied spiritual life, there is not and cannot be truly effective militant ideological work.

The party is convinced of the correctness of this approach, the rightness of its revolutionary initiative in developing glasnost, democracy, and the socialist pluralism of opinion. But it would be naive to suppose that a society, renewed through and through, will be born of its own accord, automatically, and all at once; just because of moral purification, well founded criticism, and a break with the unworthy past. No, the dialectics of consciousness and practice are immeasurably more complicated. The effectiveness of ideological activity depends to a decisive extent on concrete political, organizational, and socioeconomic conditions.

Today we have managed to arouse public consciousness, to overcome the state of apathy and alienation, and now the question is this: Where will all this awakened consciousness go? In which direction will public opinion develop?

Will it serve the cause of restructuring, go down the path of increasing constructive and creative efforts, the path of labor and responsibility, the path of the true renewal of socialist society?

Or will it tremble at the difficulty and unfamiliarity of the new tasks, give in to passions and emotions, break away into superficially attractive initiatives, into various short-lived campaigns?

Or else will it give a brief sigh over life and slip back into slumber, which would suit perfectly all those who like the time of stagnation?

It is clear that there can only be one path: the path of restructuring, the path of renewal. The party will make use of all possibilities to see that public awareness is shaped on the basis of the development of democratization and glasnost, and is aimed at creative work (applause).

The cause of renewal needs guarantees and protection. These guarantees must be created and strengthened both in the consistent implementation of radical economic reform, the reform of the political system, and in the sphere of public consciousness and spiritual and ideological life.

There is no doubt that quite a lot of saddening and even tragic things have been said in the past years, things which can cause bitterness, pain, disappointment, and disagreement. Of course it is more soothing not to know this, not to be aware of it. But revolutionary awareness, a civic stance, courage and high responsibility in a person cannot be born from such an approach. This is essential for the success of restructuring. It was precisely because of this that the party embarked boldly on a critical reconsideration of the past, on the restoration of historical truth, the rehabilitation of those who fell victim to unjust political accusations and lawlessness. This work must be continued.

There should be no questions which one would avoid answering. There should be no doubts which one could brush aside. Our party honor and conscience and the intellectual dignity of the party of Lenin are involved.

It is not simple and easy to reach for the truth. But a party that lives in conditions of ideological comfort, that has deduced that it has the truth in its hands and that it is not necessary to go after it day in and day out but that it can be simply taken out of the safe—such a party runs the risk of losing its spiritual and moral authority, its revolutionary nature and the ability to be society's political vanguard.

Numerous remarkable qualities are inherent in our social consciousness, in the Soviet man. This is so. Nevertheless, today we pose the question of the need to inculcate purposefully initiative-taking, independence, lively interest in the new, the need for it. Without it, new frontiers of restructuring cannot be reached. These qualities can only be inculcated on the basis of democratic forms of life in society.

Restructuring has brought to the forefront of life glasnost, which takes the most different forms in the process of its implementation: in the work of state and public organizations, at assemblies, meetings, scientific and creative conferences, and citizens' rallies. The media today are a powerful rostrum for public opinion. They have done quite a lot to restore the historic truth and justice, to voice criticism of shortcomings and omissions, to spread the experience of restructuring and to develop in people the ability to think and act in a new way, creatively, purposefully.

But now we must go forward. We need a new quality of the party press, a new quality of its politically educational and organizational role. Our press now should, without lowering the level of criticism of all that impedes progress on the path of restructuring, go deep into the

processes, analyze the complex dialectics, the contradictory nature of establishing a new society in all areas of its life. And to achieve that, more knowledge, more competence, more constructiveness and responsibility are needed. The press can resolve that task only through involving broad social strata, but supporting the experience of real foremen of restructuring.

Today there is no more need to argue that there can be no restructuring without glasnost. Without it we would have been unable to do the great amount of work on analyzing the reasons for negative phenomena and ways of overcoming them. We would have been unable to create a new moral and political atmosphere in society, to bring the ideas of restructuring to the forefront.

Glasnost means pluralism of opinion on any issue of domestic and foreign policy, free comparison among different points of view and debates. Only with that approach can it fulfill its social role: to serve the interests of the people and socialism.

But glasnost, like any manifestation of democracy, presumes high responsibility. Glasnost cannot be combined with claims to a monopoly on view, with the imposition of different dogmas to replace those we are rejecting, with serving group interests and even less so with distortion of facts and with the settling of personal scores (applause). It is extremely antidemocratic to deprive people who have been subjected to criticism of the opportunity to respond to the essence of it. What sort of glasnost would this be? It is totally unacceptable when discussions, meetings, pages of the press, and television screens are used for wrangling, hurling insults, and labeling (applause).

Nonetheless, comrades, there are still instances—and this must be plainly stated at the conference—of suppression of and even reprisals for criticism. We meet with such cases in party organizations, and the government apparatus, and with regard to the mass media. Quite often, the active and uncompromising way Soviet people expose specific shortcomings—their protests against irresponsibility, against abuses by officials—arouses a furious response and opposition from some people. Once more we see how they silence and even persecute those who raise their voices to defend the truth. Party organizations and party committees at all levels must protect the development of criticism and self-criticism and act from positions of principle.

When we speak, comrades, of instilling political culture and civilized behavior in human relations, our mass media can play an enormous role, by setting their own example.

All this must obviously be kept in mind in drafting the conference resolution on glasnost. Here is another ideological aspect of the party's political activity at the present stage of perestroika. In the current processes of re-establishing truth and justice, rejecting everything

that has deformed socialist ideology and practice, and abolishing stereotypes and dogmas, some people insist that these are allegedly an erosion of principles, of the foundations of socialism, a denigration of its history. We cannot agree with this, comrades. Categorically, we cannot! (applause). We do not have the right to allow perestroika to stumble on the stone of dogmatism and conservatism, on someone's prejudices and personal ambitions. It is a matter of the country's destiny, the destiny of socialism, and we must clarify the grave nature of the situation to those who have not yet grasped it. In this matter, which is a most important one for us, there can be no compromises (applause).

I would like to state most firmly here at the conference that we will continue to develop all genuinely socialist values, and decisively eliminate everything that has distorted the revolutionary theory and aspect of socialism.

Tempestuous discussions and clashes of passions have revealed an important situation, both gratifying and inspiring. It confirms with new force, after so many trials, dramatic situations, and tragic falls, the correctness of the historic choice made by our people in 1917—the choice in favor of socialism (applause).

Look how everyone can now speak his mind and say what he wants. This multiplicity of opinions, judgments, and emotions is manifested in public life on an unprecedented scale and under the most various guises. And what has happened? Without pretending or wishing to embellish, we can say that despite all the gravity and critical nature of judgments heard over this period the Soviet people have, in the process of perestroika, once again voted decisively and powerfully for socialism (applause).

Yes, we are renouncing everything which deformed socialism in the thirties and which led it into stagnation in the seventies. However, we want the sort of socialism which is cleansed of the deposits and distortions of earlier periods but which, at the same time, is the successor to all the best born of the creative thinking of the founders of our doctrine and which has been embodied in life through the labor and efforts of the people and which reflects their hopes and aspirations. We want a socialism which encompasses all the advanced experience of world development and which is based to the fullest extent on the achievements of human progress.

Of course, it is not possible today to describe in every detail the specific features of the society toward which we are marching through restructuring. But it is possible and necessary to outline the basic parameters and main features of what we call a qualitatively new state of society.

It is possible because the main directions and tendencies of the transformation of society have already emerged. It is necessary because, apart from criticism which has

revealed shortcomings and given an understanding of what we should renounce, there is an equally great demand for constructive and positive guidelines to show the way and the means to bring practice closer to the ultimate aims and ideals of socialism.

We see socialism as a system of genuine and real humanism in which man is really the "measure of all things." The development of society from the economy, the spiritual and ideological sphere, is aimed at satisfying the requirements of man and at his all-round development. All of this is accomplished through the work, creativeness, and energy of the people themselves.

We see socialism as a system with an efficient and dynamic economy based on the best achievements of scientific-technical progress and ensuring the highest level of labor productivity, an economy directly subordinated to satisfying the demands of society and flexibly adapted to it. Such an economy is based on varied forms of public and personal ownership, the organization of production in such a way that the working people are the real masters of production and that earnings are directly linked with the results of one's labor. The planned management of the economy is based on the organic combination of the role of the center with structural questions being resolved with broad independence of production units as the producers of goods, acting on the basis of cost accounting and independence and working for the market.

We see socialism as a system of social justice, combining social guarantees of man's vital requirements of work, health protection, education and housing with the consistent implementation of the principle of distribution according to one's work, with the eradication of any forms of excessive leveling and social parasitism. A society which values man's material and moral abilities, his fruitful labor, skill and talent above everything else and suitably rewards him for this.

We see socialism as a system with high standards and morality. It inherits and multiplies the best achievements of the spiritual development of mankind and its rich moral experience. It is a society where the working man enjoys a full and rich life in the material and spiritual sense, one which rejects consumerism, lack of spirituality, and cultural primitivism. The concept of a high standard of culture includes also the ecological standards of society and a careful and sensible approach to the natural conditions of the life and production activity of people, and the preservation and multiplication of natural wealth.

We see socialism also as a system of genuine sovereignty of the people in which all working people are guaranteed full opportunity to express their needs and interests, to participate in the management of social processes, and to overcome the alienation of man from the system. This is

a society of the socialist self-management by the people, of profound and consistent democratism in economic management, social processes, legality, openness, and glasnost.

We see socialism as a system of genuine equality among all nations and ethnic groups, their social and spiritual flourishing and mutual enrichment, where there is no room for any display of dissension between the nationalities, nationalistic and chauvinistic prejudices and where internationalism and the fraternity of nations triumph.

Lastly, we see socialism as a system whose nature and interests are organically characterized by the striving for peace, by strengthening cooperation and interaction with the fraternal socialist countries, establishment of normal civilized relations between all peoples and states on the basis of democratic principles, equality of rights, noninterference in each other's affairs, and recognition of the sovereign right of peoples to determine their own fate themselves.

We have in mind precisely this kind of democratic, human face of socialism when talking about the qualitatively new situation in our society, as an important step in the advance toward communism.

The coming years will determine our country's future and the fate of the Soviet system. For us, this future will be as created by us; we will have to do it ourselves; nobody will do it for us or instead of us. This is how the question is put, and we must provide a direct answer to it without omissions and reticence, without attempts to evade honest comparison of the desirable and the actual words and deeds, subjective ideas and objective realities.

The Soviet people want clear prospects, rich and unconditional democracy, legality without exception, glasnost in everything, big and small, fraternity and comradeship in relations, respect for industriousness and talent, and faithful service to the cause and to public duty. We do not need social utopias, but we need clear guidelines, objective criteria of socialist spirit at all stages of the changes so that the trends of social development are clearly visible, so that they are not overwhelmed by petty detail and ostentation, as was often the case in the past.

We are convinced of the vitality of Marxist-Leninist doctrine which laid the scientific foundations for the opportunity to build a society of social justice and a civilization of free and equal people. This is what guides us during the process of revolutionary restructuring, and this is how we shall act at its new and most important stage, which our party conference opens (**applause**).

Comrades! In concluding my report, I would like to speak in general terms about the debate which preceded the conference and which became particularly lively following the publication of the Central Committee theses.

It is a long time since there has been such a broad, passionate, and fruitful debate within the party and in society, one which has been lively in its thought, its great number of proposals, and at times sharp clash of opinions. It was essentially centered on the main questions of restructuring—the democratization of public life and life within the party. The debate was actually about one item—how to make this better.

We can clearly say that the proposals and ideas which the Central Committee brought to the conference were born of the collective thought of the party and the entire people.

Our aims are more democracy, more socialism, a better life for the working man and the greatness and good of the country.

These days we are to sum up the results of the work carried out for the sake of achieving these aims, to adopt documents of tremendous importance, which should give a new impetus to restructuring and to make it irreversible. It is precisely this which determines the level of responsibility of each delegate and of our entire conference to the party and the Soviet people (**sustained applause**).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

Resolutions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference: On Political Reform

*18020016b Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian
No 10, Jul 88 (signed to press 6 Jul 88) pp 60-87*

[Resolution on the implementation of the reform of the political system]

On Some Urgent Measures Related to the Practical Implementation of the Reform of the Country's Political System

[Text] The 19th All-Union Party Conference extensively discussed and adopted major decisions on the intensification of perestroika, the reform of the political system and the further democratization of the party and society. These resolutions are of tremendous historical importance to the destinies of the country. They are an inseparable structural component of perestroika and, at the same time, its powerful booster. They provide society with the possibility of confidently following the path of revolutionary renovation and of strengthening the party's role as a political vanguard.

The implementation of the adopted resolutions is urgent and it is important, on the basis of the interests of the cause, to undertake their implementation without delay.

The conference deems necessary:

1. To hold this year an accountability and election campaign in the party organizations, guided by the resolutions of the conference on reform in the political system and the democratization of party life.

To complete by the end of this year the reorganization of the party apparatus and to make the necessary changes in its structure in accordance with the resolutions which have been passed on the division of functions between the party and the soviets.

To recommend to the CPSU Central Committee to carry out the necessary work to this effect.

2. The conference calls for submitting for consideration at the next session of the USSR Supreme Soviet draft bills on restructuring the Soviet authorities and making the necessary supplements and amendments to the USSR Constitution and the organization of elections and holding a conference of people's deputies in April 1989, at which the new state authorities will be established.

The elections to republic and local soviets and, on this basis, the establishment of leading soviet authorities in republics, krays, oblasts, cities, rayons, settlements and rural areas to take place in the autumn of 1989.

On the Progress of the Implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress Decisions and Tasks in Deepening Restructuring

1. Having discussed the report of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "On Progress in the Implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress Resolutions and Tasks in Deepening Restructuring" and also the basic results of the first half of the 12th 5-Year Plan, the 19th All-Union Party Conference states: The strategic course formulated by the party at the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th Party Congress aimed at the comprehensive and revolutionary renewal of Soviet society and the acceleration of its socioeconomic development is being unswervingly implemented. The country's slide toward economic and sociopolitical crisis has been halted.

The consolidation of society and an upsurge in the creative energy of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia are taking place under the influence of the ideas and actions of restructuring. People have come to believe in restructuring and are advocating its deepening and the imparting of an irreversible nature to the revolutionary transformations.

Democratization and glasnost have radically changed the ideological-political and social atmosphere.

A process of restoring the economy to health and reorienting it toward the satisfaction of people's urgent requirements has begun. The new methods of economic management are gathering momentum. The conversion

of associations and enterprises to cost accounting and self-support is taking place in accordance with the Law on the State Enterprise (Association). A Law on the Cooperative was drafted extensively discussed, and adopted. New, progressive forms of intraproduction labor relations based on contracts and leases, and individual labor activity are becoming part of life. The organizational restructuring of management, aimed at creating favorable conditions for the effective management of the primary components of the economy, is in progress.

The work begun on the party's initiative has made it possible for the growth of working people's real incomes to resume. Practical measures are being implemented to increase production of foodstuffs and consumer goods and to expand housing construction. Reforms in education and health care are being implemented. Spiritual life is becoming a powerful factor in the country's progress.

Considerable work has been done to rethink the present-day realities of world development and to update and impart dynamism to foreign policy.

Restructuring is thus becoming an increasingly deep-rooted part of the life of Soviet society and is exerting an ever increasing transforming influence on it. Nonetheless, the conference notes that restructuring processes are progressing in a contradictory, complex, and difficult manner, in a confrontation between the old and the new. Although positive trends are in evidence and initial results exist, a radical breakthrough in economic, social, and cultural development has not occurred. The obstruction mechanism has still not been totally dismantled and replaced by a mechanism of acceleration. To a large extent, the economy is continuing to advance extensively. The pressure of gross-output and volume-indicator approaches has not been overcome.

The structure of the economy retains a basically outlay nature. Scientific and technical progress is developing slowly, and plans for increasing national income and saving resources are not being fulfilled. There is no appreciable improvement in output quality. The country's financial situation remains difficult. The food and consumer goods supply situation remains tight, and the population's demand for services is not being met. The housing problem remains acute.

In addition to the democratization of society, the radical economic reform is the foundation of our entire restructuring. The reform is currently receiving renewed impetus from the transformation of the political system. This reform must be basically completed within the current 5-year plan. This, in turn, will determine both the rate and the success of the planned modernization of the political system. However, the new economic mechanism sometimes malfunctions because relevant party and government resolutions are not fulfilled in the requisite manner by central departments. Leveling and freeloading attitudes remain a serious obstacle to the

intensive development of the economy. Sluggishness is being displayed in creating conditions for the wide spread of cooperative, contract, and lease forms of economic activity.

The heavy legacy of stagnation is exerting a restraining influence on the processes of restructuring. But the slow implementation of the projected transformations cannot be explained solely in terms of this. A great deal is rooted in the shortcomings in the current work of party, state, and economic agencies and social organizations. There is a lack of necessary persistence and purposefulness in implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee January and June (1987) Plenums. The new democratic methods of leadership, openness, and glasnost are finding it difficult to make headway and are running up against conservatism, inertia, and dogmatism of thought and action. The actual attitude to work and action has not changed as it should in various components of society, including labor collectives. Conscientious fulfillment of one's obligations has still not become the norm. The standard of labor discipline does not match the requirements of restructuring. All this is having an impact on end work results.

At all levels of public, state, and economic activity, there are still many officials who are unwilling or unable to break with command and administrative methods and react badly to innovations. There are also considerable numbers who are afraid of the scale and depth of restructuring, who would prefer to stop half-way and limit the revolutionary content of restructuring to half-measures. At the same time, there are attempts to artificially spur on events and skip stages, and calls are made to resolve everything at a single stroke, ignoring the existence of objective preconditions or the level of social awareness.

With a view to overcoming the bureaucratic methods of administration characteristic of the administer-and-command system, the conference resolutely supports the course aimed at transforming the functions and work style of ministries and other central departments, eliminating superfluous components, transferring their rights to the localities, and substantially reducing the apparatus and raising the qualifications of its cadres. Dragging this matter out for a long time cannot be tolerated.

The activity of many party organizations, which have not managed to promptly and correctly assess the causes of obstruction, are biding their time, and are displaying irresoluteness in combating the old and rapidly mastering the new forms and methods of activity, is lagging behind the tasks of restructuring.

All this indicates that restructuring needs further intensification and reliable guarantees of its irreversibility. The conference stresses that restructuring is the only possible way to strengthen and develop socialism and solve the urgent problems of social development in the

interests of the people. We must advance firmly and resolutely along this path, displaying staunchness and making realistic use of the possibilities of each given stage.

The conference considers that radical reform of the political system is coming to the fore today. Precisely this must open up new opportunities for deepening restructuring in all areas of social life and provide guarantees of its irreversibility.

2. The most important task in the socioeconomic area is to accelerate the solution of the urgent problems of the people's prosperity.

Above all we must achieve a substantial improvement in the country's food supplies. This is a most important sociopolitical question. The shortest way to resolve it involves determining the potential of kolkhozes and sovkhozes in every way, based on development of diverse forms of contract and lease, as well as creation of an extensive network of cooperatives—both within the framework of existing farms and in the context of mutual relations with other enterprises and sectors of the economy. We must adopt urgent measures to improve the transportation, processing, storage, and sale of agricultural produce and to make efficient use of funds allocated for the retooling and construction of enterprises in these sectors.

The conference believes that the necessary conditions have now taken shape in the country for kolkhozes and sovkhozes everywhere to switch to the new principles of economic management. All obstacles hampering this—both centrally and locally—should be removed. Special responsibility for the resolution of this task rests directly with kolkhoz and sovkhoz leaders and specialists, rural communists, and soviets of people's deputies.

Any attempts to order around kolkhozes and sovkhozes should be stopped immediately. They are capable of autonomously resolving questions of intrafarm activity and determining the forms of interfarm ties and production services. The key questions of present-day agrarian policy are the social reconstruction of the countryside, improvement of working and living conditions in the countryside, and provision of the necessary material and technical resources. The crux of agrarian policy is to restore the socioeconomic equilibrium between town and country and change production relations in agriculture itself.

Utilizing the potential of the new economic management mechanism, it is necessary to accelerate the saturation of the market with diverse goods and services and to undertake work everywhere to increase the production of consumer goods. A radical retooling of light industry and other sectors producing goods in mass demand is required. Wide use should be made of local resources and the potential of the cooperative movement and

individual labor activity. It is necessary to step up the interest of local soviets and labor collectives in increasing the production of goods to satisfy the needs of the region's population.

The conference approves the measures adopted to drastically increase the volume and pace and improve the quality of housing construction with a view to fulfilling the task set by the 27th CPSU Congress of providing virtually every family with an individual apartment or house by the year 2000. The conference notes that the expansion of the scale of state, cooperative, and individual housing construction and the initiative of the labor collectives and local soviets in this matter are held back by the weakness of the construction industry—above all, by the lack of construction materials and the acute shortage of special machines and equipment. The conference advocates the urgent resolution of these questions by government agencies of the USSR and the Union republics.

At the same time, it is necessary to thoroughly study and resolve questions connected with maintaining available housing in proper condition, ensuring democratic monitoring of the allocation of apartments, and establishing a fair rental system.

The conference regards as a most important task the unconditional fulfillment of the programs adopted for health care and environmental protection and for improving the ecological situation in the country. All measures in these areas should be based on people's interests and on social orientation, while the efficiency of work should be enhanced considerably through the introduction of economic incentive methods and timely scientific engineering backup.

The core of all structural and investments policy and the starting point for setting the pace and proportions of reproduction should be the 27th CPSU Congress line on social reorientation of the economy. This is linked inextricably with a new quality of economic growth, all-around intensification of production, resource conservation, acceleration of scientific and technical progress, and modernization of machine building. This approach should also determine the concept for the 13th 5-Year Plan.

In developing and deepening economic reform, it is necessary to complete the establishment of the new economic mechanism and take the principles of reform to every primary labor collective and each work place. It is necessary to drastically step up people's interest in the highest possible end results, totally eradicate leveling, and be guided more boldly everywhere by the principle of remuneration of labor, according to its quantity and especially its quality, not allowing a situation to exist in which it is possible to live comfortably while doing poor work.

The conference stresses that the implementation of all economic and social tasks can only be ensured on the basis of the conscientious and highly productive labor of the Soviet people.

It is deemed expedient within the framework of the present 5-year plan to complete the polishing of the economic mechanism and to carry out the organization restructuring of management centrally and locally and of the system of foreign economic ties. The switch to wholesale trade in means of production is to be accelerated, along with implementation of the program of financial improvement of the national economy, including putting the budget, the credit system, and the activity of banks in order. After nationwide discussion, there is to be a reform of pricing and a review of wholesale, purchase, and retail prices. In implementing the retail price reform, it is necessary to adhere firmly to the principle that a change in prices should not harm in the least the people's living standard.

3. Revolutionary restructuring is impossible without the comprehensive activation of society's intellectual and spiritual potential and scientific and technical progress, an increase in the scientific and technical contribution of scientific and engineering cadres, the enhancement of their prestige, and the improvement of their working conditions, up-to-date standards throughout the education system, and the enhancement of people's general and political standards.

The conference stresses the great significance of intensive development of basic and applied sciences, resolution of the acute problem of putting discoveries and inventions to practical use, and a permanent link between science and production. New forms of organization of scientific life are needed. A profound restructuring is vitally necessary in the social sciences, which must totally eradicate dogmatism and dissociation from real life. It is their duty to creatively study topical and long-term questions of socialism's development and problems of world development and to increase their real contribution to politics and society.

The conference advocates the further democratization of science and culture and creation and development of a material base for this sphere, consistent with the demands of the restructuring of society. In supporting the diversity of efforts and of the artistic pursuit of truth, competitiveness, innovation, and continuity, the party counts on activeness, dedication, and a high sense of responsibility to the people on the part of men of science, literature, and art.

The conference attaches fundamental significance to augmenting the theoretical arsenal of restructuring, renewing ideological work, ridding it of routine, empty verbiage and stereotypes, bringing its content and tone into line with the realities of life and learning to conduct an honest, direct discussion with people on all questions of interest to them.

The raising and education of the young generation is a responsible task for the CPSU and our entire society. The conference demands the consistent and accelerated implementation of the reform of secondary and higher schools. This applies to the strengthening of their material base and, most importantly, to the role of the teacher, instructor and educator.

The party sees young people as an active and enterprising force for restructuring. The conference considers it necessary to have a strong, integrated state policy regarding the young generation, so as to create conditions that will enable young people to acquire independence as early as possible, uncover their potential to the maximum and realize their goals in life, and be better prepared to assume in good time the economic, political, and moral responsibility for the country's fate for the fate of socialism.

The conference advocates the full restoration of the Leninist traditions of party leadership of the Komsomol and observance of its organizational autonomy and right to participate in political activity and the elaboration of policy and to uphold young people's interests in party, soviet, and economic bodies. The Komsomol bears a special responsibility to the whole of society for its work in the Pioneer movement—that first school of civic awareness and morality.

The conference draws attention to the need to solve more vigorously problems directly affecting women's interests. Women must be widely represented in leading bodies from bottom to top. It is necessary to increase their role in society and political life, to defend and protect the mother's authority and rights, to create the conditions for her to perform her duties, and to intensify concern for young families.

4. The conference approves the proposals for the reform of the political system set out in M.S. Gorbachev's report and advocates their practical implementation.

Key importance attaches to the demarcation of the functions of party and state authorities and the revival of the sovereign power of soviets from bottom to top. Together with the reform of the judicial system and other institutions ensuring the legal regulation of relations between the state and citizens and the protection of the political, economic, social and personal rights of all members of society, this is aimed ultimately at completing the creation of a socialist law-based state in which the unconditional subordination of absolutely everyone to the law will be the supreme principle.

The conference regards as most important preconditions of the efficient functioning of the political system, a transformation of supreme power in the state, envisaging the convening of congresses of USSR people's deputies, the activity of a two-chamber Supreme Soviet on a regular basis, the institution of the position of chairman of the Supreme Soviet, the democratic exercise by them

of their prerogatives, and constitutionally regulated interaction among all the top echelons of power, including the USSR Council of Ministers.

The conference advocates renewing in the spirit of restructuring the activity of social organizations and associations—trade union, Komsomol, women's, veterans', and others and creative unions—and considerably increasing their role in the functioning of the political system and in implementing and coordinating the interests of various strata of the population for the good of the whole people.

5. The conference notes that the CPSU, assuming the revolutionary initiative, was able to provide an objective critical analysis of the condition of society and the party itself, put forward a program of restructuring, rally the broad people's masses around its ideas, and organize practical work for the revolutionary transformation of social relations. Thus the Communist Party has demonstrated yet again that it is the bearer of society's programmatic goals and acts as the vanguard of the people.

With the demarcation of the functions of party and state agencies, there must be a full revival, taking due account of contemporary conditions, of the Leninist concept of the party as the vanguard of society which, basing itself on the Marxist-Leninist teachings, ensure the theoretical elaboration of the most important questions of the country's development, formulates the ideology of restructuring and thus, through organizational work among the masses, by inspiring and uplifting them, imparts the correct, socialist direction to the advance of our entire multinational society. The party implements cadre policy, ensuring the rational placement of cadres via the democratic mechanism of the transformed political system. The CPSU must implement its political life through the communists working in State and Economic bodies, in social organizations, and in labor collectives. The party acts within the framework of the Constitution and Soviet laws.

The resolution of the tasks of restructuring, which are crucial for the country and for socialism, requires enhancement of the party's leading role and new criteria for assessing its performance in this role.

The CPSU will never henceforth permit a repetition of anything like what was associated with the periods of the personality cult and stagnation, which caused profound deformations in the socialist society, delayed its development for entire decades, and resulted in tremendous loss of life and incalculable moral and ideological losses.

6. The conference approves the CPSU Central Committee's international activity, which is based on the new political thinking, and the new methods of incorporating the Soviet Union's peace-loving intentions in world politics. It confirms that only a political approach to

resolving contradictions in world development and regulating conflict situations provides the opportunity for the USSR to play its historically predestined role in ensuring the survival and further progress of mankind.

In this context, the conference highly assesses the principled line of and practical measures taken for strengthening internationalist collaboration with the socialist countries, improving Soviet-U.S. relations, revitalizing the all-European process, and developing ties in the Asian and Pacific region, Latin America, and Africa and fruitful contacts with the Nonaligned Movement and with various political parties and the world public. It approves the efforts in support of the authority of the United Nations, as well as efforts to settle regional conflicts on the basis of the principles of national reconciliation and freedom of choice.

The conference regards as correct the Soviet leadership's approach to the problem of removing the threat of war through frank and constructive dialogue and disarmament, an approach which opened the way for the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate and Shorter-Range Missiles and for moving the talks on nuclear, chemical, and conventional armaments to a practical plane.

The conference totally approves the decision on withdrawing troops from Afghanistan on the basis of the Geneva agreements and of an attitude treating this neighbor of ours as an independent, neutral and non-aligned state.

Foreign policy activity must make an increasing contribution to releasing the country's resources for peaceful building and restructuring and be closely linked with the democratization of society, including the process of formulating decisions and monitoring their execution.

All defense building must henceforth be geared predominantly to qualitative parameters—with regard both to equipment and military science and to the personnel of the Armed Forces. In guaranteeing the reliable security of the Soviet State and its allies, it must be implemented in strict accordance with our defense doctrine.

Restructuring needs a foreign policy that suitably reflects its humanist essence and gives Soviet society broad access to mutually advantageous cooperation and diverse democratic relations with the surrounding world.

The conference confirms the CPSU's course of invariable solidarity with the struggle of communist and workers parties and all social forces for peace and social progress, for freedom and democracy.

7. Expressing the will of the 20 million-strong army of communists and the vital interests of the Soviet people, the conference declares: The party will persistently and

purposefully deepen the process of revolutionary restructuring, ensuring its irreversibility, and do everything it must do to achieve its aims.

The conference calls on all party organizations and all communists and nonparty people to join still more actively in the processes of society's renewal, which are of historic importance to the fate of the motherland.

8. The conference deems it necessary that the CPSU Central Committee ensure consideration of all specific proposals and requests voiced by the conference delegates in the name of the communists who elected them, and also the proposals and questions set out in the collective and individual appeals sent to the conference in the course of the discussion of the theses, and provide information via the mass news media on the results of the examination.

On the Democratization of Soviet Society and the Reform of the Political System

1. The experience of 3 years of restructuring, revolutionary renewal of society, and democratization of party and public life have placed the need for in-depth reform of the political system on the agenda.

The Soviet state was born as the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat and, at a certain stage of social development, turned into a state of the whole people. The task now is to ensure that Soviet statehood fully matches that concept and that all matters in the country are decided by the people and their plenipotentiary representatives and are under the people's full and effective control.

The upcoming reform of the political system must, in the conference's opinion, resolve the following problems:

- Provide maximum scope for the self-management of society, create conditions for the full development of the initiative of citizens, representative authorities, party and public organizations and labor collectives;
- Establish a mechanism for the democratic identification and molding of the interests and will of all classes and social groups and their coordination and implementation in the Soviet state's domestic and foreign policy;
- Ensure conditions for the further free development of every nation and ethnic group and the consolidation of their friendship and equitable cooperation based on the principles of internationalism;
- Radically strengthen socialist legality and law and order in order to preclude the possibility of usurpation of power and abuses, effectively counter bureaucracy and formalism, ensure reliable safeguards for the protection of citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms and the discharge by them of their duties with regard to society and the state;

—Clearly demarcate the functions of party and state authorities in accordance with the Leninist conception of the role of the Communist Party as the political vanguard of society and the role of the Soviet state as the organization and instrument of power of the people;

—Create an effective mechanism which will ensure the prompt self-renewal of the political system in light of changing domestic and international conditions and the development and introduction of the principles of socialist democracy and self-management in all areas of life.

The reform of the political system must be comprehensive in nature, apply to all its levels, and be carried out in a coordinated way in conjunction with restructuring in the economy and throughout society and, moreover, in the shortest possible time.

2. Ensuring the full power of the soviets as the bases of socialist statehood and self-management in our country is the decisive thrust of the reform of the political system.

The conference deems it essential to strengthen the legislative, administrative, and supervisory functions of soviets, to transfer all important questions of state, economic, and sociocultural life to them for their examination and decision, and to restore the leading position of elected organs vis-a-vis executive bodies and their apparatus. The party's policy—economic, social, and for nationalities—must be carried out primarily through the agencies of people's representation.

The management of local affairs must be reorganized on principles of self-management, self-financing, self-sufficiency, and coordination of regional with general state interests. For this, it is necessary to create real conditions that will ensure soviets' responsibility and independence in solving problems concerning the comprehensive development of the territories under their jurisdiction. They must have steady sources of income base on long-term rates, including income from all enterprises situated on their territories, build up resources essential for the economic development and enhancement of the life of the population, environmental protection, and the solution of other vital tasks, and form extrabudgetary development funds from supplementary income, including receipts from the population, with firm guarantees of the free disposal of resources obtained as a result of skillful economic management and socialist enterprise.

It is necessary to update the organization of the work of soviets: to broaden the range of questions resolved exclusively at sessions; to provide for the periodic release of deputies from their official and production duties for work in the soviet, standing commissions, and electoral districts; and to proceed on the basis that each soviet has within the framework of the law every possibility of choosing the forms and methods of its activity in light of local conditions. The nomination of several candidates, secret voting, and the holding of competitions must

become the rule when forming ispolkoms and appointing and confirming the heads of departments, administrations, and ispolkom services. It is necessary to ensure that the work of all soviet units is carried out publicly and is always in the electors' sight.

The conference advocates that permanent presidiums of soviets be elected in local authorities, except for rural and settlement soviets, and that their chairmen be elected by secret ballot in all soviets without exception. The recommendation, as a rule, of first secretaries of party committees to the position of chairmen of the corresponding soviets should help enhance the role of representative organs.

Members of the ispolkoms of local soviets on all levels and also the heads of their departments and administrations, judges, state arbiters, and prosecutors cannot become deputies of the corresponding soviet. This principle should be applied to members of the government and leaders of departments of the USSR and Union and autonomous republics.

The introduction of restrictions on holding elective positions and positions subject to appointment and confirmation by soviets to two consecutive terms will be an important democratic stipulation.

The restoration of soviets' authority and influence necessitates the substantial renewal of the existing electoral system. While positively assessing the experience acquired in this matter since the 27th CPSU Congress, the conference deems it essential to go further, ensuring unrestricted nomination of candidates, broad and free discussion of them, the inclusion on the ballots of more candidates than seats, strict observance of the democratic procedure of elections, regular reports by deputies, and the possibility of their recall. Extensive power must be granted to district preelection meetings, which must become democratic fora for the competitive selection of candidate deputies. Soviets will become real working organs if principled people, with a broad state vision, who firmly support socialist renewal and are capable of worthily representing their voters and energetically exercising the rights granted them have been elected to them.

The conference advocates the establishment of a single term of office—5 years—for soviets of people's deputies.

Having summed-up the results of the debate on the CPSU Central Committee theses and in light of the discussion at the conference itself, the delegates deem it necessary to modernize the supreme state authority and advocate that the supreme power body in the country be the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which, in addition to deputies from territorial and national territorial electoral districts, is to include deputies representing the basic units of the political system—the party, trade unions, the Komsomol, and other mass social

organizations, as well as cooperative, creative, and scientific organizations elected democratically at congresses or plenums of their central bodies. The USSR Congress of People's Deputies, meeting at annual sessions, could resolve the most important constitutional, political, and socioeconomic questions of the country's life. The congress sets up a comparatively small two-chamber Supreme Soviet of the USSR—a standing legislative, administrative, and monitoring authority—and elects the Supreme Soviet chairman by secret ballot. It is necessary to eliminate the depersonalized nature of the chambers and to reorganize the work of standing commissions and deputies.

New approaches should be applied in forming and organizing the activity of soviets on all other levels and codify this legislatively.

3. The conference sees as an important direction of the reform of the political system the decentralization of administration and a reallocation of functions and powers which ensures maximum local initiative and independence. A departmental approach and parochialism must be precluded and the functions of the center secured here, without which use of the advantages of socialism and observance of all-Union interests in the vast multinational state are impossible.

The conference notes that in the course of the economic reform and the reform of the political system there will be an increase in the role and responsibility of the USSR Council of Ministers as the highest executive and administrative organ of authority, accountable to the USSR Supreme Soviet, for the implementation of domestic and foreign policy and the elaboration and implementation of the plans and long-term programs of economic and sociocultural development.

The democratization of society presupposes systematic work to simplify the structure and perfect the methods of work of the entire state apparatus. Superfluous components must be eliminated and the numbers of the apparatus reduced to the optimum level. It is essential that we have a new type of apparatus based on high professionalism, versed in modern information technology, democratically monitored by the people, and capable of advancing economic and social progress. Noting the positive significance of the work being performed in this field, the conference advocates its acceleration, with not a single component of the system of administration remaining outside of the restructuring. It would be expedient to create in the country a uniform system of public and state supervision subordinate to the elective authorities.

Paramount significance should be ascribed in implementation of the reform of the political system to questions of the development of the Soviet socialist federation in the interests of the continued strengthening of the equal fraternal alliance among all nations and nationalities in the USSR.

4. The conference deems a matter of fundamental importance the formation of a socialist law-based state as the form of the organization of political power fully consistent with socialism. The accomplishment of this task is inseparably related to the maximum guarantee of the rights and liberties of Soviet man, of the responsibility of the state to the citizen and of the citizen to the state, the enhancement of the authority of the law and strict compliance therewith on the part of all party and state agencies, social organizations, collectives, and citizens, and with the efficient work of law enforcement organs. A fundamental restructuring of the activity of these organs should be the core of the legal reform. The conference deems expedient its completion within a relatively short time.

5. The reform of the political system presupposes a restructuring of such important components thereof as the social organizations. The unions, Komsomol, cooperatives, and women's, veterans, and other organizations, expressing the interests and aspirations of various strata of Soviet society, contribute to the shaping of the domestic and foreign policy of the party and the state, in which the interests of our entire people organically blend.

The recent emergence of a number of new public associations and formations, setting as their goal assistance to the cause of socialist renovation should be seen as a positive phenomenon. At the same time, the conference condemns any activity aimed at undermining the socialist foundations of society, the incitement of national and racial hostility, and the preaching of war, violence, and immorality.

While rating highly the activity of social organizations, the conference notes the need for the democratization of their life, the enhancement of their independence and responsibility, and the emphatic surmounting of such shortcomings as excessive organization, formalism, and a weakening of self-motivating principles. In turn, the party will contribute in every possible way to ensuring that the social organizations comprehend their place in society in a new way and incorporate their creative potential in the renovation process more vigorously, so that the patriotic movement in support of restructuring develops even further.

Under the one-party system which has taken shape historically in our country, the existence of a permanent mechanism of free dialogue, criticism and self-criticism, self-supervision and self-evaluation in the party and society is a matter of vital significance.

6. The party is fully resolved to promote the strengthening of the social rights of the working people, which are a vivid expression of the advantages of the socialist social system. Success on this path will be determined by the consistent implementation of the economic reform and the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic

development. In this connection, the conference emphasizes the need for strengthening labor discipline and the workers' conscious and creative approach to their production duties. The level and quality of social benefits which society can grant to its members will ultimately depend on the attitude toward labor of each collective and every Soviet individual.

Great importance for a broadening of the citizens' political rights and individual freedoms will be attached to the legalization of the procedure for the exercise of these constitutional rights and freedoms. A particular place among them belongs to the rights of the individual to participate in management, to the expression of his opinion on any issue, and to freedom of belief. The law must reliably protect the citizen's personal dignity, the inviolability of his domicile, the secrecy of correspondence and telephone conversations, and so forth. Soviet people's rights and freedoms are inseparably connected with their civic duties and with respect for the law, which is obligatory for all. Socialist democracy is incompatible with willfulness and lack of responsibility.

7. The conference deems that the success of the reform of the political system will depend to a decisive extent on the work of the party, and makes it incumbent upon all party organizations and communists or participate most assertively and creatively in tackling tasks which arise in this connection. As the initiator of the reform and active proponent thereof, the party is fulfilling in practice its mission of political vanguard of the working class and all working people.

The main feature of the historical moment in which we are living is to ensure that the activity of CPSU corresponds in full both in content and methods to Lenin's idea of the party's leading role in society. This demands primarily that party committees refrain from substituting for state and economic bodies preclude the adoption of party decisions containing direct instructions to the latter, and adhere strictly to the principle of the CPSU pursuing its political course through communists working in the various areas of societal life.

The conference sets as a present-day task the irrevocable abandonment of command-and-injunction methods of work by party organs and the strictest compliance with democratic principles and the requirements of the USSR Constitution and other laws. It is in accordance with the capacity for pursuing party policy in the new way and by the methods of ideological-political and organizational work among the masses that the level of activity of each party organization and the maturity of party officials should be determined.

8. The vanguard role of the CPSU in the restructuring and renewal of society is impossible without a profound democratization of the party's internal life. The paramount task consists of fully restoring the Leninist understanding of the principle of democratic centralism, which makes provision for the freedom of debate at the

discussion stage of questions and unity of action after decisions have been adopted by the majority. Measures to deepen intraparty democracy must be drafted and implemented with a view to ensuring that all CPSU units operate in an atmosphere of party comradeship, free discussion of all topical questions pertaining to policy and practical activities, criticism and self-criticism, collectivism and conscious discipline, and personal responsibility.

The conference attaches great importance to the democratization of the life in primary party organizations. It is necessary above all, ridding them of petty regimentation from above, to enhance their independence, strengthen the authority of elected party bodies and secretaries of primary party organizations, create conditions which would stimulate their work, and overcome the passiveness of some party members. The conference has noted that the level of involvement of communists in the work of party committees does not match the needs of the radical restructuring of party work and development of intraparty democracy and socialist self-management by the people. Every communist must become a fighter for restructuring and for the revolutionary transformation of our society.

Democratization must also embrace an important process such as the admission of new members into the CPSU. A firm end must be put to regulating the replenishment of the party's ranks by means of the "quota allocation," which frequently creates artificial obstacles barring the admission into the party of leading and enterprising people. The main criteria to be used in assessing the qualities of someone who wants to join the party are his or her political stance, actual participation in restructuring, attitude toward work, and moral make-up. Here it is necessary to objectively take account of the opinion of labor collectives and to discuss questions relating to admission at open party meetings.

9. The conference regards the full restoration of the Leninist principle of collective discussion and adoption of decisions as one of the key avenues of the democratization of the party. It is inadmissible for the party apparatus to supplant elected authorities, and for the role of communists to be reduced to attending meetings and voting for lists of proposed candidates and predrafted resolutions. It is necessary to change the nature of party committee meetings and plenums, enhance their efficiency, and ensure a critical and constructive approach to the problems of political leadership and ideological education.

The conference is in favor of broader participation by members of the CPSU Central Committee in the work of the Central Committee Politburo, of regular accounts and briefings by the Politburo to be delivered at Central Committee plenums, and of commissions made up of Central Committee members to be set up for various areas of domestic and foreign policy.

The democratization of party life demands utmost openness in the work of all party organizations and their leading agencies. The conference supports the proposal to publish the minutes of party committee plenums and drafts of resolutions under preparation, on major questions of party and social life.

A special role in the renewal of intraparty relations belongs to the elective party bodies. The conference draws attention to the need for regular accounts to be submitted to their committees by the buros of party raykoms, gorkoms, okruzhkoms, obkoms, and kraykoms, and Union republic communist party central committees, and of party committees and party buros to primary and shop party organizations. At the same time, communists have the right to recall from elective party bodies people who are not coping with their duties or who have compromised themselves, and, if necessary, replace, by way of election, the entire membership of an elective authority.

With democratization, party cadre policy is in need of serious renewal. The formal, nomenklatura approach to the selection and placement of cadres is becoming obsolete. The main method of the work of party committees in this sphere is to be the organization of the training and retraining of cadres, and their education bearing in mind their possible recommendation for leading positions in accordance with democratic procedures. The final solution of cadre questions must be determined by election results.

10. The conference regards the democratization of the election process in the party a question of paramount importance. In electing members and secretaries of all party committees up to and including the CPSU Central Committee, it is necessary to ensure the broad discussion of candidacies, secret ballots, and the inclusion on slates of greater number of candidates than there are mandates. It is deemed advisable to recognize the party organizations' right simultaneously with elections of delegates to a conference or a congress to introduce proposals for candidacies to the superior party authority, with the conference or congress delegates retaining the last word.

The conference supports the proposal for establishing a uniform term of office of 5 years for elective party bodies from the CPSU Central Committee down to party raykoms. In view of this relatively long term of office, it would be desirable to introduce the practice of holding party conferences after 2 or 3 years with the right of partial renewal—up to 20 percent—of the composition of party committees. This also applies to all-Union CPSU conferences.

The limitation of terms of office in elected positions is called upon to be a most important guarantee against stagnation in the cadre corps. The conference deems it advisable, as of the upcoming accountability and election campaign in the CPSU, to put into effect the following rule: All buro members and secretaries of party

committees, including members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, can be elected to the same position for no more than two consecutive terms.

11. With a view to improving control and auditing work in the party, and ensuring reliable guarantees against subjectivism, arbitrariness, and the influence of personal and casual circumstances on party policy, it is proposed to create a single control body: a CPSU Central Control and Auditing commission and corresponding local authorities, abolishing the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee and the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and the party and auditing commissions of local organizations. The new agencies must be elected at party congresses and conferences and be accountable to them.

12. The question of changes in the party apparatus assumes great importance in conditions of restructuring and demarcation of the functions of party committees and state and economic bodies. The conference believes that the structure of the apparatus of party committees must be entirely consonant with the tasks of strengthening political leadership and must accord with the aims of the new stage of restructuring. The party apparatus should be reorganized in the very near future, while simultaneously reducing its size and increasing the efficiency of its work. The principle of the strict subordination and accountability of the party apparatus to elected party bodies must be strictly observed.

13. The reform of the political system is a major and intensive task that will require making responsible party decisions and major legislative acts, including substantial changes to the USSR Constitution, the constitutions of Union and autonomous republics, and the CPSU Statutes.

The conference recommends that communists working in the relevant state power agencies and management and mass social organizations take the necessary measures to implement the program for democratizing Soviet society and reforming the political system approved by the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

On the Struggle Against Bureaucratism

1. The conference notes that the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th Party Congress marked the beginning of a genuine offensive against bureaucratism and its ugly manifestations, including diktat, administrative arbitrariness in the economy and social and spiritual areas, official indifference toward the rights and needs of people, and a scornful attitude toward public opinion and the working people's social experience. In the conditions of stagnation and fettered democratic institutions, bureaucratism

grew to dangerous proportions and became a brake on social development. Bureaucratic perversions, especially in political leadership, are alien to socialism as the living creativity of the masses.

The radical economic reform, the reform of the political system, the processes of democratization in the party and society, glasnost, the development of criticism and self-criticism, and the real involvement of the people in the management of society are thoroughly undermining the positions of bureaucratism. But the struggle as a whole is yet to come.

The management apparatus remains unjustifiable cumbersome. A considerable part of it operates divorced from the requirements and interests of society. Measures elaborated by the party to transform the economy and other aspects of the country's life are often blocked through bureaucratic actions of ministries and state and economic agencies and the passiveness of many party organizations and soviets of people's deputies. Departmentalism and parochialism are still widespread, while the varnishing of truth, willfulness, and violations of Soviet laws have not yet been overcome. There are many instances of suppression of criticism and crushing of working people's initiative.

It is the duty of all party organizations and all communists to make the fullest possible use of the conditions created by restructuring for consistent and uncompromising struggle against the social vice of bureaucratism, and for high standards in the socialist management apparatus.

This struggle must be launched in the economy through rigorous observance of the laws on the enterprise and the cooperative system, of the powers of labor collective councils, through the utmost and all-embracing development of relations of cost accounting, independence and responsibility of enterprises, contractual, lease and cooperative forms of economic activity, and production democracy, and through improvement of the organizational structures of management.

This struggle must be launched in the social area by increasing concern for satisfying working people's material, everyday, and spiritual needs, through consistent implementation of the principle of socialist justice and the precise execution of laws.

The struggle against bureaucratism in sociopolitical life must be waged through the tireless intensification of democracy, the broad development of the forms of socialist self-management, and the enhancement and consolidation of the power of soviets, through working people's direct participation in the elaboration and implementation of state decisions, the expansion of information available to the population on the state of

affairs in various areas of societal life, and the intensification of people's control over the activity of management bodies. It is essential to repulse any attempts to replace democratic centralism with bureaucratic centralism.

The offensive against bureaucratism in the spiritual and moral areas means to revive Lenin's traditions and criteria of spiritual life, to creatively utilize and develop the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, to master and develop the new political thinking, and to be implacable toward manifestations of dogmatism, petty bourgeois morality, social parasitism, and official abuses. It is necessary to create an atmosphere of free comparison of views and opinions and to resolutely overcome petty tutelage and remnants of the command style in the leadership of science and culture.

The party will succeed in involving all social forces in the struggle against bureaucratism and in scoring real successes in this struggle only if it sets a convincing example of democratization of its own activity and of intraparty life, cleansing them of all bureaucratic accretions whatsoever.

2. The conference positively assesses the measures being implemented in conformity with the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Central Committee June (1987) Plenum on the restructuring of management and the reduction of its units and apparatus. It believes that this work must not be delayed or reduced to a one-shot campaign and to mechanical reorganizations. It must be conducted continuously, ensuring that the management system is in line with the changes constantly occurring within society.

It is necessary to aim for the transfer of more and more management functions and powers to the lower levels, with centralized leadership concentrating primarily on the main processes. Of particular importance are the improvement of management right at production level, the strict observance of the rights of labor collectives, as established by law, by leaders of all ranks, and galvanizing the work of the labor collective councils.

It is mandatory for party organizations and all communists to aim for strict observance of the principle that the management apparatus serves, and is fully accountable to, elective authorities, the soviets and the people. Any of its actions which leads to perversion of emasculation of laws and government decisions are anticonstitutional. Openness, and accessibility for control and inspection by working people and the public must become the standard for the apparatus' work.

The apparatus' primary task is to organize matters competently. This requires substantial changes in the actual procedure for drafting and making administrative decisions, simplifying it to the utmost, getting rid of the merry-go-round of overcautious coordination exercises and unnecessary requests for trivial background material

and information from the localities, and reducing statistical reporting many times over. Use must be made of the practice of submitting options for the solution of the most important economic and social problems to expert assessment by scientists, the public, and nationwide discussion or referendums.

The functions and responsibility of every management component and its workers must be precisely determined and demarcated. It is necessary to unswervingly implement Lenin's instruction: "...in all circumstances without exception collegiality must be accompanied by the most precise establishment of the personal responsibility of every person for a precisely defined job."

The conference advocates the resolute rectification of the situation where administrative bodies bear no practical material responsibility for the negative consequences of their activity and both the people who execute the decisions and the labor collectives have no real means of influencing them. It is necessary to include the administrative apparatus in the system of new economic and relations, overcome the leveling approach to the remuneration of managers' work, and closely link this remuneration to the economically accountable results of the work of sectors, enterprises, organizations and territories.

While combating bureaucratism it is at the same time necessary to protect and strengthen in every way the authority of leaders. It is necessary to extensively develop the training and retraining of cadres in management and to substantially enhance to management standards of leadership workers and specialists. A well coordinated, precisely operating, and flexible administrative apparatus must become an effective working instrument of restructuring.

3. It is necessary to make state and public institutions and party committees fully accessible to the working people, eliminate all kinds of procrastination, formalism, and red tape in the practice of the administrative apparatus, and eradicate situations where a person feels powerless in the face of a bureaucrat's indifference and stubbornness. Any attempts to encroach on citizens' legitimate rights by means of departmental instructions and bureaucratic subterfuges should be nipped in the bud.

It is necessary to substantially improve the organization of the procedure for seeing people on personal matters in institutions and enterprises and in party, soviet, and trade union agencies. Avoiding the treatment of justified requests and legitimate demands from working people should be considered a serious official misdemeanor entailing the strictest punishment, up to and including removal from one's position. Ministers and other leading officials on Union, republican, and local bodies should actually hear out citizens in the labor collectives, and resolve questions that arise then and there and eliminate

the shortcomings that are worrying people. Reports by leaders of all agencies to the labor collectives and at citizens' places of residence should become the standard.

Leaders of party bodies up to and including CPSU Central Committee secretaries, should systematically meet with communists and working people to resolve urgent questions of the life and activity of party organizations and labor collectives.

4. The conference demands that in the struggle against bureaucracy all party organizations make full use of cadre policy. It is necessary to ensure that the selection and placing of cadres take place openly, on a competitive, contested basis. The atmosphere of principle-mindedness comradeship, and the responsibility of leadership cadres to the collectives that elected them is to be fully revived. Party organizations should withdraw their trust from communists who, while holding responsible positions, display a formal attitude to the job, arrogance or indifference to people's needs. Such people should be removed without delay and attempts to transfer them to other leadership positions should be nipped in the bud.

5. A decisive factor in the eradication of bureaucracy is real, full power of the people and broad involvement of working people in the management of state and public affairs.

The conference stresses the exceptional importance of creating an integrated system of social and state control, subordinate to the elected authorities. Party organizations should ensure that this system is based on the initiative activeness of the people's masses and creative, veterans', women's, and other voluntary social organizations that express the interests of various strata and groups of the population.

The CPSU considers it its duty to create an atmosphere in the country such that every citizen will be confident that he will obtain satisfaction against bureaucrats from the soviets and the organs of people's control, that the trade union will uphold his labor and social rights, that the Komsomol will come to the defense of young people's interests, and that the law enforcement organs will provide reliable protection from administrative tyranny and violations of rights and freedoms.

The conference deems it necessary to create legal conditions for stepping up the struggle against bureaucracy, and making provision for the same in the laws now being drafted. The practice of application of the USSR Law on Appealing to the Court Against Actions by Officials infringing on Citizens' Rights should be improved.

The work of the apparatus should be regularly discussed and assessed at citizens' assemblies and meetings in labor collectives and public organizations.

The mass media are called upon to point out specific sources and manifestations of bureaucracy and examples of the successful struggle against it. The power of satire should be fully utilized in the struggle against negative phenomena.

6. The conference demands energetic measures from all party organizations to eliminate any elements of bureaucracy in their own activity and establish a Leninist style in their work. It is necessary to raise to a qualitatively new level verification of the actual fulfillment of the party's decisions and political directives. In the struggle against bureaucracy this is a question of paramount importance, to which the attention of communists working in ministries, departments, organizations, and institutions directly concerned with the satisfaction of people's needs and requirements is drawn in particular.

The principle of accountability and responsibility of all communist leaders to the primary party organizations must be consistently implemented. Every leader must maintain close links with the masses and set an example of high professionalism, industriousness, modesty, accessibility and respect for the people.

The work of every party organization should be built on the basis of the principle of collectivity, and the practice of systematic reports by elected party authorities at party committee plenums and meeting of communists is to be improved; criticism and self-criticism must be developed; violations of the norms of intraparty democracy should be dealt with strictly. No party organization and no worker should be outside control.

In the struggle against bureaucracy reliance should be placed on people who are enterprising, creative, and intolerant of sluggishness and stagnation, and who have demonstrated in practice their ability to use democratic methods. These are the people who should be supported in every way and recommended for party work.

The 19th All-Union CPSU Conference calls on communists and all working people to be more active in launching the struggle against bureaucracy at all levels of administration and in all areas of social life.

On Interethnic Relations

1. The Soviet socialist state created by V.I. Lenin embodies the revolutionary will and aspirations of the multinational family of equal peoples. The commonality of their historical destiny is the basis of international socialist brotherhood. The unique union of republics was the result of the efforts on many generations of Soviet people. Inscribed on its banner is the international unity of the working people of all nations and ethnic groups in the USSR, the right of nations to self-determination, the revival and development of national cultures, the acceleration of the progress of previously backward national regions, and the overcoming of interethnic discord. An integrated national economic complex took shape—the

material foundation of the unity of the peoples of the USSR. The economic, cultural, and cadre potential of all the republics and autonomous areas increased immeasurably. A new historic community—the Soviet people—became a reality. A natural logical growth of national self-awareness is taking place.

However, the dynamism inherent in the initial stage of the formation of the multinational state of the Soviets was substantially wasted and undermined by a departure from the Leninist principles of the nationalities policy, by violations of legality in the period of the personality cult, and by the ideology and mentality stagnation. The results achieved in the solution of the nationalities question were made absolute, and the notion that there were no problems in national relations became firmly established. The requirements of the socioeconomic and cultural development of both individual republics and autonomous formations, and ethnic groups were not adequately taken into consideration. Many acute questions brought to the fore by the actual course of development of nations and ethnic groups were not tackled promptly. This engendered social dissatisfaction, which at times assumed the nature of conflict. Instances of national egoism and conceit, parasitic sentiments and parochialism continue to occur. The negative phenomena which built up over decades were ignored for a long time, driven under the surface, and were not duly assessed by the party. Restructuring, democratization, and glasnost have laid bare these phenomena, and at the same time, have created the necessary conditions for overcoming them democratically.

2. The party conference considers it a task of historic importance to persistently assert and creatively develop the Leninist standards and principles of the nationalities policy, and to resolutely cleanse them of artificial accretions and deformations. The basis for this is provided by the political course charted by the 27th CPSU Congress, which combines the satisfaction of the interests of all nations and ethnic groups with the common interests and needs of the country, and by an internationalist ideology incompatible with any brand of chauvinism and nationalism.

The development of the independence of Union republics and autonomous regions is viewed by the party as being indissolubly linked with their responsibility for the consolidation and progress of our multinational state. The socialist ideal is not stultifying unification, but full-blooded and dynamic unity within national diversity.

3. The party conference believes that in the context of the restructuring of the political system, urgent measures should be implemented for the further development and consolidation of the Soviet Federation on the basis of democratic principles. Above all it is a question of broadening the rights of Union republics and autonomous formations through the demarcation of the areas of

competence of the USSR and Soviet republics, decentralization, the transfer to the localities of a number of management functions, and the strengthening of independence and of responsibility in the areas of the economy, social and cultural development, and environmental protection.

One of the main tasks is to create conditions for the greater independence of the regions, and to implement such forms of cooperation whereby each republic may have a vested interest in the improvement of the end results of their economic activity as a basis for their own prosperity, and for measuring the common wealth and might of the Soviet state. The radical economic reform and the process of democratization open up broad scope for the optimal combination of the interests both of national-state formations, and the country as whole. Matters must be organized in such a way that the working people are well informed as to how much a republic or oblast produces, what its contribution to the country's economy is, and how much it receives. The idea of the conversion of the republics and regions to the principles of cost accounting with the precise definition of their contribution to the solution of nationwide programs merits attention.

The internationalization of the economy and of all social life is a logical process. Any urge toward national exclusivity can only lead to economic and spiritual impoverishment.

A qualitatively new mechanism for the formation of republic and local budgets must be worked through legislatively and their role in tackling questions of the socioeconomic development of the regions must be substantially enhanced. It is essential to ensure the effective interaction of the territorial managements with USSR ministries and departments and enterprises under all-Union jurisdiction, while the responsibility of both republican and Union managements for the comprehensive development of each region will have to be intensified. The development of direct links between Union republics requires in-depth legal elaboration and practical solutions.

The activity of those institutions of the political system through which national interests must be made known and coordinated should be galvanized. Of paramount significance in this connection is the enhancement of the role of the soviets of people's deputies, above all the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, its standing commissions, and the USSR Government. The creation of standing commissions of questions of interethnic relation in the USSR Supreme Soviet, the supreme soviets of Union and autonomous republics, and where necessary, in local soviets would be expedient. The question of setting up of a special state body for the affairs of nationalities and national relations should also be examined.

The conference recommends that, taking account of the new realities, legislation pertaining to union and autonomous republics and autonomous oblasts and okrugs should be developed and updated, reflecting more fully their rights and duties and the principles of self-management and representation of all nationalities in the power agencies in the center and locally. This will necessitate the introduction of respective amendments to the USSR Constitution, and to the constitutions of Union and autonomous republics.

4. It is important that in each national region economic and social progress be accompanied by spiritual progress with reliance on the cultural originality of the nations and ethnic groups. Socialist culture, developing as a multinational culture, must remain a powerful factor for the ideological and moral consolidation of our society.

Concern must be shown to ensure that ethnic groups residing outside their state-territorial formations or not having such state formations are given greater opportunities to realize their national-cultural demands, particularly in the sphere of education, contacts, and ethnic creativity, and also for the creation of centers of national culture, utilization of the mass media, and the satisfaction of religious needs.

A most important principle of our multinational state is that of the free development and equitable use by all USSR citizens of their native languages, and the learning of the Russian language, voluntarily adopted by the Soviet people as a means of interethnic contact. All suitable conditions should be created for the harmonious and natural development of national-Russian bilingualism, with consideration for the specific features of each region, and for ensuring that it is free from formalism. More concern must be shown for the active use of national languages in various areas of state, social, and cultural life. The study of the language of the people whose name a republic bears must be encouraged among citizens of other nationalities residing in its territory, primarily among children and young people. None of this should run counter to the democratic principles of free choice of the language of education.

5. Every generation of Soviet people has its own way of learning patriotism and internationalism. It is important to ensure that, from an individual's very first social experiences, beginning with the family, the school, and the Young Pioneers and Komsomol organizations, these values are organically combined, operate in inseparable unity, and preclude national nihilism and national exclusiveness alike. It is necessary to discover the sources of our peoples' friendship, to actively develop standards of interethnic contacts, and cultivate respect for the traditions, language, art, and history of the country's peoples and of other peoples in the world. Service in the ranks of the USSR Armed Forces must become a genuine school of internationalism.

The conference believes that it is necessary to boost the sociopolitical importance of the nationwide holiday marking USSR Education Day.

Life has convincingly proved that national narrow-mindedness and chauvinist arrogance begin to develop whenever the practice of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism withers. It is the civic duty of every Soviet person to struggle against these ugly deviations and to eliminate what causes them. Any actions dividing nations and ethnic groups, as well as attempts to infringe on the rights of citizens of any nationality, must be perceived as morally unacceptable and inimical to the Soviet state's interests.

It is necessary to learn to differentiate between genuine national interests and their nationalist distortions. Any claims to national exclusiveness are impermissible and insulting, even for those on whose behalf they are made. In the spirit of Lenin's tradition, it is necessary to struggle primarily against "homegrown" nationalism and chauvinism, and this must be done mainly by representatives of the corresponding nationality.

6. The conference notes that multinationalism in our country's conditions is a powerful source of development and reciprocal spiritual enrichment of the peoples. The shaping of a socialist and internationalist way of life is the cause of the entire party and all Soviet people. For this purpose, it is necessary to mobilize the political experience, labor morality, and moral potential of the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, and their profound commitment to the good-neighborly communal life of different peoples. A special role in this work is assigned to the Soviet intelligentsia. The overall climate in national relations depends to an enormous extent on its civic maturity and on the depth of its perception of the fundamental interests of its own people and society as a whole.

Any national problems require a considered and comprehensive approach on the basis of profound analysis and objective assessment of every specific situation. They must be solved calmly and with extraordinary responsibility, within the framework of socialist democracy and legality, primarily by coming closer to others, with due consideration for the ongoing processes of revolutionary renewal, and without detriment to the Soviet people's international cohesion. Work must be done to create a social atmosphere in which people of any nationality would feel at home anywhere in our socialist motherland.

7. A contemporary nationalities policy needs profound scientific and theoretical elaboration. This is a responsible civic assignment for scientific institutions and specialists. Its successful performance requires the creation of appropriate organizational and cadre prerequisites and the pooling of the scientific community's efforts. It would be expedient to consider the establishment of a

national scientific center for the comprehensive study of topical problems of national relations, and to expand scientific research and information work in this area.

8. Party organizations and communists of all nationalities are called upon to be the cementing force, the soul of the socialist union of peoples, and active vehicles of internationalism. Their entire activity must be aimed at ensuring the working people's unity around the tasks of restructuring, shaping healthy public opinion, and carrying people along with them. It is necessary to firmly pursue, in the spirit of Lenin's demands, the line of ensuring that all nations and ethnic groups are represented in party, state, trade union, Komsomol, and economic agencies, including at the Union level, and that the composition of leadership cadres most fully reflect the national structure of Soviet society.

The conference supports the CPSU Central Committee Politburo proposal to hold a Central Committee plenum on questions of national relations.

The conference expresses its firm belief that our present and future lie in the consolidation and unity of all Soviet peoples. It is the patriotic and international duty of every citizen and every communist to preserve and augment everything that serves the cohesion of Soviet society as a foundation for the free development and flourishing of all USSR peoples and the strengthening of the might of our common fatherland. This is what V.I. Lenin called on us to do, and this is the path that the Communist Party is following.

On Glasnost

1. Guided by the interests of socialism and restructuring, the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference regards the further development of glasnost as one of the most important political tasks.

The first 3 years of restructuring have convincingly confirmed that the atmosphere of glasnost in the activity of party, soviet, and public organizations and the mass media, the development of real criticism and self-criticism, and the assertion of openness and truthfulness in politics have enabled the party and the entire people to gain a better understanding of their past and present, to reveal the obstructing factors, and to awaken powerful patriotic forces for vigorous and purposeful work for the good of the country and socialism. It is precisely the incorporation of glasnost in social life that has helped in assessing the situation in the country profoundly and objectively, with public participation, in formulating in a collegial fashion principled decisions on accelerating socioeconomic development, and in ensuring vigorous and interested support by working people for the CPSU's course of restructuring.

The conference regards glasnost as a developing process and emphasizes that its consistent expansion is an essential condition for the expression of the democratic

essence of the socialist system, the orientation of that system toward man, and the involvement of individuals in all affairs, social, state, and collective and as an effective guarantee against distortions of socialism, on the basis of nationwide monitoring of the activity of all social institutions and power and management bodies.

The conference sees glasnost as a necessary condition for implementing socialist self-management by the people and the exercise of the citizens' constitutional rights, freedoms, and duties, as a method of comparing and encapsulating the entire diversity of interests existing in Soviet society and socialist pluralism of opinions, as an effective way of strengthening internationalism and fostering socialist internationalism and of asserting the humanist complexion of socialism. Glasnost in all areas of life is one of the most important conditions for further deepening the processes of restructuring and its irreversibility.

In the international arena, glasnost, by revealing the positions of governments and peoples, helps to promote the cause of peace and cooperation, to strengthen the ideas of creating a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, and to form modern civilized international relations. As a means of implementing the principles of an open foreign policy, it helps to involve social organizations, labor collectives, the working masses, and scientific and cultural personalities in international contacts and to develop people's diplomacy. It also facilitates the solution of complex international problems at international level, along intergovernmental lines.

Ultimately, glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism serve the interests of the people, reflect the openness of society's political system, and are evidence of its strength, political viability, and moral health.

The conference also notes that glasnost, being a sharp weapon of restructuring, must itself be deepened and supported. A considerable array of information remains inaccessible to the general public and is not used for purposes of accelerating socioeconomic and spiritual development and improving the political culture of the masses and management cadres. Attempts to curb glasnost in the activity of party, soviet, and public organizations, collectives, and the mass news media take place. Departmental and parochial barriers are frequently erected in its path. The desire to publicize particular shortcomings, abuses, instances of bureaucratism and communist arrogance, and other negative phenomena has met administrative resistance. The number of letters from working people making various complaints to party authorities and the mass news media is not declining. Instances of persecution and even reprisals over criticism continue to occur. Cases where glasnost is used to serve personal or group ambitions have not been eradicated, thus destroying the normal channels of mutual contact and comradely exactingness between people. The inalienable principle of true glasnost, whereby freedom to express opinions should serve the cause of

enhancing the individual and protecting his dignity and not humiliating him by means of slander and abusive labels, is not always implemented.

The conference stresses that the consistent expansion of glasnost is an essential condition for the unfolding of the processes of the democratization of all areas of public life and the renewal of socialism. In developing glasnost, the party is invariably guided by Lenin's instruction that the masses must know everything, form an opinion of everything, and embark on everything consciously. The Communist Party and the Soviet people need truth and complete and objective information on everything taking place in society. Glasnost must promote the consolidation of all social forces around the ideas and principles of restructuring.

3. The conference sees as the party's urgent task the comprehensive promotion of the assertion and development of the basic principles of glasnost: the inalienable right of every citizen to obtain on any social issue full and authentic information that is not a state or military secret; the right to open and free discussion of any socially significant issue.

The conference notes that the party is called upon to set an example of initiative in developing glasnost. Extensive information for communists and the population on the work of CPSU leading bodies and local party organizations and their committees and on the activity of leading cadres, open party forums and meetings, free discussion of questions of party life and party leadership of socialist building; an attentive approach to the examination of critical observations, opinions, and proposals from working people; promulgation and discussion of drafts of very important decisions are all components of the open character of the CPSU policy and of the strengthening of its links with society.

It must be regarded as the duty of party leaders at all levels and members of elected party bodies to regularly appear before party organizations and before labor collectives and the population to submit information and reports on their work. It is the duty of party organizations to inculcate the standards of glasnost and the ability to conduct democratic polemics and comradely debates.

The congress deems it necessary to bring the existing instructions and rules of party committees' and organizations' work into line with the demands of the democratization of party life. Provision must be made for free access by members of elected party bodies to sessions of the party committee buro, accountable to them, including the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and the right to use documents, information, and data in the possession of the party committee and its apparatus.

The conference attaches special significance to glasnost in cadre policy and to the creation of a democratic mechanism for promoting leading cadres based on public opinion.

4. The conference confirms that glasnost and openness to control and criticism by the masses are an essential condition of the effective functioning of the authorities. Glasnost should be extended to all stages of their activity, planning, and management; public opinion should be studied and taken into account; there should be public discussion of statewide and regional economic, national, youth, ecological, social, and other problems.

Heads of enterprises and institutions, the boards of kolkhozes and cooperatives, and labor collective councils are called upon to act in the manner of glasnost. Working people must be kept abreast of solutions to production and social questions and know the results of the activity and the financial status of their collectives. The administrations must give the collectives advance information of draft decisions affecting people's interests and to ascertain attitudes toward the projected measures.

Glasnost is an obligatory aspect of the activity of people's control and law-enforcement bodies. Data on their work should be published regularly, along with statistics on the state of crime and measures to prevent it.

It is necessary to lift unwarranted restrictions on the use of statistics on the socioeconomic and political development of society and the ecological situation, to create a system for gathering, processing, and disseminating this information based on modern information technology, to ensure access to all library stocks, and to regulate legislatively the use of archive materials.

The conference urges all social organizations to perform their statutory functions in the manner of glasnost and openness, giving the population extensive information on the work of congresses, conferences, and elected bodies and decisions made by them.

5. The conference notes the important role of the mass media in expanding glasnost. They are called upon to comprehensively reflect the activity of party, state, and social organizations, serve the consolidation of socialist society, actively propagandize accumulated experience, and be an instrument for nationwide monitoring of the situation in the country. The conference considers it impermissible to suppress critical articles in the press and also to publish information that is not objective and impugns the honor and dignity of the citizen. Glasnost presupposes social, legal, and moral responsibility on the part of the mass media. The indispensable requirements in this area are a high ideological standard and morality, competence, strict observance of professional ethics, absolute reliability of information, and the right of each citizen who has been criticized to publish a valid

response in the same press organ. Openness and criticism should not serve as grounds for the growth of cliquishness or manifestations of demagoguery and national, regional, or corporate egoism. The viewpoints of all sides in a dispute must be reflected objectively and without distortion in the mass media. No one has a monopoly on truth, and there must be no monopoly on glasnost either.

6. The conference believes that glasnost has fully proved its worth and that it must be comprehensively developed still further. With these aims in mind, legal guarantees must be created for glasnost, for which it is necessary to envisage constitutionally codifying the right of USSR citizens to information. It is necessary to draft laws defining the rights and obligations of the state, officials and citizens in the implementation of the principles of glasnost. It is necessary to create a system whereby working people are given constant and complete information on the situation in the enterprise, the village or city, the oblast, republic, and country and to legally codify the right of citizens, the mass media, labor collectives, and social organizations to obtain information of interest to them. It is necessary to clearly define the limits of necessary secrecy and official secrets and to establish accountability for the dissemination of information which constitutes a state or military secret, violates citizens' legal rights, harms public order, security, and the health or moral well-being of the population, and also responsibility for preventing the exercise of the public's right to information and for its concealment, distortion, or unlawful use.

It is impermissible to use glasnost to harm the interests of the Soviet state or society and the rights of the individual, to preach war or violence, racism, and national and religious intolerance, to propagandize cruelty, or to spread pornography; it is also impermissible to manipulate glasnost.

By persistently asserting and expanding glasnost in party, state, and social affairs and in the mass news media, the party and Soviet society are setting in motion the mighty potential of the socialist system and its deep reserves. Without glasnost there is no restructuring or democracy. Glasnost is the natural atmosphere of the life and progress of democratic, humane socialism.

The conference urges all communists and party organizations to spread the word of truth among the masses, to actively develop socialist democracy and the standards of debate and to create conditions conducive to the lively and frank discussion of all questions and to the display of Soviet people's initiative and creative thinking.

The conference expresses the confidence that all communists will help to assert glasnost as the rule in the life of socialist society.

On Legal Reform

1. The All-Union Party Conference notes that during the period since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum major measures have been implemented to provide legal backup for restructuring. However, they should be regarded as merely the beginning of the great work connected with molding the socialist legal state. In the next few years it will be necessary to implement a broad legal reform designed to ensure the supremacy of the law in all areas of social life and to strengthen the mechanism for upholding socialist law and order on the basis of the development of people's power.

2. Great significance is attached to improving the legislative activity of the supreme authorities of the USSR and of Union and autonomous republics, aimed at strengthening the constitutional regime in the country and resolutely enhancing the role of Soviet laws regulating the most important areas of social relations, and at the consistent implementation of the principle that everything is permitted which is not prohibited by law. It is especially important to democratize the legislative process, which should be done on the basis of glasnost and the competent scientific evaluation and discussion of draft laws, with the participation of the broad public and all the people.

3. The fundamental review, codification, and systematization of the law are to be an inalienable part of the legal reform. In the light of the new conditions of economic management, the humanizing and democratization of social life, and the intensification of the prevention of violations of the law it is necessary to make substantial changes to the law on socialist ownership, planning, financial, tax and economic relations, and environmental protection, and to the standards regulating citizens' travel, labor, housing, pension, and other questions of working people's life, and to radically review the criminal, administrative, procedural, and corrective labor laws. It is necessary to give utmost attention to the legal protection of the individual and to consolidate the guarantee for the exercise of the Soviet people's political, economic, and social rights and freedoms. At the same time it is necessary to enhance the responsibility of every citizen to his labor collective, the state and society as a whole. In order to ensure that government laws and resolutions strictly correspond to the requirements of the USSR Constitution it would be useful to establish a constitutional supervisory committee and also to intensify all monitoring work designed to ensure that the laws are observed in departmental regulations and that the number of such regulations are sharply reduced.

4. The conference considers as one of the important tasks of restructuring to enhance the role of the courts in the system of socialist democracy. It is necessary to considerably strengthen the guarantees of the implementation of such principles of Soviet legal proceedings as the adversarial system, glasnost, the strict observance of the presumption of innocence, and the impermissibility

both of bias toward the prosecution and connivance with those who have violated Soviet laws. It is necessary to enhance the prestige of the courts, ensure the unconditional independence of judges and their subordination to the law alone, and to establish specific measures of responsibility for interference in their activity and contempt of court. One guarantee of the strengthening of judges' independence must be the election of rayon, city, okrug, oblast, and kray courts by superior soviets of people's deputies, as well as extending their mandate. In order to increase the objectivity of justice and the role and responsibility of people's assessors it is expedient to increase their number for trials of most complex cases.

5. Under the conditions of economic reform and the introduction of cost accounting, self-management, and self-financing, there arises a need to extend the powers of the State Board of Arbitration as regards strengthening contractual discipline and protecting the rights of enterprises and cooperatives, to substantially enhance the role of the judiciary, and to strengthen legal services in soviets of people's deputies, ministries, and departments and economic organizations.

6. It is necessary to decisively enhance the responsibility of prosecutor's offices, to fully restore the Leninist principles of prosecutor's supervision whose purposes it is to strictly supervise the execution and uniform interpretation and application of laws throughout the country, and to persistently struggle against violations of socialist legality, regardless of the perpetrators. The further strengthening of prosecutors' independence and the exclusion of any pressure on them and interference in their activity must serve this task.

7. Constant attention must be given to improving the militia's work, raising the standard and professional literacy of internal affairs organs' staffers, the strictest observance of socialist legality by them, the consolidation of their ties with labor collectives and the population, and the elimination of abuses existing in this area. In the interests of making better use of internal affairs organs' potential in the struggle against crime, it is deemed expedient to concentrate the investigation of the main bulk of criminal cases within the MVD investigative apparatus, constituting it as an independent structure not subordinate to republic or local internal affairs organs, to enhance the responsibility of investigators, to consolidate the legal guarantees of the legality of their actions, and to step up prosecutor's supervision of preliminary investigations.

8. The conference attaches great importance to enhancing the role of attorneys as a self-managing association for providing legal assistance to citizens, state enterprises, and cooperatives and for representing their interests in the courts and before other state bodies and public organizations. The participation of defense attorneys in preliminary investigations and court proceedings must be expanded.

9. It is a matter of urgency to secure the cadres needed for the legal reform, presupposing the creation of a streamlined system for the selection, education, training, and retraining of legal experts to be assigned for work in soviets of people's deputies, the national economy, the militia, and other law enforcement organs. For this purpose it is necessary to reorganize the training of scientific and teaching cadres of the highest qualifications, to preclude their detachment from practical work, and to enhance competence in the solution of legal questions concerning the implementation of the economic reform.

10. The shaping of a socialist state based on the rule of law, the reform of the political system, and the introduction of new methods of economic management demand the adoption of effective measures to restructure the legal education of the population, to organize universal juridical training as a uniform statewide and partywide program encompassing all strata of working people and all cadres at central and local level alike. Legal literature must be available to every Soviet citizen and published in the required quantity. An important place in cultivating respect for Soviet law, the culture of socialist democracy, and high civic activeness and responsibility must be assigned to secondary, vocational, and higher education, the mass media, the creative unions and other public organizations.

11. The conference deems it expedient for the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers, with the participation of public and scientific organizations, to formulate and implement in the immediate future a specific action plan for the implementation of the legal reform in our country.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988. 05003

Speech by M.S. Gorbachev at the Closing of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference on 1 July
18020016i Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 88 (signed to press 6 Jul 88) pp 88-95

[Speech by M.S. Gorbachev at the closing of the 19th party conference.]

[Text] Comrades! Our conference is ending its work. The documents that have just been adopted on the results of the debate and the discussion itself of the documents relieve me of the necessity to draw lengthy conclusions. Nevertheless, the conference has been an event of such scale that there is a need to assess the work we have done over the past 4 days in accordance with the most rigorous criteria.

This is necessary not in order to pay tribute to past traditions of praising each routine party forum. It is necessary, I believe, so that we ourselves recognize the 19th Party Conference's place in the life of the party and the country. A major event has occurred in our party's history (**applause**).

First of all, as to the atmosphere of the debate. It was a real, open, party discussion of the main current preoccupation of communists and all Soviet people, an attempt to find answers to questions that worry them. The Palace of Congresses has never seen a discussion like it, comrades, and I believe we would not be telling a lie if we said that there has been nothing like it in nearly six decades (**applause**).... In this sense we are entitled to say that the conference took place in a Leninist spirit, and lofty responsibility to the people and to the revolution triumphed at it (**applause**). This alone gives it a special meaning.

One couldn't help noticing the delegates' extremely high activeness. It must be said that we were in a difficult situation. In fact, there were around 300 people who had put their names down to speak. Unfortunately, not all of them were able to do so, but to some extent the need to speak found an outlet at the sessions of the drafting commissions—as I said before, around 150 people spoke there. It is a new form of work for us, in which nearly one-tenth of the conference delegates participated, and it made for a businesslike consideration of many concrete issues that emerged during the debate and for solutions to be found.

The conference was dominated by a spirit of high exactingness, a robust and principled statement of the issues, and, at the same time, party comradeship, one might even say, amicability toward one another. This is also an example to the whole party and the whole of our society. That is what it should be like between people of like mind, people who are engaged in the great cause of restructuring and renewal of society and feel that they have behind them hundreds, thousands, and millions of their comrades in the party and all Soviet people, who have been following our work with immense interest. In this sense the conference—I think this can be said—reflected the political atmosphere that is being established in our country and it demonstrated the level of democratic development attained by the party, and not only by the party but by the whole of Soviet society in a period of slightly over 3 years since the Central Committee April Plenum.

Now as to the content of our work. Its main result is that a programmatic political position was elaborated on all the fundamental questions which were the subject of partywide and nationwide discussion on the basis of the CPSU Central Committee theses and were then the theme of a lively debate in this hall. The conference did not simply approve the proposals made by the Central Committee, but in many respects enriched them with the experience of party organizations and labor collectives. I

will say this: We all listened with enormous interest and rapt attention to the representatives of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia, the scientists and cultural figures, the specialists in various areas of the national economy, enterprise leaders, and party workers who spoke here.

Essentially, the conference covered the whole range of problems facing the party and the country at the present stage. But if I were to single out the most important elements in the debate and in the decisions we have adopted, I would say the following: The conference focused attention on the question of the party's role as the political vanguard. What can one say by way of a brief summary of the delegates' opinions? There is total conviction that the party has a clear-cut action program, elaborated by the 27th Congress and enriched by the experience of restructuring so far. It has the unconditional support of the people who have accepted the restructuring policy and will not allow any backtracking. As I understand it, the conference delegates had no doubts about this (**applause**).

There was expressed here, in a passionate and exacting manner, a desire to see an even stronger party. This can only be welcomed and I believe we are all pleased about that. The conference, as its resolution states, demanded that our party should be in full measure a party of the Leninist type, not only in content, but in its methods of activity as well. In other words, it must abandon once and for all the command and injunction methods and conduct its policy through organizational, cadre, and ideological work while most rigorously observing Soviet laws and democratic principles of social life.

There must be no supplanting of state bodies and no diktat over trade unions, the Komsomol and other public organizations, and creative and other unions. Does this mean that the party's leading role could wane? Such doubts were expressed. In my view, the conference gave a quite clear and convincing answer to this question: No. Remaining the ruling party, the party possesses all the requisite levers for implementing its leading role. And the main one is the 20 million communists through whom the party conducts its political course in all areas of the life of society.

Under conditions of democratization, glasnost, and the changing of the functions of party committees, the party's authority will undergo a serious test. This process is already taking place. Let us be frank: Under the conditions of the command and administer system, when the party apparatus gave orders to all and sundry, it was sometimes difficult to determine where a party committee and party secretary had leading authority and where, at best, they had "authority of office" and people submitted to them only out of necessity.

There is no doubt, comrades, that restructuring and the reform of the political system are creating a fundamentally different situation. The party's leading role in the

new conditions will be entirely determined by the real authority which has to be demonstrated anew each time by concrete actions. That is why it is simply vital for us to overcome even the slightest passivity in members of the party. Every communist must be a fighter for restructuring and for the revolutionary renewal of society. Let this be the principal mandate of our conference (applause).

By and large, comrades, the conference became a major stage in developing the Leninist line of the Central Committee April Plenum and 27th Party Congress and in deepening the theory and practice of restructuring. This determines its political scale and weight.

In this connection, I want to express on basic consideration. We have adopted a number of meticulously thought-out and responsible decisions. But if we delay their implementation—and this is one of the chronic diseases we have not yet shaken off, one that has also been evident in the first years of restructuring—much of it may come to nothing. About this we must speak directly. Let us shake off the chronic ills and embark immediately on practical work, without waiting for any extra decrees, circulars, instructions, and elucidations.

The necessary work must be organized within the framework of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. We must get to the point where the upcoming report and election campaign takes place on the basis of the principles we have agreed on here. Changes are to be made in the apparatus structure in the fall. As for reorganization of the soviets, the whole range of questions connected with this will be examined at the fall session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Elections of USSR people's deputies could be held in April 1989 and elections to Union and autonomous republics' Supreme Soviets could be held in the fall of next year.

In view of the enormous significance of these problems, the conference presidium is submitting for the delegates' consideration a brief resolution on some urgent measures on the practical implementation of the reform of the country's political system.

As far as the political results of the conference are concerned, every delegate, when he gets home, will be able to tell his work comrades, communists and non-party people, and all citizens the way we are going to act in the future and put its decisions into practice.

Furthermore, up to the last moment of the conference's work, our attention was focused on the question of the democratization of society and radical reform of the political system. By determining its main directions and parameters, I believe we have answered the main question facing us: How to ensure the deepening of restructuring and guarantee its irreversibility. Thus, there is every reason to say that the conference has done its main job (applause).

Of course, some hard organizational work has still to be done to implement the reform. We have to thoroughly discuss all this in the party and in society. But we now know precisely how the political system should be transformed, we have formulated a common opinion, and given it the form of political precepts.

The resolve to continue and deepen the radical economic reform, forcefully expressed at the conference, is equally significant. The prerequisites for it were established by the decisions of the Central Committee June (1987) Plenum and by the adoption of laws, in particular the laws on the state enterprise (association) and on the cooperative system. Our attention was focused on experience acquired in the first months of work by a large mass of enterprises in accordance with the new principles and questions connected with the progress of the reform. And this is right: Everything that is happening at the base is of immense significance for society; it is the foundation of restructuring.

As for the key, crucial aspects of the debate on these questions, the main point made was that after the conference, we must get down in earnest to finishing work on dismantling the inhibiting machinery. Representatives of practically all the delegations said that bureaucratism is still baring its teeth, so to speak, resisting, and putting a spoke in the wheels. As a result, the reform is getting bogged down in many areas. This is perhaps one of the most important observations the delegates brought with them and it means that it is a widespread phenomenon. So we in the Central Committee and in the government and central and local organizations must make every effort to more vigorously promote the process of radical economic reform.

I believe the delegates will unanimously support the view of the comrades who talked about the need to concentrate primarily at the present stage on solving the food problem and advancing as the primary task giving our peasantry all-round assistance and boosting agriculture. Whatever can still be done in the current 5-year plan must be done without fail. We have already sought out extra capital investments and resources and directed them into this area through various channels. All this must be properly assimilated and utilized. It is simply our sacred duty to boost agriculture. I think that after the conference, tougher demands will have to be made and the whole process of implementing its guidelines on support for the agrarian sector and rural working people will have to be monitored. Then we will be able to ensure the speediest solution of the food problem

Another feature of the conference, it seems to me, was the fact that the most vital political and economic problems were discussed in close connection with the spiritual area and were given a kind of moral dimension. This was evidence of a deep understanding of the fact that at the present stage of social development and under conditions of the scientific-technical revolution's enormous influence on all social processes, no problems can

be really solved without the intellectual and moral potential of the people. Hence the high, I would even say, heightened tone of the discussion of the problems of science, education, culture, and the future of literature and art.

I do not remember and I do not know of any other party forums, even congresses, at which this sector has been so widely represented. Various views were expressed at the conference, reflecting trends that are interacting and sometimes conflicting in the social consciousness. This is logical. We are asserting a pluralism of opinions and are rejecting spiritual monopoly. But I think you will agree that among the diverse judgments offered at the conference, the main unifying idea is as follows: It is necessary in all things to start with people, act on the basis of their people's interests, and establish the humanitarian values of socialism. Then a pure moral atmosphere in society will be guaranteed, along with intensive creative thinking and genuine cultural blossoming.

What we need is not blind faith in a bright future, but scientific forecasts based on profound and exact knowledge of the inexhaustible potential of the people of a socialist society, of their labor and creativity. That is why we talk about the new, human face of socialism as the goal of restructuring (**applause**).

It can be said that glasnost was one of the conference heroines. Primarily because our very debate was the result of the establishment of an atmosphere of openness, honesty, and sincerity in society, but also because we discussed here what we are going to do with glasnost in the future, what its potential and reasonable limits are. And although opinions varied, I believe that here too we ultimately concurred that it is necessary to give every backing to the mass media and their work on clearing out and sweeping away all manner of negative phenomena inherited from the past and stimulating bold, original, and interesting people, real heroes of restructuring.

On the other hand, there was an equally clear demand for journalists to be more responsible about what they write and to rid themselves of cliquish and departmental ambitions and biases and to stop laying claim to a monopoly on the truth. The times when the printed word was the obedient instrument of authoritarianism and bureaucratic tyranny are still fresh in people's memories. That is why it is so important to learn today, at a time of humanization of all aspects of our life, the skills of criticism, the skills of comradely polemics. I believe, and in this respect the conference work was not in vain, that we all have a better understanding of how to conduct a party debate (**applause**).

In my reaction to the discussion I do not think it possible to pass over the speech made by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. Above all, I think that we acted correctly in offering him the floor. As I have already said, democracy necessitates lifting the shrouds of secrecy from such questions, although there is, incidentally, no secret here.

That part of Comrade Yeltsin's speech where he deals with the specific problems discussed at the conference coincides to a considerable degree with the report and the debates. In that sense his proposals form part of the general trend of discussion. We also note that Comrade Yeltsin, like others, spoke in favor of continuing restructuring and deepening it in the interests of society and the people.

But I cannot agree with B.N. Yeltsin's statement that we announced restructuring without adequate analysis of the causes of the stagnation which had arisen, without analysis of the contemporary situation of society, without deep analysis of history and the omissions committed by the party, or that restructuring has the character of something done for effect.

During preparation for the conference and the discussion which took place in the party and society and at the conference itself, we have assessed from positions of principle both the achievements and the problems of restructuring and summed up the activity of party and state bodies, labor collectives, and the country as a whole. I will say this: We have acted correctly, Comrades, for all of us are concerned about how restructuring is developing. That anxiety has been voiced here, it has galvanized us, strengthened our intention to advance the process of reforms even more resolutely.

I think that Comrade Yeltsin's criticism that we have achieved no revolutionary transformations in 3 years is also unjust and unacceptable. Of course, if you have the overall, long-term scheme of things in mind, our society's attainment of a new quality through restructuring, then it is impossible as yet to talk about revolutionary transformations. We have spent quite a lot of time in getting to understand the society in which we live, the past, where the roots of many of our present-day phenomena lie, the surrounding world, and our relationship with it. All this had to be understood in order to prevent operating by "revolutionary leaps," which are extremely dangerous, and in order not to permit improvisation in policy. We had to involve society and its intellectual and scientific potential to get to the bottom of all this and develop a policy of restructuring based on serious critical analysis and then transform it into practical decisions in the main areas. This had to be done. And it had to be done responsibly. We thus proposed the policy of restructuring, and there is no alternative to it (**applause**). This in itself was a great achievement for the party in the past stage.

We are as much concerned as is Comrade Yeltsin with the practical tasks that worry our people. And I think that the speeches heard here, particularly those of representatives of the working class, have shown that working people hope for the most rapid solution of these questions.

I do not know either why Comrade Yeltsin voiced a critical attitude to the Central Committee theses and questioned how thorough and well-considered they are. This document has been received as a very serious one in the party, the country, and the world. Nor do I understand his claim that Central Committee members did not take part in the preparation of the theses. I have met personally with two-thirds of the members of the Central Committee, not to mention the fact that they have written and made their own comments. And finally there was the plenum at which the draft theses were discussed. Comrade Yeltsin took part in its work, but said nothing, did not ask to speak. Central Committee members are present here and will remember how it was.

I think, comrades, that our present conference and the entire nature of the discussion and the approved documents are the most convincing evidence that restructuring is under way in the country and is gathering momentum.

In trying to understand in human terms everything that is happening in the Central Committee and the Politburo—it, after all, concerns the general secretary first and foremost—I am bound to return to the history of the question. When we recommended Comrade Yeltsin as first secretary of the Moscow Party Gorkom, we did so on the basis that the work in the capital's party organization needed serious enhancement and that the situation in Moscow itself required improvement. An experienced, energetic person with a critical approach was needed. We observed those qualities in Comrade Yeltsin, which served as the basis for his nomination to that position. And your humble servant also appended his signature. In the initial period Yeltsin energetically involved himself in the work, did much to revive it, and launched a struggle against the negative phenomena that had accumulated in Moscow. We supported him in his efforts, appreciating that the Moscow Party organization faced difficult tasks, but at a certain stage we sensed that something was amiss. This began when the time for a practical solution of the problems of restructuring came, its transformation into all areas of life, when strenuous and intensive work designed to effect radical changes was needed. Neither the gorkom as a whole nor the first secretary was up to this. And Comrade Yeltsin, instead of relying on the party organization, people, and collectives, began resorting to hectoring and command methods. This was followed by a ceaseless change of cadres.

We initially thought that this was probably justified, that the wrong comrades had been chosen, and that the conference held in the city had been unable to correctly resolve the cadre issue. And that probably was the case. Not everyone proved capable of solving the new problems and assuming leadership of a party organization at that crucial stage in the development of the city and the country. But when he started changing cadres for the second and third time around, it began to worry us. I made a comment to Comrade Yeltsin at the Politburo. I

said, in a comradely manner, that Boris Nikolayevich must draw his own conclusion and incorporate it in his work. In other words, it was help, nothing more.

What do I think is the tragedy of Comrade Yeltsin as a politician?: At the stage when practical problems had to be solved, he lacked the strength and resorted to big talk, statements, and overadministration. But even then—everyone has to know about this, we must clear up this question completely—the Politburo did not consider Comrade Yeltsin as lost and incapable of working further. We continued to support him, and major decisions were taken on Moscow, about which I spoke at the Moscow Party Gorkom Plenum.

In August 1987, when I was on vacation, I received a personal letter from Comrade Yeltsin in which he raised the question of his being released from his post as first secretary of the party gorkom. I deemed it essential not to rush but to look into it carefully, and even the Politburo did not know of the letter's existence. I decided to have a chat with Boris Nikolayevich after my vacation and proposed to him that we get the events marking the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution out of the way and then meet and talk things over. He agreed but, contrary to our understanding, unexpectedly spoke at the Central Committee October Plenum. I have already spoken about the thrust of his speech, and my speech at the Moscow Gorkom Plenum has been published. I said nothing else at the time. Comrade Yeltsin, after discussion and comments by comrades, acknowledged his mistakes.

I will quote from the verbatim record of the plenum—an episode at the end of the session, after everyone had spoken:

Gorbachev: Tell us how you regard the comments of your Central Committee comrades. They have said a lot about you and ought to know what you think. They will, after all, be making a decision.

Yeltsin: Aside from certain expressions, I agree with the assessment on the whole. The fact that I let the Central Committee and the Moscow City Organization down by speaking today—that was a mistake.

Gorbachev: Will you have the strength to carry on your work?

Voices. He will not be able to. He must not be allowed to remain in such a position.

Gorbachev: Wait a minute, wait a minute, it is I who is asking him the question. Let us approach the matter in a democratic way. We all need an answer before taking a decision.

Yeltsin: I have said that I let down the party Central Committee, the Politburo, the Moscow Party Organization.... I repeat what I said: I ask to be released both as candidate member of the Politburo and leader of the Moscow City Party Organization.

Those are the facts. After Comrade Yeltsin's speech was acknowledged to be politically mistaken—he himself acknowledged this—I nevertheless put it to the Central Committee members as follows: Do not decide the question of his release from his duties as candidate member of the Politburo now, let us instruct the Politburo to examine the question. But the situation had already caused such a reaction that the matter could not be left as it was. We spoke about everything at the Moscow Gorkom Plenum, and the comrades there said what they thought about Comrade Yeltsin's work far more trenchantly—you know about this.

In general, comrades, I think that this serves as a lesson not only for Comrade Yeltsin but for the Politburo, the general secretary of the Central Committee, and us all. We must firmly pursue the path of resolutely reviving our party in line with Leninist principles, on the basis of broad democratization, relying on the primary party organization, cadres, and the elective aktiv. We cannot solve the great tasks of restructuring we have set ourselves by resorting to the old methods, which have been condemned not only by the party and the whole of society but by time itself (**applause**).

And one more lesson. Comrades have rightly remarked at the conference that information should have been given and everything said, the process would not then have developed the way it did (**applause**).

I return once again, comrades, to the question of what most concerns delegates now—I sense this both from the speeches and the notes passed—the question of how to ensure the implementation of the decisions taken by us. Let us structure the whole life of the party in accordance with the conference resolutions without waiting until the congress introduces all this into the statutes. The conference's political precepts are in being, let us be guided by them. That is first.

Second: Let us not postpone the reform of the political system as a whole. It is necessary so that the restructuring process make progress. The process is being held up right now by the existing political system. No repetition of what happened with the Central Committee January Plenum must be allowed. It was a major plenum which made an in-depth analysis and revealed the causes of what had occurred in the party and the country. But we did not think through the mechanisms for implementing the plenum decisions, and they were left suspended in mid air, as it were. Things did not go as we planned. In no circumstances must the decisions of our party conference by condemned to the same fate.

Many questions raised here are not covered by the resolutions. I think that all this should be expressed in generalized form and submitted for discussion by a plenum, specific assignments given, and their execution supervised. Many of the notes passed have suggested that a verbatim record be issued. We must do this without fail so as to arm our party and the whole of society with the ideas expressed during discussion at the conference.

And another question, comrades, that was raised on the eve of the conference and at the conference proper—the question of erecting a monument to the victims of the repressions. No doubt you will remember that this was mentioned in the closing speech at the 22nd Party Congress and was greeted with approval. The question was also raised at the 27th Party Congress, but no practical decision was made. As was said in the report, it is our political and moral duty to restore justice to the victims of lawlessness. Let us discharge this duty by erecting the monument in Moscow. I am sure this step will be supported by the entire Soviet people (**applause**).

In concluding my speech, I will return once again to a question posed before the conference: how to deepen and make irreversible the revolutionary restructuring that was launched in the country on the initiative and under the leadership of the party. The entire course of our work, the materials of the debate, and its final documents convincingly show that the conference has given a clear answer to this question: through democratization, economic reform and transformation of the political system, we will make restructuring, we will arrive at a qualitatively new state of society, a new, human and democratic face for socialism. We will proceed further and conduct a creative quest for ways and methods of attaining this goal under conditions of democracy and glasnost and will work hard on the practical implementation of the tasks facing under us (**applause**).

M.S. Gorbachev read out the text of the resolution that was adopted unanimously. He wished the delegates fine achievements and success in their work.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

Social Type of Personality

18020016j Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 88 (signed to press 6 Jul 88) pp 94-104

[Article by Vladimir Aleksandrovich Yadov, doctor of philosophical sciences, professor, leading scientific associate, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History of the Natural Sciences and Technology (Leningrad Department)].

[Text] Perestroika formulates its own requirements concerning the molding of the social character, the social type of personality. We, however, have still not fully realized how difficult and indirect this process may be.

The social type of personality is the product of the complex interweaving of historical-cultural and socio-economic conditions of human activities. Based on this understanding, the Marxist classics emphasized the importance of acquiring a profound knowledge of the social typology of individuals who are formed in a society, particularly at turning points in its development.

Following the victory of a proletarian revolution in a country with average developed capitalism, one of the historical tasks which appeared could be described as the need to develop the features of the social character of a worker employed in highly industrialized production. This refers to acquiring a broad concept of industrial culture, which presumes competence, high personal responsibility, practicality, punctuality, work efficiency and commitment in business relations.

The high pace of industrialization during the first 5-year periods necessitated the mass reinforcement of the industrial working class with the peasantry, "with newcomers into the factory environment" (Lenin). Their influence affected the cadre structure of workers, most of whom, incidentally, were employed at small semi-artisan enterprises. Industrial discipline and high labor standards neither existed nor could exist in this case. Furthermore, as Lenin wrote, capitalism "bequeathed, particularly in a backward country, the type of customs in which anything belonging to the state, anything official, is considered material for malicious damage. This mentality of the petit-bourgeois mass is felt at each step. In this area as well the struggle is quite difficult" (*Poln. Sobr. Soch.*) [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 265).

On the one hand, the struggle for labor discipline was complicated by the then level of production forces and the rather primitive production technology. The basic requirements for a scientific organization of labor, recommended by A.K. Gastev in the 1920s, were reduced specifically to improving the work place. They neither encompassed nor could encompass at that time the overall production process. On the other hand, the main slogans of the first 5-year plans were requirements to develop initiative and firmly to abandon obsolete standards, regardless of the nature of the work. Punctuality and observing "stipulated regulations" were condemned as vestiges of the bourgeois past. The production frontrunner was distinguished by working with revolutionary scope, mass rationalization, shock work and participation in the Stakhanovite movement.

The high pace of industrialization and the extensive method of production development required shock work methods, readiness for dashing and self-sacrifice; faith in the socialist ideals and the party's authority under the circumstances of the prevailing "pressure style" of management began to be combined with "leadership mentality," and obedience to directives and commands issued "from above."

A personality of a worker was developing, sincerely accepting the values of initiative, creativity and innovation, energetically mastering collective shock work; in the final account, this degenerated into ordinary rushing, pushing into the background the values of punctual, organized, responsible and "unhurried" work, in the sense that it had to be well proportioned, systematic and with normal technological and organizational support.

The values of initiative and creativity were promoted and shaped in school. Demands for personal responsibility and punctuality, which had by no means traditionally distinguished our social character, did not find practical support under these circumstances. In the structure of value orientations which we set in the 1970s in the course of mass surveys of workers and engineers, the values of creativity and initiative were emphatically placed at the peak of the scale of values, while orientation toward self-discipline, accuracy and punctuality assumed an almost negative meaning as indications of timidity, inertia and lack of proper daring.

Stagnation processes in industry and violations of the principle of wages based on labor and, above all, the use of "averaging," and social passiveness stimulated the turning of interests away from production activities, the more so since the enhancement of the people's well-being and tempestuous housing construction, initiated in the 1960s, created a substantially broader framework for freedom of activity in the nonproduction, consumer and recreation areas compared to production and sociopolitical life.

By the end of the 1970s sociological studies had detected a clear shift in the overall trend of the interests of the individual from the socioproduction area to family and consumer activities.

In a mass comparative study conducted between 1962 and 1976, in a list of 23 leisure-time occupations, in a first study on "Man and His Job," about 30 percent of the workers chose as preferable occupations related, one way or another, to production and social activeness (rationalization, study, social work during leisure time). In 1976 they were chosen by barely 5 percent. Demands concerning labor conditions drastically increased, while interest in the meaning of the work and its creative opportunities remained on the level of the beginning of the 1960s. A process of mechanization of labor increased. However, something even more indicative, the weakening of material and moral motivations for labor were indications of a growing alienation of labor. In our data this was manifested in the fact that whereas in the first survey, conducted in 1962, less than 3 percent of the 3,000 people surveyed, had declined to provide a positive or negative assessment of various aspects of the work, in 1976 some 30 percent of the 5,000 workers in different professions displayed their indifference toward such assessments.

We obtained amazing data in the 1976 study in comparing the "business potential" of workers belonging to different age groups. According to foremen and other information, an industrial worker reached maximum work efficiency at the age of roughly 45 (!), drastically different from workers in the 30-year age group. For example, discipline violators (at that time) in the 30-year age group were twice more numerous compared to workers in their 40s; 10 percent of workers in the 25-30-year age group produced defective items compared to virtually no one in the 40-45-year age group. Let us note, however, that by the age of 25 the workers had the same skill as those at 40 and that their production practice was adequate (a minimum of 7 years) and so was their education. The reduced efficiency of 30-year old workers could be explained essentially by the lack of social and professional responsibility and interest in the work.

Here as well we come close to the situation which developed in the area of collectivistic relations, in relations between the collective and its members.

Collectivistic upbringing is an unquestionable accomplishment of our social system. However, like any social process, collectivistic upbringing contains within itself a contradiction. It began to develop the negative tendency of promoting individual irresponsibility. A standard of collectivistic upbringing was developing, reflected in the formula "If you cannot we shall teach you. If you do not want, we shall force you." However, the "teaching" was reduced to the fact that Petya, who was failing, was assigned to the excellent worker Katya, while Ivanov, who was falling behind, was given frontranking worker Petrov as his tutor. They involved their wards in the work and were answerable for them to the collective. As a rule, the formula "we shall force you" did not work. In almost all cases the collective somehow carried this careless worker along.

At that time sociologist V. Yakushev studied in one of the scientific-production associations in Lvov an interesting social phenomenon. The design-engineering bureau of that association had converted to a new organization of labor: the more one produced the more one earned. The salaries of engineers were made dependent not on the fulfillment and overfulfillment of norms but on the overall volume of qualitatively performed work. It was discovered in the course of the experiment that those who were in the last places, based on quarterly indicators (candidates for reduced salaries), began to transfer to other design institutes, while those who were being promoted on the basis of their production indicators worked better. Furthermore, engineers from other institutes began to join this scientific research institute, hoping for faster promotions. This method, which was given the name "Pulsar," was one which allowed to select those who were most energetic and self-organized.

Meanwhile, in the production shops of that same association brigades working on the basis of a single order were created. Toward the end of the year the best

workers began to leave such brigades, for they were unwilling to share earnings with those who were careless, preferring the individual piece-rate system.

What did this experiment prove? Among others, that the reasons for poor work were low personal responsibility, and undeveloped practical competitiveness, which are mandatory features of the social character of a worker engaged in modern intensive work.

I shall cite two other examples from the studies conducted by psychologists and sociologists. The first was a study of relations within sports teams which had reached the superior league in basketball and, for the sake of comparison, teams which had not achieved great sports successes. It turned out that in the best teams relations were more stressed whereas in the weak ones they were ideally friendly. Prevailing in the first were exigency and businesslike relations; in the second there was a kind of psychological compensation for low exigency, manifested in highly friendly behavior.

In a recent study (of 18 collectives, 340 people) sociologist V. Kostyushev singled out two substantially different parameters of competition: rivalry and cooperation. Brigades in which competition prevailed had less collectivism but were superior in production indicators. Brigades in which cooperation prevailed were good at everything other than production indicators. Optimum competitiveness and cooperation yielded maximum productivity. However, what is of interest to us here is not the ideal balance between competitiveness and cooperation but the specific contribution made by competitiveness and rivalry to productivity.

The lack of sharpened awareness of personal responsibility and readiness to assume culpability for failure (so called internalizing of the individual as a particular psychological feature of the character) are among the unquestionable obstructions to perestroika. Could it be that there is an excessively high percentage of "externals," of those who tend to credit successes to their capabilities and efforts but prefer to blame circumstances and other people for failures?

The correlation between "internal" and "external" psychological types varies, incidentally, from one culture to another. For example, it was found that black Americans are more external than white (the effect of racial discrimination); among Protestants, the beliefs of which assign responsibility for one's fate on man himself, there are more internals than among Catholics.

Special studies conducted on this topic by Leningrad psychologist K. Muzdybayev do not give grounds for computing the overall correlation between "internals" and "externals" in our culture. However, they clearly indicate that regardless of general personality indicators based on the "internalism-externalism" scale (the result of the interpretation of the special tests), the higher the

level of personal responsibility included in the job regulations, the more frequently noticed is truly independent behavior; the better the work at a given enterprise is organized, the higher become the average indicators of the responsibility which the members of the collective assume.

The development of contemporary production technology is a powerful instrument in shaping personality features needed for work under such circumstances: professionalism, accuracy, neatness, self-discipline and high personal responsibility. However, the decisive importance in this case is not the direct impact of technology but the system of social organization which somehow translates technical work requirements into the language of production standards, relations among its participants and social relations among people.

Today, under the conditions of the development of democracy, self-government and glasnost, this is not merely a question of social practice. By no means everything here is satisfactory in the theoretical aspect as well. The principle that "the collective is always right" concentrated the attention on the struggle against individualism. However, as Lenin emphasized, there is no relative, no abstract truth. The absolutizing of this principle leads to identifying collectivism with conformism. Why do we admire the persistence and conviction with which Lenin defended his position, sometimes against an absolute majority while, conversely, we forget the right to have one's own opinion and stance, when it becomes a question of the "simple" man, the "rank and file" party member or citizen? Is it not because we are still unable to reject the familiar formula of "man as a cog" in a complex collective mechanism?

The thousands of examples which crowd today the pages of the mass press depict models of ideological fighters who, in the interest of the cause, opposed bureaucratic oppression and administrative pressure. They include chairmen of kolkhozes, directors of plants, workers, intellectuals, characters in works of fiction and real promoters of perestroika. However, neither in education, philosophy or sociology do we find a proper interpretation of the problem of interrelationship between the individual and the collective at the present stage in the development of society: with comprehensive literacy, competence and professionalism suffice. In the majority of labor, scientific and other collectives, their members are sufficiently competent to have the right actively to defend their views. And when a decision has been made after a debate, it becomes the standard for collective organized action. To begin with, however, we must abandon the simplistically understood idea that "the collective is always right." The collective is right only when it is truly right, i.e., providing that it makes a proper decision, consciously and after mature discussions.

Our major ills include a lack of culture, of general education, humanitarian and technical culture, a standard of relations and a standard of debates, behavior or

simply good manners. The formula that culture means integral reproduction of the human personality is right. Instead of such integrality, for many years we stopped at describing the "comprehensively developed individual." The ideal of communist society, formulated by Marx, became just about the standard for instruction today. The ideal of the comprehensively developed individual led, in its time, to promoting the movement of "communist labor" brigades (instead of a movement for conscientious socialist labor). In addition to the ideal type of personality, however, the sociologists also single out the so-called basic type, who is most consistent with the objective conditions of the contemporary stage in social development and, in addition to this type, we have the modal type, the truly prevalent one.

Obviously, the comprehensive and harmonious development of the individual becomes objectively possible only with corresponding or, more accurately put, sufficiently developed material and spiritual prerequisites which are as yet to be formulated. This as well will require the efforts of society on the historical scale of our time and not the scale of a single 5-year period. It is only then that the slogan of developing a truly universal personality could be put on the agenda, a personality whose features are revealed through the performance of essential social types of activities. In this case universality is pitted against any type of restriction. It expresses the infinite nature of individual development and embodies "the endless elimination of the limit to this development" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "*soch.*" [Works], vol 46, part II, p 35).

Today we must strive and aspire to reach a comprehensive and harmonious development of the individual, reorganizing our society on the basis of the principles of perestroika and helping it to reach a new qualitative status. It is entirely clear that these are concepts which bring to light the communist features of the social type of individual rather than the present social standards which could be considered necessary rather than desirable.

As social scientists, we must concentrate on substantiating the objectively necessary features of the individual, basic to the contemporary conditions of the economic and social development of society, that which ensures perestroika and progress in their real social context.

It is a question of adopting more modest criteria for comprehensiveness and harmonious development: eliminating in the development of the personality obvious contradictions between technological and humanistic culture, eliminating alienation from politics and promoting involvement in sociopolitical life, putting an end to the horrifying neglect of one's own health, developing basic habits of leading a healthy way of life and eliminating the gap between the ability to judge of everything and professionalism in areas in which a person must make responsible decisions.

From what aspect must we approach education, and what must be given priority? Our long studies of the sociopsychological features of governing and self-governing of the social behavior of the individual, as well as the studies of other psychologists and sociologists, both Soviet and foreign, lead to some important conclusions related to such matters.

The first is that man accumulates, on the basis of his entire practical experience, a mass of most varied "readinesses" to accept reality and operate within it in an entirely definite manner. Whatever name we may give it—sociopsychological personal stance, a personality attitude, nature of the individual, and so on, such a "readiness" consists of a number of strata and has several relatively independent levels. It implies a summed up life stance, a concept of life, which is the product of socialization, the roots of which may be traced to childhood and adolescence. The restructuring of the life stance at a mature age is more difficult.

In this sense the optimal social influence is, on the basis of a given already established general trend of development of the individual, to interpret his life stance and to orient it in a socially useful direction.

Another standard of personality "readinesses" for a specific type of behavior involves a more or less structured system of values related to the life stance, i.e., concepts on the objectives of life and the means of attaining such objectives. However, the value structure is not so rigid as its internal nucleus—the life stance. The values which are, so to say, on the periphery are more adaptable to changing their place within the overall hierarchy.

Most frequently the gap between the system of values and the practice of actual behavior (or, more accurately, the social concepts governing actual behavior) is the result of the influence of a variety of conditions governing practical daily matters. One example of this gap—a consequence of social stagnation—was noted by A. Alekseyev, who worked as a research sociologist at an enterprise. If the worker turns to management with a suggestion for a certain major novelty, as a rule, the answer is "What is with you, you want more than the others?" At that point that same innovator becomes characteristically "restructured." He camouflages his initiative as a forced action and says: "If we do not do this we would fail." This presents a typical model of a split awareness, and a contradiction within the system of personality traits: neither the worker nor his manager reject the value of the initiative, publicly proclaimed; on the contrary, they welcome it. They have not as yet lost their status in the overall hierarchy of values. However, the rot has appeared, a gap has been formed in the chain of superior values and practical behavioral concepts, and a gap between word and action, so to say, has become consolidated within the structure of the mind itself.

A purposeful upbringing and education and the influence of changing conditions in life, sociocultural influences and propaganda of behavioral models approved by society would contribute to changes in the overall hierarchy of value orientations of the individual, favorable to society. Interesting data may be found in sociopsychological experiments which prove the possibility of the purposeful convincing influence leading to stable changes in the structure of individual values. Similar results are achieved through psychological training, in the course of group discussions (such as a changed attitude toward the values of innovation).

The system of summed up social concepts of the individual in specific typical social situations and toward social projects turns out to be even more flexible and fluctuating. How, for example, should one behave at a meeting: Keep silent or daringly join in the debate? Changes in the specific social situation, should they become sufficiently stable, lead to changes in such generalized social concepts. We can easily note such results in daily life: the people adopt a different attitude toward drunkenness, for example; the stereotype of "conivance" and, worse, the concerned feeling of pity toward a drunk, disappears. Today with increasing frequency drunks are rebuffed in public places.

The claim that changes in this entire complex hierarchy of social predispositions in the lower levels of behavioral "readiness" are transmitted with difficulty to the area of the higher value levels, whereas changes in the higher levels of hierarchy, in the life stance and system of values, actively influence the lower levels of predisposition for a certain type of behavior, is of a radical nature.

Therefore, the formula of unity between word and action becomes concretized: words based on convictions, supported by a system of the value structure of the individual, are embodied in action with the greatest degree of likelihood and without external coercion or control. Those which poorly agree with the life stance demand constant social control over their practical implementation.

The study of society, all social sciences, which owe the people and society a great deal, are scheduled to play a major role in solving the difficult problems of shaping a social type of individual consistent with the conditions of perestroika. They include psychology, sociopsychology, sociology and the science of pedagogy.

The development of Marxist sociology was greatly harmed during the years of stagnation; this particularly applies to the aspiration to deprive it of its own theoretical content and convert it into a strictly applied discipline, into "specific sociological studies." In the view of the majority, sociological research was identified with public opinion surveys. The mass press introduced the stupid cliché of "sociological survey." "Sociological" was the label given to any survey which in some cases had nothing in common with a professionally organized

study in which we must observe the requirements of a substantiated selection and an equally accurate interpretation of results. That, however, is not the main thing. Marxist sociology, based on the dialectical-materialistic understanding of history, also has its own theoretical subject: it is the science of the establishment, development and functioning of social communities, social organizations and social processes; it is a science of social relations as mechanisms for interconnection and interaction among communities and between communities and individuals, and of the laws governing social actions and mass behavior.

The human individual is shaped "in specific social circumstances" not abstractly but within specific social communities with which the people identify themselves and the interests and motivations of which they adopt as their own. The same individuals may be part of a variety of social communities, the interests of which frequently clash or may be entirely opposed. Hence the split, the contradictory nature of the mind. People can perfectly cooperate and work unitedly in an international collective while, at the same time, assume opposing views under conditions of aggravated relations between national groups. In such a situation they identify themselves not with the labor collective but with the entire ethnic national community. Knowledgeable action, in the sociopsychological meaning of the term, in resolving such conflicts means to discuss the problem on the level of interests consistent with those of the social communities between which a conflict has broken out.

In general, the problem of reciprocal subordination and coordination of the interests of communities on different levels and of different types is among the most difficult. Above all, it is a question of a new political thinking in which the interests of all mankind assume leading positions: nothing which could harm mankind, from destructive wars to the destruction of the habitat, can be justified with "national interests," for in reality it means causing irreparable harm to the national interests themselves, which have been misinterpreted and viewed on a shallow self-seeking basis.

Furthermore, this is a problem of correlating national interests with interests of ethnocultural communities, with regional and departmental interests. Here as well that which harms the national interests could be rejected as morally and politically groundless aspirations. Open discussions and extensive representative surveys of public opinion are becoming today the standard of our sociocultural and political life, a mechanism for the detection of such possible contradictions and the search for optimal solutions.

Detecting differences and coordinating the interests of socioprofessional, sociodemographic and sociocultural groups and communities, actively interacting on the scale of the entire society or a given area (republic, city, small settlement) is a separate problem. Obviously, in this case we must observe the principle of pluralism of

such interests within the framework of the unity of our moral-political values and ideals. Intolerance of the views and positions of representatives of a different cultural community, of senior generations toward the young and the young toward their elders, and professionals in one area toward professionals in another area or with a different orientation are all traces of that same past which was based on the unquestionable right of some groups to dictate their will on other by virtue of their command status, economic privilege or bureaucratic position, that which Lenin liked to describe as "communist arrogance."

The three main enemies named by Lenin at the 2nd All-Russian Congress on Political Education: The first enemy, communist arrogance; the second, ignorance; the third, bribery" (op. cit., vol 44, p 173), to this day remain retained obstacles to the enhancement of the people's social activeness.

"Communist arrogance" was converted into officialdom's scorn for the masses and, frequently, antihumanism, indifference toward the life and destinies of the individual. Today the essence of party requirements is to be able to work among the masses, to convince the masses and to learn from them, to head the collectives as acknowledged leaders, which is the real way for surmounting this old disease.

Ignorance, which is particularly intolerable under present circumstances, is manifested in the readiness to be the judge in all matters, at all costs, with the inability to accept other views, opinions and concepts. Collective discussion acquires a meaning precisely when it involves the participation of competent, of informed people. That is precisely why glasnost and extensive information on the problem under discussion are the alpha and omega of collective competence. Our experience in organization with the help of the Leningrad television program "Public Opinion," with open lines and free access to the microphone revealed, which was one of its unquestionable advantages, obvious faults. This involved the lack of discussion standards and the inability and unwillingness to hear someone else's views and to understand someone else's viewpoints, and the inability to accept positive ideas.

Ignorance is quite scandalously manifested in bureaucratic and command incompetence, fear of loss of dignity by acknowledging one's lack of information about anything at all or unwillingness to seek advice from competent sources.

Bribery in its direct and vulgar meaning has still not been eliminated. However, a variety of "reciprocal services" have become substantially more widespread. They are the same type of bribery, i.e., a rejection of the standards of social justice and compensation according to one's work, intelligence and merits and not based on any other criteria, as loyalty to an individual, official dependence and repayment of a debt for a past service.

Perestroika requires a personality whose character would be consistent with its objectives. Such a social type is shaped by involving increasingly broader masses in the revolutionary transformations of society. According to some data based on public opinion surveys (not representative for the entire population of the country), about one-third of the respondents expressed their subjective readiness to accept the view that "perestroika depends on my own efforts," while the remainder tended to believe that suitable social conditions are needed to this effect.

In our view, these are good sociopsychological indicators, for they prove that a type of "critical mass" is developing, which enables us to hope for an acceleration of the "chain reaction" in the enhancement of the human factor. Naturally, however, we must also take into consideration the passive stance of people who are only expecting practical changes in the production and social areas, and in all fields of life, but do little to promote them. The new stage of perestroika, which marks a transition to energetic practical action, should urge on that segment of the citizenry to engage in more decisive actions in the spirit of perestroika. We must not forget the fact that long years of social passiveness were combined with thoughtless conformism. From this viewpoint, discussions in the press, particularly those which developed on the eve of the party conference, played the role of a catalyst of sociopolitical activeness and helped more clearly to bring to light the interests of supporters of perestroika and its opponents, and thus to promote the development of the political awareness of the broad masses, facing many people with the need to make a conscious choice of a stance toward perestroika. Unquestionably, this influenced the course and outcome of the party conference itself.

The development of democracy and glasnost and the economic autonomy of labor collectives are the support mechanisms of perestroika, which also promote the shaping, strengthening and development of the very features of the individual who are becoming today basic personality features: professionalism and competence and initiative-mindedness, combined with self-discipline and a feeling of personal responsibility, civic-mindedness and ideological conviction and, in the final account, the shaping of an integral individual who will actively participate in the process of social change.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Comintern: Practical Experience

18020016k Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 88 (signed to press 6 Jul 88) pp 105-115

[Article by Fridrikh Igorevich Firsov, head of sector, CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, doctor of philosophical sciences; and Kirill Kirillovich Shirinya, consultant, CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] The victory of the October Revolution in Russia and the defeat of fascism in World War II were major

stages in the history of the global revolutionary movement, related to the activities of the Communist International—the international organization which functioned in the period between these two greatest events of the 20th century.

V.I. Lenin initiated the founding of the Comintern. The actual founding which took place at its 1st Congress in March 1919 "was the record of what had been gained not only by the Russian but also the German, Austrian, Hungarian, Finnish and Swiss or, in short, the international proletarian masses" (V.I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 37, p 512). The Comintern played a great historical role in the development of the communist movement in the world, the formulation of its strategy and tactics and the strengthening of its ranks on the positions of Marxism-Leninism, and the unification of Leninism with the international labor movement.

A number of works have been written by Soviet historians on the positive experience of the Comintern, which solved unprecedented tasks in terms of scale and difficulty, and which also noted its omissions and errors. Today, however, such works can satisfy neither researchers nor readers interested in the history of the communist movement. The point is that so far the methods through which the Comintern functioned as an international organization, the mechanism of interaction between its leading authorities and the sections, particularly the Comintern Executive Committee (IKKI) and the VKP(b), the ideological and political struggle within the Comintern, and Stalin's influence on the spiritual atmosphere, theoretical thinking and political decisions and practical steps taken by the IKKI have remained virtually unstudied. Work on these problems requires the removal of the existing stereotypes and the introduction in scientific circulation of a huge amount of archival documents which were either difficult to obtain or totally inaccessible in the past. The procedure for the use of such documents, which are the property of the International Communist Movement, should obviously be based on agreements among fraternal parties. Nor should we forget that attempts undertaken in the past critically to evaluate one aspect or another of the history of the Comintern were considered a violation of party positions. All of this led to a one-sidedness in summations and conclusions and the appearance of "non-persons" in publications.

The profound study of the historical path and experience of the Comintern require an interpretation of the activities of this organization in the full dimension of its real complexity and global nature, and a comparison between the processes of the class struggle and their reflection in the policies of the Comintern which, in turn, influenced such processes. Such work calls for describing in full the experience of the Comintern, both positive and negative. The study of this experience is important not only from the viewpoint of drawing lessons. It is necessary in formulating a more profound view on the course of

social development, the identification of the laws and complexities of the interaction among different trends. Telling the entire historical truth means looking at history from truly scientific positions, without ignoring facts which, until recently, had not been published or were either unjustifiably classified as insignificant. In pointing this out, however, we do not forget the tremendous merits of the Comintern and of those who participated in its work, who dedicated their knowledge, strength and energy and, frequently, their lives to the common cause.

Today the task of the Soviet researchers is to restore the entire truth of the activities of the Comintern and write its true and full history. Historical publications have discussed in sufficient detail the achievements of the Comintern and its role in the global revolutionary movement. The authors of this material set themselves a different task: To indicate the difficulty and contradictory nature in the development of the Comintern and the influence which a number of negative trends exerted on it, as well as to submit some of their considerations on such problems which are subject of debate at the present time.

In our view, the starting point in the study of the historical experience of the Comintern is the restoration, to its fullest extent, of the Leninist concept of the International Communist Movement and the Marxist-Leninist view on the ways of the struggle for the main strategic objectives of the working class. This concept includes, above all, a profound realistic study of the trends of social development and the specific historical situation and, on this basis, determining the prospects and tasks of the struggle. Lenin tried to ascribe this feature to the Comintern. Naturally, even while Lenin was directly involved in Comintern work, by no means were all cadres of the communist parties able to rise to the level of Lenin's understanding of the problems of the revolutionary movement. A struggle was waged for the assertion of the Leninist views, opposed by opportunistic and sectarian-dogmatic and semianarchic elements.

At first, in 1919-1920, the Comintern and the communist parties set the task of directly making socialist revolutions in a number of countries and creating soviets as the authorities of the new system. Lenin and his fellow workers displayed the greatest possible energy in promoting this trend. The fundamental ideological and political positions held by the Comintern were codified in the documents of its 2nd Congress (July-August 1920), which expressed this trend. The Comintern considered as its most important function the immediate making of a global proletarian revolution. It seemed to many party members that the movement was developing so dizzyingly fast that it would take little time to put an end to the capitalism system in Europe. The sharpness of the class confrontation and the aspiration to overthrow the bourgeois power as soon as possible influenced a number of political concepts held at that time.

However, hopes for an imminent victory of the Proletarian Revolution in Europe were not justified. By the turn of 1921 trends had already become apparent indicating a decline in the revolutionary proletarian struggle and the mounting of a counterattack by the bourgeoisie. As a sober and realistic politician, Lenin was the first to point out the need for making a major change in the course of the communist movement and adapting it to the new conditions, according to which the main task would be not the frontal attack on capitalism but laying a systematic siege around its fortress.

At the 3rd Comintern Congress (June-July 1921) Lenin sharply spoke out against the supporters of the "offensive theory," who believed that the communist parties must lead the masses to revolutionary combat regardless of the objective situation. The "offensive theory" was actually an appeal for hurling oneself at the sword drawn by the class enemy. Lenin cautioned that following the "left-wing stupidities" and the "offensive theory" meant dooming the communist movement to its death. Under the existing circumstances what mattered was not the waving of red flags or superrevolutionary appeals but strengthening the positions of the working class and achieving real results in its struggle in defense of its basic interests. Lenin focused the attention of the communist parties on the task of winning over on the side of the party members the majority of the working class and the broad toiling masses.

In the course of the uncompromising struggle against left-sectarian elements and for a new political orientation, Lenin was actively supported at the congress by K. Tsetkin, O. Kuusinen, V. Kolarov, B. Smeral and other communists. The turn made by the Comintern in 1921 coincided with the adoption of the NEP in Soviet Russia. Naturally, however, it was caused by changes in the world situation. "Lenin," K. Tsetkin said later, "was never the prisoner of his own formulas. He never allowed his actions to be bound even by his own previous formulations. In the course of the live development of theory and practice, he was always ready to revise his conclusions and never subordinated the forces which created life to the power of dead letters." Therefore, the Leninist stage in the activities of the Comintern was characterized by the aspiration of the leading authorities—the Comintern Executive Committee and its Presidium—to structure their policy on the basis of the accurate knowledge of the deployment of class forces and the various opportunities provided by the existing circumstances and the changes occurring in the social mentality of the broad masses. Lenin and his supporters daringly formulated new decisions, fearlessly rejecting obsolete concepts and finding new ways of struggle and ways of involving the masses in it.

The Leninist understanding of the ties between the party and the masses was manifested in the policy of the United Workers Front, which was formulated by the Comintern by the end of the 1921-1922 period and was

thoroughly analyzed at its 4th Congress (November-December 1922). The line which was adopted as a base in the struggle for unity of action among the individual detachments of the working class and its organizations was the embryo of the new concept in the development of the revolutionary process in capitalist countries: the path which lied ahead and which would mobilize the masses, goes through solving the transitional problems of the stage and the development of a nationwide struggle against the onslaught mounted by capitalism, reaction and fascism. The Comintern raised the slogan of a worker and worker-peasant government as an alternative to a bourgeois government, aimed at the further advance of the revolutionary forces.

The international communist movement, based on unified ideological and theoretical positions, was presented in Lenin's concept also as a comprehensive movement, steadily developing, with its own features and national specifics according to the country. Consequently, the Comintern was considered in this dialectical unity both as an alliance of different parties and as a single global party. The activities of the Comintern and its Executive Committee and apparatus were determined by the development and requirements of the communist movement as a whole. At the same time, its distinguishing features were also defined by the functional methods of this organization, its external and internal relations system and its centralized management.

At Comintern fora all communist parties participated in the collective interpretation of the situation and in discussing long-term and current problems, jointly assuming responsibility for decisions. During the Leninist period of the Comintern, such discussions were characterized by their democratic nature, open defense of views and the aspiration jointly to find answers to the pressing problems, taking into consideration specific historical conditions, national features and traditions. Arguments were solved by the Comintern on the basis of democratic centralism, i.e., by majority vote following the debates ended. As a rule, efforts were made to achieve complete reciprocal understanding and to reach decisions which would satisfy the supporters of the different approaches. If practical differences could not be eliminated, a compromise decision was adopted on the basis of items on which agreement existed. One of the vivid examples of such compromise was the agreements which were concluded, with Lenin's participation, during the proceedings of the 3rd Comintern Congress, between the majority and the minority of the United Communist Party of Germany.

Naturally, a number of Comintern concepts displayed excessive "universality." At that time, however, this did not mean a deliberate neglect of the specific conditions of the struggle waged by the working class in the individual countries. Nonetheless, this was more due to the insufficient maturity of the communist parties which, at that time, had still not mastered the art of finding decisions independently, and most consistent with the

conditions of their own countries. The concern shown by Lenin for following a democratic procedure in the formulation of resolutions by the Comintern and showing respect for the views and the contribution of each individual party to the common project provided the most favorable atmosphere for invariably combining international concepts with political conclusions which would take into consideration individual and specific features. Such problems as well require additional study by our historians, for they contain one of the "secrets" of the flexibility and efficiency of the Leninist communist policy.

Lenin was able to rally and unite in the solution of the most important political problems all the most active and capable leaders of the international communist movement. This also applies to the leaders of the RKP(b) who were assigned by the Leninist Central Committee to work in the Comintern. G.Ye. Zinovyev, N.I. Bukharin and K.B. Radek played a significant role in the formulation and implementation of the political stipulations of the IKKI. Although they differed with Lenin on a number of issues, at that time this was not considered an insurmountable obstacle in the formulation of a common Marxist-Leninist political line. As the most experienced and mature party in the Comintern, the RKP(b) played a tremendous positive role in its activities, as was acknowledged by all communist parties.

In subsequent stages in its history, the Comintern emphasized its support of the Leninist ideas and traditions. However, the death of the leader of the international communist movement was an irrecoverable loss for the Comintern as well. Subsequently, many of the essential concepts of the Leninist doctrine were, in our view, dogmatized and distorted, thus gravely weakening the revolutionary-transforming power of Marxist theory. A comparison between the first sharp turn in the international situation, related to the relative stabilization of capitalization, and the study of the situation which was made by the Comintern at its 5th congress (June-July 1924) indicates that already then a certain alienation had become apparent between political evaluations and reality. The congress proceeded from the view that a time for new revolutionary action was developing in the world; life proved that this was a mistake.

Starting with 1925, in formulating assessments concerning the stabilization of capitalism, the Comintern reached a number of important conclusions on the intensification of its contradictions and the overall crisis in the capitalist system. Although the problem of Comintern policy at that time has been insufficiently studied as yet, it is obvious that these conclusions were of a direct and simplistic nature. The period of decline of capitalism was conceived as a period during which the possibilities of the development of that system had become essentially exhausted, including that of its production forces. Thus, until the autumn of 1926, as chairman of the Comintern Executive Committee, Zinovyev, together with Stalin, repeatedly emphasized

that capitalist stabilization is developing on the basis of rotten and weak foundations and that each step in this process also meant that the revolution was approaching. The complex dialectics of the development of capitalist contradictions was actually reduced to the axiomatic assertion that any progress made by capitalism also meant progress toward its doom. Each class conflict within the capitalist world was gauged according to the same system.

Trotsky assumed one of the extreme views. He said that capitalism was unable to develop its production forces further and that the economic upsurge which was being noted was the stagnation of such forces, with fluctuations on their upper and lower levels. Among the leaders of the Comintern in the second half of the 1920s, it was Bukharin who assessed the situation and development trends more realistically. However, in his study as well one could feel a certain underestimating of the viability of capitalism and its adaptability to the new conditions.

It was accordingly that revolutionary possibilities of the worker and national-liberation movements were overestimated. At that time the view which prevailed in the Comintern and the communist parties was that the national bourgeoisie in the colonies and dependent countries had definitively taken the side of imperialism and could not play a positive role in the anti-imperialist struggle. Stalin was particularly active in promoting this concept. Instead of the implementation of the Leninist slogan of establishing a united anti-imperialist front, he demanded that the strike be aimed at the national bourgeoisie and proclaimed the slogan of the hegemony of the proletariat as the basic prerequisite for liberation from imperialism. This stipulation subsequently became part of the resolutions of the 6th Comintern Congress (July-September 1928). It not only sharply reduced the scope of communist policy in the national liberation movement but also provided an erroneous projection. In this connection, exaggerated strategic objectives were set to the communist parties.

On repeated occasions, the Comintern accepted a purely communist party platform as the line which would be adopted by the masses immediately as their own; efforts were made to promote cooperation with social democratic workers providing that they convert to systematically revolutionary positions and break with the organizations to which they belonged. As a rule, such attempts failed. It would be wrong to depict matters as though sectarian-dogmatic errors were always imposed upon the communist parties "from above," by the leadership of the Comintern. Matters were much more complex. Strong left-wing-sectarian moods existed at the "lower strata" as well, in the communist parties and the revolutionary labor movement itself. They could be explained by a number of reasons, such as the influence of petit-bourgeois revolutionism, feelings of revolutionary romanticism, simplistic concepts of the ways of the class struggle, and so on. In frequent cases the IKKI was subjected to heavy pressure by sectarian moods "from

below" and yielded to them. Even in adopting political resolutions which condemned leftist deviations, the IKKI itself frequently pulled toward the "left."

By the end of the 1920s and beginning of 1930s the view on the prospects of international development was formulated by the Comintern under the influence of Stalin and the "left-wing" in a number of communist parties, one-sidedly: a new round of revolution and wars was approaching. In our view, this was a manifestation of feelings of impatience and expectation of a new revolutionary wave. Historians are as yet to study the internal life and spiritual atmosphere which developed at that time in the leading Comintern agencies. They must answer, in particular, the question of why the stubborn struggle waged by the Comintern for strengthening the communist vanguard and surmounting the influence of opportunistic, petit-bourgeois and sectarian-adventuristic views and moods led not only to the ideological and political tempering of the cadres of communist parties but also to the manifestation of a dogmatic ossification in theory and politics. The reason for which efforts to look at the development of events more soberly and realistically triggered opposition and even accusations of a trend toward opportunism and rejection of revolutionary prospects is a different matter. The sectarian-dogmatic concepts were manifested most emphatically at that time on matters of the unified workers front and relations with the social democrats. As we know, Lenin had given a rather sharp assessment of the role which the social democrats had played during the period of revolutionary upsurge of 1919-1920. The appearance of the Comintern itself was related to the process of the separation of the revolutionary trend within the proletarian movement from social reformism. At that time the right-wing and centrist social democratic leaders, following the slogans of "pure democracy," actually set up, together with the bourgeoisie, a line of defense against the rising proletarian revolution. Under the changed circumstances, with the conversion of the Comintern to a policy of united worker front, the attitude of the communist parties toward the social democrats were defined by a number of new aspects. Without interrupting the ideological struggle against social reformism, in accordance with Lenin's behests the communists had to find ways of approaching social democratic workers in order to organize the joint struggle against the capitalist onslaught.

Extremely interesting and important in that sense were Lenin's statements, as quoted by Zinovyev on 4 December 1921, at a meeting of the IKKI, expressed by Lenin in the formulation of the tactics of the single front: "Some worker strata which are today participating perhaps for the first time in political life, strata which have always existed, and which now, by virtue of the overall situation become involved in politics, must outlive their reformist illusions. On the basis of their own experience they must try the path offered to them by the reformists and which are new to them." Lenin thus believed that the labor movement in the capitalist countries had to

experience, to a greater or lesser extent, personally, the ways offered by the social reformists. How should the communists react to such a possibility? Lenin answered this question as well. In 1922 he wrote about the few chances for a "peaceful evolution of capitalism toward the new system something which, as communists, do not believe very much but to which we must give our help...." (op. cit., vol 44, p 407). This Leninist view rejected the artificial aggravation of the confrontation with the social democratic organizations in the struggle against the capitalism onslaught. Furthermore, we can conclude from Lenin's words that he ascribed prime significance to raising the masses in the spirit of joint actions.

In the period of relative stabilization of capitalism, the task of organizing a united front became even more important. Unfortunately, the Leninist ideas of developing a united front were not implemented (not to mention further intensified) for a variety of reasons, such as the opposition of the right-wing social democratic leadership, which promoted a policy of class cooperation with the bourgeoisie, as well as the sectarian errors allowed by the communists in the implementation of such tactics. By the turn of 1924 Zinovyev and Stalin, who shared the left-sectarian moods which existed in a number of communist parties, presented a formula which essentially reduced the entire content of the united front only to a maneuver aimed at exposing the social democrats which were to be the target of the main strike. Soon afterwards, such a view on the social democrats described them as the "third bourgeois party," as the twin, the wing of fascism. The formula of "social fascism" became a major obstacle in the struggle for unity of action within the working class and facilitated the right-wing social democratic leaders to sabotage the united front.

The slogan of "class against class" which was thought up by the Comintern and the communist parties as a slogan of the unification of the entire working class against the bourgeoisie, in practical terms assumed a sectarian content. It was reduced to intensifying the attacks on the social democrats and organizing worker actions without the participation of the social democrats and the reformist trade unions. The united front was conceived only as unity of action by the workers on the lower level, also directed against social democratic organizations. The leftist groups of the social democrats were considered the most dangerous enemies of the communists in the labor movement.

Other weaknesses and errors in Comintern and communist party policies of that time could be noted. The ways of development of the revolution in the various types of countries were defined schematically. The possibility was denied of transitional stages in the advanced capitalist countries. General democratic tasks, immediate partial demands and the humanistic ideals of socialism were underestimated. The fear was expressed that such

requirements and tasks could draw the proletariat away from the struggle for class interests. These errors, naturally, could not fail to influence the efficiency of communist policy.

Let us also note the fact that in the history of the Comintern of the end of the 1920s and start of the 1930s, which has been as yet studied very poorly, the "cleansing" of Comintern ranks from elements and groups which, at that time, was described as "rightist" and "conciliationists" played a particular role. We believe that the content and results of this "purge" should be reassessed on the basis of a most thorough study of documents and facts. In this case the campaign mounted by Stalin against those who could turn out to be supporters of Bukharin also exerted a certain influence.

In looking at the reasons for the negative phenomena in Comintern activities, we must take into consideration the conditions of the class struggle at that time, the confrontation between the USSR and the forces of imperialism and the aspiration which was relatively widespread within the communist parties of marching toward the objective along the straight and most radical and, as was assumed them, the fastest way. The left-wing-sectarian concepts gained a further impetus under the conditions of the aggravation of the class struggle during the 1929-1933 global economic crisis out of which, according to the communists, capitalism would be hardly able to come out. Under those circumstances a trend gathered strength toward converting the Comintern into an organization with a high degree of centralization, an authority which would efficiently direct all sections operating under a great variety of circumstances. Thus, the correlation between centralism and the democratic principles in IKKI activities changed in favor of excessive centralization, which restricted the political maneuverability of the communist parties and hindered their prompt reacting to fast changes in the circumstances and frequently also led to a passive waiting for directives issued by the center.

Development proceeded in a very contradictory manner. On the one hand, international unity within the communist movement increased, and the spirit of solidarity and comradeship, mutual aid and, particularly, support of party cadres working clandestinely, hit by the class enemy, strengthened. Increasingly, communists in different countries realized the leading role of the Soviet Union in the struggle for the cause of socialism throughout the earth.

On the other hand, the methods used in discussing ideological and political problems within the Comintern, which had been established by Lenin, began to be violated. In 1928-1929, particularly in connection with the removal of Bukharin from Comintern work, increasingly arguments within the IKKI began to be settled by expelling from the communist movement individuals who disagreed with one concept or another, as formulated by Stalin. It was only with his permission, as

confirmed by documents, that the Comintern leadership could take any given political step. Debates which, in the past, were extensive became considerably more restricted and limited, frequently determined by a pre-established formula. General political circumstances were reduced to stereotypes. Just about all complex processes occurring in the bourgeois camp and in the social reformist movement were simply rated as a step toward fascism, which influenced the definition of the specific objectives of the anti-fascist struggle. In turn, this struggle was identified with that of the overthrow of the capitalist system, which prevented the concentration of efforts aimed against fascism which was rushing to gain power. Any more or less major event in the class struggle was considered a symptom of the ripening of a revolutionary crisis, while as a rule efforts were made to explain failures of communist parties with a single reason: their falling behind the allegedly tempestuously growing revolutionary moods of the masses. A negative role was played by the letter which Stalin sent in 1931 to the editors of the journal PROLETARSKAYA REVOLYUTSIYA, in which the experience of bolshevism was absolutized and pitted against that of other revolutionary parties. All of this marked a serious departure from many basic aspects of the Leninist concept of the international communist movement.

At that time the Comintern and the communist parties were engaged in extensive and intensive work to promote the ideological-political and organizational strengthening of their ranks. Through their joint efforts Trotskyism, which threatened to lead the communist movement along a path of adventurism, was routed; powerful international campaigns of proletarian solidarity were mounted defense of the Chinese revolution, for saving Sacco and Vanzetti, and so on. The Comintern led the masses in the struggle against the capitalist onslaught and the threat of war and in support of the Soviet Union.

In the course of the class battles and the mass movements the communists gained combat experience, combining it with extensive internationalist approach to the solution of major political problems. An entire galaxy of leaders of the communist movement was trained, people who had profound theoretical knowledge and tremendous political experience. Comintern activities helped the progressive segment of the working class throughout the world to retain its high combat spirit, engage in propaganda among the masses and gain a number of new combat positions. As a whole, at that time the opportunities which were available to the communist movement were not realized entirely or used because of sectarian-dogmatic errors.

A new qualitative shift in the deployment of class forces in the world arena appeared in the first half of the 1930s as a result of the consequences of the global economic crisis, the onslaught of imperialist reaction and fascism and the increased threat of war. Priority was given to

anti-fascist general democratic tasks. At that time, however, communists, social democrats and democratic forces were unable to unite in order jointly to block the path of fascism. Instead of drafting a common platform, which would be acceptable for purposes of rallying all anti-fascist forces, the Comintern charted a course of outstripping the onslaught of fascism with the help of socialist revolutions. The realization of the need for a change in Comintern and communist party policies came belatedly. In this case the initiative was manifested both from below—by the communist parties (particularly those of France, Spain and Italy), as well as from above, from the Comintern leadership, which was assumed by G. Dimitrov, the hero of the Leipzig trial.

Life demanded a new tactical and strategic orientation and changes in the methods of activity of the Comintern. In developing the new approaches, G. Dimitrov relied on the support of noted leaders of the communist movement, such as M. Thorez, P. Togliatti, W. Pieck, K. Gottwald, O. Kuusinen and D.Z. Manuilskiy. His suggestions were approved by the VKP(b) Central Committee Politburo, which instructed the delegation representing the VKP(b) to the IKKI to support the line according to which, based on the general Comintern concepts, the communist parties could independently solve their political and tactical problems and for the center of the daily leadership to be systematically shifted to the grass roots.

Thorough studies have been made in Soviet publications of the significance of the 7th Comintern Congress (July-August 1935) in formulating the policy of the united labor and broad popular fronts, and the policy of the struggle for the overthrow of fascist dictatorships and establishing popular front systems or systems of an anti-fascist-democratic nature, similar to them. This policy created the most favorable opportunities for cooperation and joint action between communist and social democratic parties and all revolutionary and democratic forces. Communist policy was focused on the formulation of general democratic and humanistic objectives for safeguarding peace, opposing fascism and struggling for social progress.

The decisions of the congress, adopted under the conditions of the strengthening of the cult of Stalin's personality, but which had actually rejected (although without open criticism) a number of Stalin's sectarian dogmas, essentially restored and developed further the Leninist concepts. They marked a major theoretical breakthrough and opened a new broadest possible field for political practice. They confirmed the great ideological and theoretical potential of the communist movement and its increased maturity.

The implementation of the policy of anti-fascist unity and unification of anti-war forces, consistent with the specific historical conditions, marked, as a whole, the completion of the process of establishing the communist parties as parties of a new type. Despite the harm caused

as a result of dogmatic concepts, within and with the help of the Comintern the communist parties reached high ideological and political maturity.

Under circumstances in which the threat of war was increasingly worsening, the Comintern deemed supporting the first socialist state in the world a particularly important task, realizing that it was precisely that state that was the main bulwark for socialism throughout the world and that the destinies of the entire international revolutionary movement and the cause of peace and progress were inseparably linked with those of the USSR. The interconnection between the Soviet Union and the Comintern was based on a coincidence of the class interests of the land of the soviets and the basic class interests of the working people in the capitalist countries.

Under those historical circumstances, however, the new strategy was not implemented systematically and to the end for a number of reasons. The opposition of the class enemy, the reaction of the right-wing socialist leadership, which continued to pursue its anti-communist policy, the insufficient political experience of the masses themselves, some errors which were made due to the inability entirely to eliminate the influence of dogmatism and sectarianism, and the adverse effect which Stalinist methods had on the life of the Comintern and the communist parties played their role in this case.

The resolutions of the 7th Comintern Congress on granting the communist parties greater political independence proved to be inapplicable under the conditions of the cult of personality. Furthermore, internal party democracy within the leading authorities of the IKKI continued to be restricted; Stalin's statements were considered unappealable, as being the final truth. In a complex situation, in which the threat of war increased, the atmosphere of suspicion intensified. Henceforth the fate and life itself of the heads of many communist parties depended on Stalin's views and personal dislikes. The campaign of terror which was launched by the end of the 1930s in the Soviet Union, aimed at the Leninist party cadres, directly affected the Comintern, including the leading cadres of the communist parties in Austria, Hungary, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Finland, Estonia, Yugoslavia and other countries. Many communists-political exiles who had found shelter in the USSR shared the bitter fate of the victims of the Stalin-Yezhov-Beria arbitrariness.

We know that in a number of cases G. Dimitrov, the IKKI general secretary, interceded for the comrades of whose innocence he was convinced. Sometimes this intervention was successful but, most frequently, the Comintern was unable to protect them from Stalinist terrorism. All of this also affected Comintern policy and relations with other political forces. The disbanding of the IKKI Presidium on the basis of false information that it had become "polluted," instigated by provocateurs in the Polish Communist Party, followed by the detention of its leadership, was not only a gross violation

of statutory Comintern regulations but also meant that essentially there was political agreement with this crime. This decision dealt a heavy blow at the Polish labor movement at a time when the threat of Hitlerite aggression was hanging over the country.

Such tragic events in Comintern history, which we have no right to suppress, were in a state of crying contradiction with the main trend in the development of the communist movement: the policy of unity among all revolutionary and democratic forces, including the movement for solidarity with republican Spain and in the struggle against fascism and the threat of war.

It is our view that the Comintern Executive Committee was unable to display its ideological-political autonomy, weakened as it was by the consequences of Stalin's arbitrary behavior, in connection with the conclusion of the Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact of 1939. As we know, this forced foreign policy step taken by the Soviet Union triggered major confusion in the ranks of the International Communist Movement. In itself, it did not require in the least of the Comintern and the communist parties to weaken the struggle against fascism. However, tactical considerations of depriving Hitler of any reason for violating the 1939 treaty, under the conditions of the Comintern's following too closely the foreign policy actions of the USSR, caused definite damage to the anti-fascist policy pursued by the communists. The term "fascism," applicable to Hitlerite Germany, disappeared from Comintern documents published during that period, and the propaganda blow was aimed at imperialism as a whole, emphasizing the particular threat of Anglo-French imperialism. The Comintern began to correct this mistake gradually only after the fall of France and the attack of Yugoslavia by Hitlerite Germany.

The assessment itself which the Comintern gave to the nature of World War II, which had broken out, as being strictly imperialist on both sides, did not properly take into consideration the particular danger of the fascist bloc and ignored the national liberation anti-fascist trends which existed in that war. It was precisely these trends that became determining with the outbreak of the Great Patriotic War waged by the Soviet people.

After the USSR was attacked by Hitlerite Germany, the Comintern dedicated its forces to mobilizing the communists and all anti-fascists in the struggle for the defeat of the fascist enslavers and for the freedom and independence of the peoples. The communist parties marched in the front ranks of the struggle for liberation, setting examples of heroism and self-sacrifice. They played the role of the cementing and guiding force of the resistance movement. The policy of anti-fascist unity, formulated by the Comintern, became the policy of the broadest possible fighting masses. Under World War II conditions the activities of a single world center, which would formulate fundamental political concepts applicable to all communist parties became increasingly difficult.

Even before that, in the course of its development, the communist movement had been gradually going beyond the organizational framework of the Comintern. By the end of the 1930s this framework was increasingly becoming an obstacle to the political flexibility and activeness of the communist parties. At this point the need for greater autonomy of the communist parties led to the conclusion that this form of organization had definitively outlived its usefulness. The Comintern was disbanded in the summer of 1943.

The organizational forms of the 3rd International are now history. However, the experience of the Comintern, both positive and negative, has not turned to ashes. Its main features, which require a profound study, are not a matter of indifference to the party members to this day. On the contrary, the study of this experience would enable us to understand better the Leninist concept of the communist movement and, consequently, will serve the cause of its renovation and strengthening. Particularly important here are aspects of Comintern history in which the trend of steadily broadening the realm of activities of the communists were manifested in their entire complexity, from the battles for the class interests of the proletariat to the organic combination of the struggle for socialism with the struggle for democracy, against war and for general humanistic ideals. This experience appears relevant and instructive to this day, when saving mankind from the threat of thermonuclear destruction has the highest priority compared to any other task, and when the ability to formulate a policy which would rally the opponents of war and, for the sake of this objective, rally the broadest possible masses, peoples and countries, assumes exceptional importance.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

1956, 1965: Lessons of Uncompleted Turns
180200161 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10,
Jul 88 (signed to press 6 Jul 88) pp 116-120

[Article by Ye. Zubkova entitled: "1956, 1965: Lessons of Uncompleted Turns.]

[Text] The journal VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS has launched a debate on "The Communist Party Between the 20th and 27th Congresses." Issue No 4 for 1988 carries two articles: "On Some Lessons of the Historical Experience In the Activities of the CPSU From the Second Half of the 1950s to the First Half of the 1980s" by V. Glotov, and "Experience and Lessons of the Unfinished Turns in 1956 and 1965" by Ye. Zubkova. These articles discuss topical problems of party activities from the second half of the 1950s to the start of the 1980s and make an attempt to interpret the reasons for negative phenomena and the logic governing the establishment of the

obstruction mechanism. The study of all of these problems is of both scientific and practical interest. The following is said on the experience of party history described in the article by Ye. Zubkova:

If we approach the development of the historical process on a somewhat conventional basis, it would turn out to be concentrated in a few critical and turning points which symbolize the start of a new stage in the country's life. The events of 1956 and 1965 were the landmarks of these turns. They remained unfinished but a great deal of their experience and the lessons of those years could indicate answers to current problems and, in the final account, work for perestroika.

The 1956 turn developed from the overall economic and political situation which was established in the country by the turn of the 1950s. The postwar restoration period had been completed. This was confirmed not only by the indicators of development of the national economy but also the growth of the peaceful orientation of social life. A certain reassessment of values occurred, including of incentives and factors for the enhancement of labor activeness. The principle of working at all costs was increasingly losing its justification (consequences of the war, difficulties of rebuilding, and so on). The more time passed since the end of the war the more clearly the contemporaries developed the understanding that this should also be accompanied by privations in daily life and the stress of toil, triggered in the past by the extreme circumstances of the war: "The war has ended, we experienced all of its difficulties and we perfectly well know that a period of peaceful construction has begun. How long should we stand by our arms?" It was thus that the mass consciousness essentially noted one of the turning points in the history of Soviet society. Its characteristic feature was the need to turn to social programs and, essentially, to the proper implementation of the fundamental economic law of socialism. Nonetheless, the mechanism which would make possible the specific effect of this law under the conditions of the development of socialism on its own basis was as yet to be identified and utilized. The need for research, based on interpreted contradictions within reality, was becoming increasingly pressing.

"Who is to blame?" It was precisely this question and put precisely in this manner that most frequently paralleled the search for the reasons for the existence of this social malady. Therefore, this ill assumed a strictly personified form while the problem of responsibility, in general, was reduced to determining the circle of the immediate "culprits" for all difficulties, breakdowns and hardships. Such an interpretation provided favorable grounds for the organization of new campaigns to identify the "saboteurs" and "enemies," and to fabricate the next "cases." The experience gained in the class struggle was turned into the only source which would provided answers to all problems of reality.

Absolutizing, which makes an accurate but limited way of action universal, has always been a basis for errors. The growth of the relative aspects of socialist practices into absolute ones played its role also in the development of the concept of socialism which took shape essentially as early as the 1930s. According to this concept, socialism was increasingly conceived as a steadily advancing and rather noncontradictory progress made by society toward the peaks of communism. This theory was based on the concepts which had developed in the first postrevolutionary years, according to which all difficulties in building socialism were explained by the lack of experience and sufficient historical prerequisites and that in the course of time the problems of economic and social building will be much simpler to solve. According to that theory, real socialism became the simple sum of "vestiges of the past" and "shoots of the future." The former were to be uprooted and the second comprehensively supported and developed. The ideal and simplified image of socialism entered theory and largely began to determine social practice which was to copy it, while anything which did not fit this structure was classified as "alien," "vestigial" and "not ours." Frozen commodity-monetary relations, truncated cost accounting and virtually total centralization of management and many others were all the result of the schematic approach adopted to reality, in which the ideal picture pushed the real world back. Whenever the actual state of socialism indicated some faults of the system which had been developed, the ideal image was slightly amended. In this case the question always was not one of **quality** than of the **extent** of the required changes. The trend of the introduced amendments (in theory and practice) was determined on the basis of the identification of the bottlenecks, i.e., of the problems which were on the surface, which were considered as primary. Hence the aspiration to follow a single chosen direction with the help of individual instruments and partial corrections.

The search for the new approach, based on the rejection of the principle of "one-time actions" and the conversion to comprehensive programs for social renovation was to take a rather long time and, eventually, lead to the concept of today's perestroika. By the turn of the 1950s the intensification of this search was held back by the circumstances under which it had been formulated. Initially it was as though its trend was given and limited by rather narrow boundaries. These boundaries were defined by authoritarianism. Its pressure fettered the development of social thinking the purpose of which was to seek ways of solving the contradictions in social life. Stalin's name was frequently used as a shield, as the supreme argument which was the final word in any dispute and which decided the outcome of any debate. Occasionally the position held by the opponent was not simply condemned but subjected to mandatory crushing with a subsequent prohibition of the right to exist. As a result, a seemingly paradoxical situation was developing in the society: the need for change gradually began to be

felt although the people at that time tried stubbornly to bypass contemporary problems. The only way out of this vicious circle was a course toward extensive democratization of society.

Isolated attempts to make the practice of political and economic management "face the people," promote local initiative (a program for the enhancement of the people's well-being was announced, the diktat of the center in agricultural production was somewhat eased, steps to accelerate scientific and technical progress were earmarked, a struggle against bureaucratism was initiated, etc.) took place in the 1953-1955 period. Nonetheless, the decisions made during that time failed to yield expected results. Some of them did not go beyond the slogan stage (such as the task of ensuring a sharp upsurge in the production of consumer goods in 2 or 3 years), and some turned into the latest campaign (such as the struggle for reducing and lowering the cost of the state apparatus). Awareness of the depth of change on the basis of which the elimination of obsolete social structures had to take place came later and was largely related to the use of the experience gained in 1953-1955.

It was the 20th Party Congress that marked the beginning of decisive changes in the foundations for the organization of social life. At that time the alternative was as follows: "...Either the party will condemn the errors and distortions which had been allowed to occur during the cult of J.V. Stalin's personality and reject the methods of party and state leadership which were hindering progress, or else the forces which were clinging to the old methods and which opposed anything that was new and creative would gain the upper hand" ("*XXII Syezd Kommunisticheskoy Partii Sovetskogo Soyuzo. Stenograficheskiy Otchet. 17-31 Oktyabrya 1961 G.*" [22nd CPSU Congress. Minutes, 17-31 October 1961]. Vol I, Moscow, 1962, p 102). Consequently, the alternative assumed an essentially **political** nature.

The process of change which, in the 1950s, affected a variety of areas of social life, began above all with the restoration of the democratic foundations for party activities, the Leninist standards of party life and collective leadership. At the same time, the activities of soviets, trade unions and the Komsomol were enhanced and their independence and initiative began to broaden. The atmosphere of quest, which was born at the 20th Congress, and which emancipated social thinking and promoted the development of new ideas and approaches, provided favorable grounds for encouragement of the creative process in science and the arts.

The trend of democratization of social life was suitably extended to the economy as well. Many of the economic changes of the second half of the 1950s and beginning of 1960s were intended to solve the problem of democratization of management: broadening the economic rights of Union republics by transferring to them jurisdiction over problems which were previously solved by the center; taking management closer to the "grass roots;"

reducing the administrative machinery, etc. The feature of all economic reorganizations at that time was that the "political determinism" of the 1956 turn greatly influenced their development. Efforts were made to solve many of the economic problems of that time through the use of political ways and means. At that point the party-mindedness of an economic manager was determined by his attitude toward planting corn while the growth of harvests was made directly dependent on the level of political consciousness. Problems of developing the virgin lands and undertaking construction in Siberia were solved less through economic means than on the basis of the use of the tried methods of appealing to conscientiousness, enthusiasm and dedication. The movement for communist labor—the noteworthy event of that time—was born above all on the crest of the wave of political upsurge and on the basis of conscientiousness and enthusiasm. Meanwhile, the initial attempts truly to link enthusiasm to economic interest (the start of the brigade contracting method) was conceived essentially as a manifestation of greed, money grubbing and almost as economic capitalism.

It appears that the image of communism which was drawn in the minds of the people and the actual embodiment of the material and technical foundations of which had been promised to occur in 20 years, had a much greater influence on economic and social policy between the end of the 1950s and beginning of the 1960s compared to the study of the specific economic situation and its problems. It was precisely by virtue of this that efforts to gain time during that period ended, all in all, in failure. Nonetheless, to a great extent they contributed to the creation of the type of atmosphere which encouraged daring and the aspiration to go beyond what was considered possible. Mankind's breakthrough into space was an event intrinsically linked to that age.

The successful solution of priority scientific and technical problems only concealed the shortcomings of "ordinary economics." Research was conducted in that area as well. In general, its vector was accurate: rejecting excessive centralization, expanding economic autonomy, making use of prices, profits, credits and other economic instruments of economic practice, converting to cost accounting relations among enterprises, etc. These problems were discussed in the course of the economic debates which were initiated as early as the mid 1950s, abating or intensifying, and continuing throughout the next decade. This gradually laid the basic concepts for the future economic reform. Equally important was the fact that these debates contributed to shaping economic thinking and prepared public opinion for the forthcoming changes. The people learned how to see the shortcomings in the economic management system behind the "carelessness" of individual economic managers and the imperfection of the overall economic mechanism. As time passed, however, the range of the discussions which, initially, had covered a wide spectrum of economic problems, narrowed further and further, initially being reduced to an argument on indicators

to be used in assessing enterprise activities and, later, to the main indicator, finally assuming a clearly manifested anti-gross output nature. Therefore, the starting opportunities of the economic reform were lowered. This was largely related to changes in the overall political situation in the country toward the end of the 1950s.

The events of 1957-1958 were conceived by some of their contemporaries as a sharp turn toward the development of the democratic process and a certain retreat from the course charted at the 20th Congress. The symptoms of this retreat were accurately seen in the reduced range of criticism, the rebirth of the dogmatically understood principle of "unity of thought," and changes in the attitude toward the truth of the past and the present. In its time, the condemnation of the cult of personality gave a major impetus to the process of social renovation. In order for this process to develop further it was necessary not only to master the lessons of the past but also steadily and critically to interpret the present and to analyze current successes and errors. It is one thing daringly to point out someone else's errors (which, on some occasions, truly requires courage) but something entirely different to have the courage to acknowledge one's own, i.e., to share the responsibility. Without the latter it is impossible to earn the full trust of the people in the vanguard and in the authority of the leadership, a trust on which the ties between the party and the masses is based. At that time, in 1957, the question of responsibility for the past was virtually closed and completed with the condemnation of "anti-party groups." The result was that political leadership at that time was placed outside the bounds of criticism.

As long as the process of social renovation has not become irreversible, fluctuations and even retreats in its development are, in a certain sense, understandable, for they are the natural reflection of the struggle between supporters and opponents of change. The possibility of "revenge" on the part of the later made the turning process "vulnerable," and subject to the influence of new factors, internal or external. We believe that the external factor, the international context, played a major role in the outcome of the 1956 turn (and, subsequently, the turn in the mid-1960s). After the war, following the appearance of the global socialist system, for the first time in virtually our entire history, we were given the opportunity not only to follow our way but to correlate our own experience in building and developing socialism with that of the fraternal countries. We acquired the opportunity of comparing and choosing. This created major prerequisites for a new solution of domestic problems, based on rejecting the absolutizing of anyone's socialist practice and dogmatizing the theory of socialism. At that time this opportunity was not used to the necessary extent. One of the reasons for this was the 1956 Hungarian crisis.

Tasks related to the development of criticism were classified as belonging to the "special" periods, the periods of "analysis and clearing," marking the start of

the new "offensive. The "analysis and clearing," which had been initiated in 1953, was already considered accomplished by the end of the decade. The process of democratization, understood more as a **prerequisite** of social renovation rather than its foundation, and its spirit and internally necessary essence, became something like a safety valve which could be opened in full or half-way or else simply shut. This approach greatly hindered the formulation of an essentially new long-term strategy for the country's socioeconomic development, taking into consideration not only the experience of the past but the failures of the present. The political leadership at that time was essentially kept outside the bounds of criticism. It deprived itself of the necessary scope for selecting and evaluating its own practical steps. The one-sided positive evaluation of decisions made at that time, their consideration as having no alternatives and being final (solving a problem once and for all) and the inability to correlate intermediary successes (the initial effect) with the inevitable appearance of new problems could not fail to bring about major faults in economic and political management.

The failure of the *sovnarkhozes* was merely one link in this chain. In the period of preparations for restructuring management, based on the territorial principle, the work of the ministries had been justifiably criticized. Nonetheless, some specialists were quite worried by the planned closing down of the ministries, as a result of which they suggested that at least some ministries be preserved or else that new authorities which would have the functions of formulating the overall policy of sectorial development be created. Some specialists noted the positive aspects of the activities of the future *sovnarkhozes* but expressed fears (which were subsequently confirmed) that such advantages would rapidly wear out and that elements of parochialism would appear. As we know, such assumptions and doubts, as well as suggestions of starting with a series of economic experiments, were ignored. When a decline followed the "upsurge" of the *sovnarkhozes* and the influence of negative trends intensified (parochialism, increased paper chase, loss of long-range prospects of sectorial progress, etc.), these phenomena were not ascribed to the system which was conceived as accurate. The reasons for the breakdowns were sought outside it, for which reason most frequently the subjective interpretation was the unwillingness and inability and sluggishness of economic managers, their inability to manage, etc. To correct the situation was interpreted as making the economic managers work "as they should." Hence the natural return to the old tried way: methods of pressure and *diktat* and, hence, the element of bureaucratic administration.

Special resolutions were passed in the mid-1960s which condemned arbitrariness and bureaucratic administration in the management of the national economy as being major hindrances in its development. At the same time, these resolutions continued the tradition of the 1950s, aimed at seeking ways of improving economic management. The essence and basic trend of the 1965

turn were determined by the economic reform. By then the understanding of the limitations of the practice of isolated corrections and improvements had been entirely realized by the party and society, along with the need to formulate a system of steps, an idea which was clearly sounded at the 23rd Party Congress. By surmounting arbitrary trends in the management of the country, the party approached the problem of ensuring new approaches to management practices, formulating the problem on a scientific basis. The steps which were taken in the mid-1960s, aimed at perfecting the system and principles of economic management, were the most important attempt throughout the postwar period of economic restructuring in accordance with the new requirements of the time. Unlike the preceding efforts, the decisions of the 1960s affected simultaneously several sectors—industry, construction and agriculture. The most essential changes were made in the industrial management system. The first 2 years of work of industrial enterprises on the basis of the new principles yielded considerable national economic results. The enterprises which converted to the new system for planning and stimulating output improved, as a whole, their indicators compared to those which were applying the old system. In the course of time, however, this difference became increasingly less noticeable. As long as a relatively small number of enterprises were working on the basis of the new principles, they were operating in more advantageous circumstances in terms of the channeling of state capital investments and the utilization of their own reserves. As the reform developed, many enterprises which officially followed the old principles adopted individual elements of the new system and thus improved their production indicators. This also indicated that as of then the reform had not developed in depth and had not affected the foundations of the economic mechanism.

The refrain of the most constructive writings on problems of the economic reform at the end of the 1960s was "the reform must not stop." Those fears were not vain: the new economic management system was surrendering one position after another (plan corrections became more frequent, rights of enterprises were curtailed, the *diktat* of the center strengthened, etc.). It was as though the reform had been stopped midway, on the level of the enterprise, without reaching the specific work place, on the one hand, or affecting the management area, on the other. Efforts to promote the reform "from below" merged within a movement for economic experimentation.

Meanwhile, the initial successes in the economic reform, which had given an impetus to creativity "from below" had an entirely different influence on the activities of the central leadership: here they were used as a kind of justification for the "adequacy" of the steps previously taken. As a whole, the development of the change in 1965 was complicated by the constant clash between two trends (let us conventionally describe them as the democratic and the conservative). Whereas the economic

decisions which were made in the second half of the 1960s were actually an extension and intensification of the searching which had taken place in the preceding decade, the political situation after 1964 was all in all conflicting with the basic principles of the democratic course charted by the 20th Party Congress.

To a certain extent, the growth of conservative moods toward the end of the 1960s was stimulated from the outside as well. In the mid-1960s virtually all socialist countries in Europe had undertaken economic reforms similar to ours. The most radical steps had been taken in Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Here the system of mandatory indicators had been abolished almost entirely; the enterprises had been granted sufficiently broad rights in distributing their income, a flexible price system had been introduced, and so on. In Czechoslovakia economic contradictions had become closely interwoven with political ones. The crisis of 1968-1969 was the consequence of the aggravation of such contradictions.

"...There was a need for new radical changes in the society and, naturally, a corresponding political will," was the way M.S. Gorbachev assessed the situation which had developed at that time. "There was a scarcity of both and even a great deal of that which had been decided had remained on paper only, hanging in midair. The pace of our development slowed down significantly." It was because of this that the turn earmarked in the mid-1960s could not achieve its full potential. Essentially, democratic processes found themselves blocked by the forces of bureaucratic conservatism. The 1965 turn, therefore, was unable to carry to its completion the tradition of 1956, although, both logically and historically, it was its extension.

We are faced, therefore, with an internally unified process which, nonetheless, was discrete in its development, a kind of **single turn**, within which the events of 1956 and 1965 are its two sides and two components: the line of democratization of the society and the line of economic perestroika. This discreteness, however, which was complicated by the inconsistency of actions, became one of the reasons for the destruction of the unity, for the failure to make the entire turn. Inconsistency of action at that time did not make it possible to combine the efforts to achieve a restructuring of society "from above" with a sufficient mass movement for social renovation "from below," without which a truly deep change in socialist conditions was impossible. In virtually all cases the start is given "from above," for which reason during the first stage of the process of change the bulk of the work is assumed by the center and the party vanguard. Nonetheless, a change is inconceivable without the participation of the masses and without their support. The nature and scale of such support and participation are a different matter. A certain period of time must pass from understanding and approving steps taken "from above" to the appearance (which is natural) of the type of forms of movement "from below," which would be consistent

with the formulated strategic concept of social renovation. The development of this process is accelerated with the appearance of positive and sufficiently tangible results of the decisions which have been made. It is on this basis that the "phenomenon of trust" in the steps taken by the political leadership appear in the masses, which triggers a sharp increase in activeness "from below." This is a major critical point of any change. It was precisely at this point that major contradictions were noted in the development of the changes in 1956 and 1965. The movement for the extension and intensification of social change "from below" encountered, in this case, a certain passiveness on the part of the "center," where the initial successes were actually accepted as a guarantee of end results, while measures which had been taken earlier were, by virtue of this fact, considered as being "all that was necessary and sufficient."

The ability not only to take practical steps but also to see their immediate and more distant consequences and the constant readiness to solve new problems does not come immediately. However, the acquisition of this skill is a necessary prerequisite for the development of socioeconomic changes.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

National Conference of the BCP

18020016m Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 88 (signed to press 6 Jul 88) pp 121-125

[Article by G. Cherneyko, candidate of philosophical sciences]

[Text] An interested, principle-minded and frank discussion on the activities of the BCP at the present stage of building socialism was held by the delegates representing almost 970,000 Bulgarian communists, at the National Party Conference which took place in Sofia on 28 and 29 January 1988. This was preceded by a mass campaign of accountability and elections, in the course of which more than 230,000 people spoke and more than 130,000 suggestions and critical remarks were submitted. Bearing in mind that the sessions of the conference were telecast and discussed at places of work, schools and homes by all population strata, it is justifiable to say that this was a nationwide debate.

The BCP National Conference took place in an atmosphere of profound change in social development, and a comprehensive restructuring of social life. Having indicated its irreversible nature, the party forum unanimously approved the concept for the further building of socialism in the Bulgarian People's Republic, drafted at the July 1987 BCP Central Committee Plenum. Based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, this concept is a scientific platform for restructuring all areas of social

development—political, economic, social and spiritual. It offers a vision of the future of the renovation: reaching a qualitatively new status of socialist society, making Bulgaria a highly developed and cultured country, upgrading the well-being of the people and creating better material and spiritual conditions for the life of the people. Man has been placed in the center of all changes. He is both the target of restructuring and the decisive factor in its successful implementation.

The new concept of building socialism, it was noted at the conference, is an objective necessity and a timely and accurate answer to the questions which appeared in recent years, when the possibilities of the former model of socialism had already become exhausted. It takes into consideration the specific (internal and external) circumstances in which Bulgaria is developing and is the result of the long search conducted by the party in the areas of theory and practice. As T. Zhivkov said in his introductory speech, the processes taking place in the country and their scale and dynamics would be inconceivable without the perestroika in the Soviet Union.

Having emphasized the close tie between the program for building developed socialism, which was adopted at the 10th BCP Congress (1971) and the concept of the July Central Committee Plenum, the National Party Conference drew the conclusion that the drafting of a new program was necessary, which could be submitted after extensive discussion to the 14th Congress for its consideration.

The conference positively rated the work on the implementation of the resolutions of the 13th BCP Congress. In particular, substantial changes had been made in the power structure, including the Council of Ministers. A number of sectorial and functional ministries and councils had been closed down and new ones of a comprehensive nature, created. New production complexes, economic trusts of a new type and associations had been set up. Municipal and oblast leading party authorities had been elected. The resolution of the BCP Central Committee Politburo on the attributes of power are being implemented. Within the framework of the current 5-year plan preparations were made for converting the national economy to the principles of socialist self-government. The Regulation on Economic Activities and the legal documents related to the comprehensive application of economic regulatory instruments had been approved and enacted starting with the beginning of this year. In accordance with the 1987 National Assembly Declaration, socialist enterprises had begun to be assigned to the labor collectives for purposes of economic management and control, based on specific conditions and the extent of their readiness. The labor collectives and the working people are becoming the "collective owners" and managers of these projects. The entire work is subordinated to the solution of the main problem: converting from power in the name of the people to power by the people themselves.

However, as was noted at the conference, this is merely the start of revolutionary changes. The full implementation of the new model will require making substantial changes in the constitution of the Bulgarian People's Republic.

In developing restructuring in width and depth, the party sets the main trends in its gradual progress and focuses on them its attention. The most important is making society self-governing. This process should include all its areas and all structures and cells within the social system. Particular attention is ascribed to strengthening self-governing organizations and territorial units—oblasts and municipalities. In the course of such activities the functions, rights and obligations are reallocated between state authorities, on the one hand, and self-governing organizations, communities and self-governing agencies, on the other.

The strengthening of the strategic functions of the state and its agencies will be paralleled by surmounting bureaucratic administrative and command methods of economic management in other areas as well. This means a new style of application of the Leninist principle of democratic centralism: a new type of organizational relations will be established between superior and subordinate levels of authority. The self-governing authorities of labor collectives and municipalities will be granted a number of rights and assigned obligations which were previously the prerogative of superior authorities. The higher echelon will concentrate on strategic problems of planning and management.

It was pointed out at the conference that self-government must be developed on the basis of effective democracy. This means, above all, electiveness and replaceability of leading authorities; competition among candidates; periodical accountability submitted by the leading authorities and managers on the work they have done, to the people who have elected them; extensive glasnost and accessibility of information; perfecting the mechanism for the study and consideration of public opinion; the duty of managers publicly to answer questions on the situation in the areas, projects and territorial units they head; and creation of sociopolitical conditions for the development of criticism. It was also pointed out that self-government must take place in a state of dialectical unity with centralism and one-man command wherever this is dictated by the conditions governing the production process and social life.

The task was set of developing a legal system consistent with the principles of self-government. New laws will be drafted and current laws will be improved. Coordination will be achieved in the functioning of the entire legal system. A principle has been proclaimed according to which all labor collectives and territorial units and all management and self-management authorities and all citizens will be equal in the eyes of the law. The functions

and rights of the judiciary will be changed. No interference in their activities of any kind will be tolerated. Judicial control over administrative regulations will be broadened.

The Fatherland Front, the trade unions, the Dimitrov Communist Youth Union and other public organizations and movements are considered organic parts of the self-government system. Along with the application of the principle of voluntary participation, the democratization in setting up their leading authorities and the use of the principle of delegation of authority will be expanded even further. The conference expressed the conviction that in the future as well relations between the BCP and the Bulgarian Agrarian National Union will be based on firm unity and will be consistent with the new processes taking place in the society.

The delegates to the conference considered a mandatory prerequisite for social progress making a radical change in the development of production forces on the basis of the scientific and technical revolution. It was emphasized that this will require a new technological base. The combination of science, information industry and computer technology was defined as the leading criterion for the growth of production forces, technological and structural changes and improved quality of output. The requirement was formulated of optimizing the correlation among mass, serial and individual output in accordance with demand on the domestic and international markets. Priority will be given to small and medium-sized enterprises operating on the basis of the most advanced production and management technologies. The production of power- and material-intensive items and items which pollute the environment will be gradually terminated. The technological restructuring of production forces in agriculture, consumer services and the social area will be accelerated; the task was set of strengthening the material foundations for spiritual life. It was resolved that the technological base of science will outstrip improvements in the technological foundations of the production process.

The plans call for increasing national production forces as a structural component of global production forces and, particularly, the production forces of the socialist community. With the further development and intensification of production and scientific and technical integration with the other socialist countries, the Soviet Union above all, there will be an extensive conversion to establishing direct relations between enterprises and associations and the creation of joint organizations. Integration will be intensified through primarily economic ways and means.

The qualitative restructuring of economic relations and the release of the energy of society must be achieved on the basis of the development and enrichment of ownership relations. Such is one of the main conclusions of the National Party Conference. The unity and indivisibility of socialist ownership in the variety of its forms—state,

cooperative, municipal, group, individual, that of social organizations and associations and mixed ownership, including the one which involves the participation of foreign organizations and individuals, were proclaimed most emphatically.

A key problem in the restructuring of economic relations is granting ownership to labor collectives of socialist property for management and control by them. It is only thus that labor and territorial units will acquire the possibility of exercising their rights, perform their obligations and assume responsibility for their activities.

The purpose of the economic self-management mechanism is to ensure the full manifestation of economic interests as the basic motivation of economic activities, aimed at expanding and improving production. The objective is, with the help of economic, political and legal means, to create real guarantees for the full functioning of national, collective and individual interests and to ensure their development in the same direction.

The new economic management system means the adoption of a new approach to assessing labor activities, based on the quantity and quality of "socially acknowledged results." The organization and payment of wages must be substantially improved. Equalization must be uncompromisingly eliminated. Wage systems which will stimulate labor collectives and individual workers to engage in the efficient production of a variety of qualitative goods in demand will be applied. A three-step rate will be applied in determining the wage size, depending on the creative contribution of the individual to end results. Under the new system no restrictions on individual income will be allowed; wages will have to be truly earned; creative labor, which contributes to social progress, will be paid considerably more than routine work. In this connection, starting with the end of 1988, the wages of engineering-technical and scientific workers, physicians, teachers and other categories of working people will be raised. Salaries to economic managers will be based on the results of the work of the organizations they manage. The piece-rate wage principle will be extensively supported, for it is considered a form of direct tie between the working people and socialist ownership projects.

As in the past, great importance is ascribed to planning as the basic instrument in national economic management. The state must focus its activities on ensuring strategic planning and the labor collectives must independently plan all their activities in accordance with state strategy. The requirement has been formulated of converting from mandatory to standard planning.

A new approach is being adopted on matters of prices and price setting. Gradually, wholesale prices will come closer to world market prices. The price reform will follow a nationwide discussion. The financial mechanism must be radically improved. With the help of the tax system the enterprises will be placed in identical

economic conditions. The restructuring of the banking system is drawing to a close. Commercial banks will convert into banks for commodity producers. It has been deemed necessary to structure economic relations entirely on a contractual basis. The arbitration system is being reorganized. The entire mechanism for self-government in the field of economics will be aimed at using the social, collective and individual interest in the development of scientific and technical progress.

Competitiveness and socialist rivalry in the field of economics will be created through the utilization of economic, legal and other instruments. One such form of competitiveness should be the system of competing for state orders, research and development, loans, capital investments, cadre support, etc.

In order to promote stability, long-term development and reliability in the activities of self-governing units, it was deemed expedient to draft a code for socialist self-governing communities, to be enacted with the start of 1991.

The BCP National Conference codified the pursuit of active and efficient social policy, which is not only a prerequisite for social protection but also a factor for encouraging the social activeness of the individual and the successful implementation of tasks in all areas of social life. Priority will be given to those who work better than others and whose work is more productive. The solution of social problems will be directly related to labor results, to the results of each labor collective and every citizen.

The main trend in active social policy is achieving a new quality of life for the people. This means providing extensive opportunities for the development and creative manifestation of the self-worth of individuals, the satisfaction of complex requirements for a variety of high quality goods and services, substantially improving working and living conditions and medical services, etc.

Another item on the agenda is that of surmounting disproportions between the production of means of production and consumer goods; between the development of the domestic market and services, on the one hand, and the overall development of the economy, on the other; and between commodity stocks and services and population savings. In this connection, increased attention will be paid to cooperation with CEMA-member countries.

In accordance with the adopted regulations, the self-governing commodity producers will be economically and socially responsible for the production of commodities and services and, together with the municipalities and the commercial organizations, for meeting consumer demand.

The conference considered restructuring of spiritual life a major prerequisite for the successful building of a highly developed and cultured society. As was pointed out, above all it is necessary for the people to become the bearer of the new sociopolitical awareness. Every person must have the opportunity to become a comprehensively developed, highly moral and cultured individual and a conscious and active participant in building socialism. Spiritual upsurge is achieved on the basis of the combination among science, culture and education. The party conference called upon the party members to promote a turn in society toward spiritual production.

One of the immediate tasks formulated here was to organize the entire structure of science, culture, education and other areas of spiritual activities on the basis of the principles of self-government and extensive democracy; ensuring conditions for the successful development and maximal utilization of the talent of creative workers and men of science, culture and education; establishing a unified material and technical base and a national creative potential; and efficiently using specific economic rules for the enhancement of spiritual production.

The BCP National Party Conference set specific assignments in ideology as well: it is necessary to shape a high social consciousness among the people and their active attitude toward socialism and a new sociopolitical way of thinking; a favorable ideological and moral climate must be established for creative work and the responsibility of every citizen and each labor collective and territorial unit must be increased. It was particularly emphasized that glasnost and a dialogue on topical problems, a standard of debates and the ability to listen to public opinion and show reciprocal respect must become instruments of ideological activity.

The conference deemed it an urgent matter to make the public education system entirely consistent with the laws and achievements of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution and the dynamically changing requirements governing production and public practice and the entire life of socialist society. The uninterrupted process of education and upgrading skills throughout a person's entire labor career was considered relevant and mandatory.

In the area of the arts the task was set of providing opportunities for people, regardless of the nature of their work and place of residence, to have access to artistic values and for man to be both the object and subject of cultural life. In this connection, the restructuring of the creative associations and organizations into self-governing units, which would structure their work on the basis of the principles of total democracy, is contemplated. The responsibility of the mass information media will be enhanced in covering the processes occurring in society and involving the entire nation in them.

The National Party Conference noted that the dynamic development of the economy is inconceivable without achieving a full consistency with the restructuring of foreign political and economic relations. Bulgaria intends to continue most actively to participate in the shaping and implementation of a coordinated course with the fraternal socialist countries, for peaceful coexistence, prevention of thermonuclear war, solving the global problems of mankind, and establishing an equal dialogue and morality in international affairs. The actions of the Bulgarian People's Republic on the world arena must contribute to the development of a qualitatively new condition of socialism on Bulgarian soil.

On the basis of the essential coincidence of objectives and trends of perestroika in Bulgaria and the Soviet Union, the demand was formulated of raising to a qualitatively new standard Soviet-Bulgarian relations. Great importance is ascribed to the gradual implementation of the long-term program for the development of economic and scientific and technical cooperation between Bulgaria and the USSR for the period until the year 2000, and to the formulation and adoption of a concept in that same area until the year 2005.

In relations among socialist countries, Bulgaria favors manifestations of true comradeship, trust and mutual aid and promoting greater efficiency and dynamism in problems of interaction and in asserting a new model of socialist economic integration. Bulgaria is prepared to contribute to the reorganization of CEMA activities as an organization of a new type and to promoting a closeness among economic mechanisms and establishing a single CEMA market. Great importance is ascribed to the efficient utilization of monetary-credit mechanisms and to a gradual shifting to convertible national currencies.

The BCP spoke out in favor of enhancing cooperation between Bulgaria and the developing countries. Relations with developed capitalist states will be structured on the basis of equality and reciprocal consideration of interests and well-wishing partnership.

The BCP intends to continue to implement active contacts with communist, worker, socialist and other progressive parties and movements, on the basis of its own traditions and possibilities. As a ruling party, it encourages the establishment and enhancement of relations with influential bourgeois-democratic, national and other parties.

The Communist Party is the strike force of perestroika, the initiator, organizer and leader in its direct implementation in all areas of life. As was said at the conference, in order to carry out its functions under the new conditions, it must make radical changes in relations with all elements within the political system and in the style, means and methods of its activities. In implementing its leading role in society, the party retains the right and responsibility for the development and assertion of the general

course of building socialism in its leading role in society and in determining the basic trends of the country's socioeconomic development.

The conference noted the pressing need for making essential changes in relations between the BCP and the state authorities and self-governing and public organizations. The demand of relieving the party agencies from extraneous functions, so that they stop being a "stage" in the hierarchy of the state system, was described as most important and urgent.

The state agencies and self-governing communities are guaranteed the right independently to determine how to implement party policy in the various areas. The party and state authorities can and must, if necessary, act not only as partners but also as adversaries.

The very important conclusion was drawn at the conference that the restructuring of society is directly related on the way the party will restructure itself, its organizations, leading authorities and cadres, and entire membership.

The party forum ascribed great importance to the suggestion made by T. Zhivkov to have the leading positions in the party, ranging from BCP Central Committee general secretary to secretary of primary party organization, to be limited to two consecutive terms and in exceptional circumstances only, three. It was also recommended to apply this principle to state authorities and all public organizations.

The BCP proclaimed its firm resolve to make radical changes in the style, ways and means of its work and to enhance the level of its organizational and ideological activities. The delegates to the conference noted that under conditions of self-government the basic functions of the party authorities and organizations must be manifested above all in the development of a political, moral and ideological climate in the country, in labor collectives and in territorial communities; in the active influence on achieving the objectives set by the party, through the activities of party members; the systematic implementation of cadre policy in accordance with party principles; purposeful educational and ideological work among the population, the young in particular; study of the results of the implementation of party policy and adoption of political measures to solve pressing problems; and efficient party control over the implementation of the party program and precise observance of the party statutes and party and state discipline, standards of morality and socialist legality.

The national conference of the BCP confirmed that the chosen path for socialist renovation is the right one. It is consistent with the objective requirements of the transitional stage in the life of society and meets with the understanding and support of the people. Now the duty of the party and of all its organizations and party members is to learn how to think and work in accordance

with the new realities and requirements, to lead the people, and to release the social energy of the masses. The BCP considers as the strategic course of its work making restructuring a nationwide project. It is a question of a process which must take place "from below" and "from above." It must be headed by the Communist Party, which is the guarantor for the radical changes occurring in the country, a generator of revolutionary ideas and suggestions and organizer in the struggle for the qualitative renovation of socialist society.

In accepting a scientifically based program for building a new model of socialism, and taking Bulgarian specifics into consideration, the BCP has directed society toward the permanent quest for more efficient solutions of rising problems. Reorganization is an open system; with changes in conditions, and as experience and knowledge are acquired, it will develop, expand, enrich and become more concrete.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Short Book Reviews

18020016n Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 10, Jul 88 (signed to press 6 Jul 88) pp 126-127

[Text] A.G. Kavtaradze. "Voyennyye Spetsialisty na Sluzhbe Respubliki Sovetov. 1917-1920 Gg." [Military Specialists Serving the Republic of Soviets, 1917-1920]. Nauka, Moscow, 1988, 277 pp. Reviewed by S. Lipitskiy, doctor of historical sciences, professor.

The need for and importance of making use of the knowledge and experience of bourgeois specialists were theoretically substantiated by V.I. Lenin. As early as March 1918, soon after the signing of the Brest Peace Treaty, he concluded that in the new stage of the struggle, when the power of the proletariat had been won and secured, "involving the bourgeois intelligentsia in the work is...the next pressing and necessary task of the day" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 159).

Despite the old problem of historiographic tradition, the question of the "fatal" novelty of scientific results achieved by the author of a compilation does not arise in reading this book. The monograph formulates and interprets new problems. It makes a more profound study of problems which have been only partially brought to light in previous works. Particularly interesting is his story on involving in Red Army service specialists with the highest possible skills—generals, colonels, lieutenant colonels and general staff officers.

An unquestionable quality of the book is the accuracy of the information and the convincing argumentation. All of the author's views, evaluations and conclusions are based on a broad range of closely studied sources.

Nonetheless, the text is by no means overburdened by quotations. From the literary viewpoint it has been thoroughly edited and makes interesting reading.

The structure of the book is like an upside-down cone. The growing depth of study is achieved by reducing the range of study targets. Thus, the base of the cone is the analytical social "portrait" of the entire officer corps of the old Russian Army, saturated with valuable information. The work is completed with a comprehensive description of the elite of military specialists who served the Soviet Republic.

The author proves the special role which highly trained military specialists played with very interesting statistics: during the civil war former colonels I.I. Vatsetis and S.S. Kamenev held the highest command position in the Red Army, that of commander in chief of all armed forces of the republic; in 1918-1920 20 people held positions of commanders of regular front formations (fronts), 17 of whom were military specialists; during that period only experienced military specialists (no more than 25 people) were appointed chiefs of staffs of fronts; all of them were nonparty people and all of them fulfilled their obligations honestly and conscientiously; 82 of the 100 army commanders were former generals and officers and only five of them betrayed the Soviet system. Equally complete and interesting information is provided on commanders of divisions and divisional staffs.

In summing up the results of long years of research, A.G. Kavtaradze shows that about 30 percent of the former generals and officers of the old army joined the struggle for Soviet rule in 1918-1920; an approximately same number, for a variety of reasons, did not participate in the war (including some guided by ideological considerations and who considered this war fratricidal); it was only roughly 40 percent who preferred to fight against the Soviet system arms in hand. The author does convincingly prove the groundlessness of the concept which sunk roots in Soviet historiography, starting with the 1930s, of the comprehensively reactionary and counter-revolutionary nature of the officer corps. (Let us recall that these concepts were one of the "theoretical foundations" of the groundless repressive measures taken against former military specialists precisely by the turn of the 1930s.)

Let us also point out that in this book military cadres are not presented merely as statistical units. Despite the limitations of a rather short study, the author has done everything possible to describe the characters and dramatic lives of his heroes. Unquestionably, the 144 photographs of military specialists who held high positions in the Red Army are a valuable contribution to the historiography of the civil war.

In conclusion, the author could be blamed for limiting the chronological time of his study to 1920 although, as we know, the armed struggle against interventionists and white guards ended only in the autumn of 1922. The expediency of further work on this topic is obvious.

K.I. Mikulskiy, V.Z. Rogovin and S.S. Shatalin, "*Sotsialnaya Politika KPSS*" [CPSU Social Policy]. Politizdat, Moscow, 1987, 352 pp. Reviewed by V. Markov.

In describing the content and significance of the social policy formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress, the authors of this book consider its main trends and the impact of the social measures on the various areas of social activity and social classes, strata and other population groups. The value of this is that the study of topical social problems, based on solid factual data, is accompanied by a criticism of obsolete "pre-perestroika" theoretical concepts and practical approaches and the exposure of the groundlessness of many dogmatic stereotypes. In particular, this rejects the old and now durable prejudice which bears the imprint of stupid propaganda and which depicts the new society as a kind of philanthropic organization which "gives," "ensures," and "takes care" of things, while the working people, the population are like dependents receiving benefits. This cliché was a reflection of the distorted interpretation of the actual historical advantages of the new society and for a long time contributed to the durability and growth of moods of dependency and of consumerist attitude among part of the population. In emphasizing the correlation between the growth of the social wealth and the efficiency of labor, and singling out the two functions of the distribution of goods—economically stimulating and socially guaranteeing (see p 165)—the authors convincingly prove the total groundlessness and harm of this stereotype.

The entire book opposes this kind of simplistic concepts of socialism. It brings to light the strong interdependence and interrelationship between social policy and the development of the economy, which provides material possibilities for the implementation of social measures and, at the same time, itself stimulates or, conversely, holds back the level of satisfaction of the sociocultural needs of the working people. Unfortunately, to this day such restraining factors remain strong, particularly as a result of the still not totally eliminated "residual" approach: we are still far from solving the housing problem, the share of hard physical or monotonous labor remains excessively high, the quality and variety of consumer goods leaves something better to be desired (making the imbalance between supply and demand substantial), and many other major shortcomings exist in the solution of other social problems which are now becoming the focal point of the attention of the public. The difficulties existing in our reality are frankly discussed in the book and their sharp assessments are based on the study of facts. On each separate occasion the authors, in considering the ways of the practical solution of pressing problems, submit interesting and occasionally controversial suggestions.

The book emphasizes the obvious "difficulty of combining social criteria with economic requirements" (p 51) and, at the same time, arguably criticizes blind aspirations immediately to achieve total social equality; the

authors indicate the groundlessness and unrealistic nature of such demands, which are based on imaginary concepts of socialism. The Marxist-Leninist concept of social justice, they write, proceeds from the possibilities and needs of social progress. It "reflects the dialectics of life: while acknowledging social equality as the foundation of social justice, it also considers situations in which equality is socially unfair. This applies, for example, to equalization in payment for labor of different quantity, quality and results, which is obviously unfair" (p 33).

In noting the urgent need for the systematic implementation of the principle of distribution of goods according to labor, in as much as the "increased efficiency of output is today the main task in economic policy" (p 48), the authors nonetheless accurately emphasize that "the socialist society invariably excludes and will continue to exclude ways and means of increasing output and upgrading its efficiency which are incompatible with its social tasks and objectives and are inconsistent with the requirements of social justice and the social confidence and well-being of the members of society" (p 49).

Naturally, the book is not void of gaps (for example, the consideration of the influence of social development on social structures and relations among nationalities provides hardly any new information). However, the many-faceted presentation of social problems in itself brings us very close to the study of social policy and practical solutions, which has been insufficiently developed in our writings. Nonetheless, one omission is particularly noteworthy: in different areas in the book the authors speak of increasing the activeness of the working people as social measures are implemented. However, this actually bypasses the main thing: in the course of the democratization of social life, to an increasing extent the exercise of social policy is becoming and will become a project for the masses themselves—the labor collectives and the self-governing people's agencies. It is precisely this that will totally eliminate the abstract feature in the requirements of humanism and social justice which are inherent in socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Chronicle. Meetings With the Editors

180200160 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 88 (signed to press 6 Jul 88) p 128

[Text] An exchange of views on the further intensification and development of cooperation between the two fraternal countries took place at a meeting between the editors and Eduardo Del Llano, director of CUBA SOCIALISTA, the theoretical journal of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee. The Cuban guest obtained detailed information on the participation of KOMMUNIST in the extensive activities of the CPSU on the ideological support of the radical restructuring

which is taking place in the Soviet Union in all areas of social life. In turn, he described the work of the journal CUBA SOCIALISTA in implementing the party assignments of improving the ways and means of managing the building of socialism under the new conditions.

The editors met with a group of journalists of party newspapers of socialist countries, accredited to Moscow. A wide range of problems was discussed related to the participation of KOMMUNIST in covering the processes of comprehensive perestroika of socialist society taking place in the Soviet Union. A discussion was also held on the responsibility of mass information media for the accurate and adequate interpretation of the various and complex phenomena in sociopolitical, economic and spiritual life.

The editors were visited by Atsusi Kodzima, director of the Moscow bureau of YOMIURI, the biggest Japanese newspaper. In the course of the talk problems related to the work of the journal in covering the processes occurring in the USSR, triggered by the economic reform and the democratization of all aspects of life in the CPSU and Soviet society were discussed.

Ludwik Krasucki, deputy editor in chief of NOWE DROGI, accredited as correspondent for the Polish Party Press for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, visited the editors with whom he shared his impressions on the way the forum of Soviet communists was covered by the mass information media, and the influence of perestroika and glasnost, which are gathering strength in the USSR, on sociopolitical life in the contemporary world. The Polish guest was informed on the place and role of KOMMUNIST in party ideological and theoretical activities. In the course of the talk problems of cooperation between the two fraternal journals and their

interaction in explaining the revolutionary processes, in terms of their nature and content, developing and intensifying in the Soviet Union and in Poland, were considered.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

05003

Publication Data

18020016p Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 10, Jul 88

English Title: KOMMUNIST, No 10, July 1988

Russian title: KOMMUNIST, 10 (1326), Iyul 1988

Editors: N.B. Bikkenin (editor-in-chief), A.I. Antipov, E.A. Arab-Ogly, B.S. Arkhipov, K.N. Brutents, Ye.T. Gaydar, I.A. Dedkov, V.I. Kadulin, S.V. Kolesnikov, O.R. Latsis, Yu.L. Molchanov, Ye.Z. Razumov, V.F. Rubtsov, N.N. Sibiryakov, Yu.A. Sklyarov, V.P. Trubnikov, P.N. Fedoseyev, S.F. Yarmolyuk.

Publishing House: Izdatelstvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication: Moscow

Date of Publication: July 1988

Signed to Press: 6 July 1988

Copies: 995,000

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1988.

10

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate

command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.