

information bulletin

Geneva Summit
Joint Statement / 3

Gorbachev's report to
the Supreme Soviet / 7

Kampuchea / 26

France / 18

**Documents
of the Communist
and Workers' Parties
Articles
and Speeches**

January 1986

contents

- 3 Summit meeting in Geneva/*Joint Soviet-American Statement*
- 5 Communiqué on a meeting of leaders of the Warsaw Treaty Member-States in Prague
- 6 In the Political Bureau of the CPSU CC
- 7 Our policy is clear: it is a policy of peace and cooperation/*Report by Mikhail Gorbachev at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on November 27, 1985*

COMMUNISTS AND THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

- 17 Great responsibility for the world's future/*Mikhail Gorbachev's reply to the joint message from six heads of state and government*
- 18 A path leading to a world without wars/*CP Canada CEC*

CONGRESSES AND PLENARY MEETINGS

- 18 With courage and confidence/*Closing speech by Georges Marchais at a national conference of the French CP*
- 21 New aspects of the political situation and preparations for the eighth GCP congress/*Speech by Herbert Mies, GCP Chairman*
- 24 For a policy in the interests of the people/*CP Greece CC*
- 26 The party will carry the cause of the Kampuchean revolution to the victorious conclusion/*Report of Heng Samrin, General Secretary of the PRPK*
- 28 Communiqué on an enlarged CC plenary meeting of the Iraqi CP
- 29 Sejm election results again confirm the Polish people's patriotic and responsible attitude/*Speech by Wojciech Jaruzelski, First Secretary of the PUPW CC*

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

- 31 Brutal betrayal of national interests/*CP Bolivia CC*
- 34 The main lines of the country's policy require a radical change/*Italian CP Leadership*
- 35 Israel's terroristic "mailed fist" policy must be thwarted/*Arab East Communist and Workers' Parties*
- 36 For a democratic solution to the current dangerous situation/*Colombian CP CEC*
- 38 Against terror, torture and the disappearance of prisoners/*Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front*

FROM THE PRESS

- 40 "New poverty": mark of Cain of an inhuman social system/*Einheit*

information bulletin

Published by Peace and Socialism Publishers — Prague
Appears in English, Arabic, French, German, Greek, Italian and Spanish

North American edition published by Progress Books
71 Bathurst Street, Third Floor, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5V 2P6

Copyright © 1968 by Progress Books, Canada

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED  PRINTED IN CANADA

1-2 (545-546) Volume 24

PRICE: \$1.50

Summit Meeting in Geneva

Joint Soviet-American Statement

By mutual agreement, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan met in Geneva November 19-21, 1985.

Attending the meeting on the Soviet side were members of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Foreign Minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR Georgy Kornienko, the USSR's Ambassador to the United States Anatoly Dobrynin, head of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee Alexander Yakovlev, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee Leonid Zamyatin, assistant to the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Andrei Aleksandrov; on the American side — U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, Chief of Staff Donald Regan, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Robert McFarlane, U.S. Ambassador to the USSR Arthur Hartman, special adviser to the President and the Secretary of State for Arms Control Paul H. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of State Rozanne Ridgway, special assistant to the President Jack Matlock.

These comprehensive exchanges of opinions covered the basic questions of Soviet-American relations and the current international situation. The discussions were frank and useful. Serious differences remain on a number of key issues.

While acknowledging the differences in the socio-political systems of the USSR and the United States and in their approaches to international problems, some greater understanding of each other's views was achieved by the two leaders. They agreed about the need to improve Soviet-American relations and the international situation as a whole. In this connection the two sides confirmed the importance of an ongoing dialogue, reflecting their strong desire to seek common ground on existing problems.

The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States agreed to meet again in the near future. In this connection the U.S. President accepted an invitation by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to visit the Soviet Union. For his part, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee accepted an invitation by the President of the United States to visit the United States of America. Arrangements for and timing of the visits will be agreed upon through diplomatic channels.

At their meetings, agreement was reached on some specific issues. Areas of agreement are registered below.

I

The sides, having discussed key security issues, and conscious of the special responsibility of the USSR and the USA for maintaining peace, are stating that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. Recognizing that any conflict between the

USSR and the USA could have catastrophic consequences, they emphasized the importance of preventing any war between them, whether nuclear or conventional. They will not seek to achieve military superiority.

The General Secretary and the President discussed the negotiations on nuclear and space arms.

They agreed to accelerate the work at these negotiations with a view to accomplishing the tasks set down in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement of January 8, 1985, namely: to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and enhance strategic stability.

Noting the proposals recently tabled by the Soviet Union and the United States, they called for early progress, in particular in areas where there is common ground, including the principle of 50 per cent reductions in the nuclear arms of the sides appropriately applied, as well as the idea of an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe. During the elaboration of these agreements, effective measures for verification of compliance with obligations assumed will be agreed upon.

The sides agreed to study the question at the expert level of centers to reduce nuclear risk taking into account the issues and developments in the Geneva negotiations. They noted with satisfaction such recent steps in this direction as the modernization of the Soviet-U.S. hotline.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan reaffirmed the commitment of the USSR and the U.S. to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and their interest in strengthening together with other countries the non-proliferation regime, and in further enhancing the effectiveness of the treaty, inter alia by enlarging its membership.

They note with satisfaction the overall positive results of the recent review conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The USSR and the U.S. reaffirm their commitment, assumed by them under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to pursue negotiations in good faith on matters of nuclear arms limitation and disarmament in accordance with Article VI of the treaty.

The two sides plan to continue to promote the strengthening of the International Atomic Energy Agency and to support the activities of the agency in implementing safeguards as well as in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. They view positively the practice of regular Soviet-U.S. consultations on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which have been businesslike and constructive and express the intent to continue this practice in the future.

In the context of discussing security problems, the two sides reaffirmed that they are in favor of a general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles of such weapons. They agreed to accelerate efforts to con-

clude an effective and verifiable international convention on this matter.

The two sides agreed to intensify bilateral discussions on the level of experts on all aspects of such a chemical weapons ban, including the question of verification. They agreed to initiate a dialogue on preventing the proliferation of chemical weapons.

The two sides emphasized the importance they attach to the Vienna negotiations on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe and expressed their willingness to work for positive results there.

Attaching great importance to the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe and noting the progress made there, the two sides stated their intention to facilitate, together with the other participating states, an early and successful completion of the work of the conference. To this end, they reaffirmed the need for a document which would both include mutually acceptable confidence and security-building measures and give concrete expression and effect to the principle of non-use of force.

II

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan agreed on the need to place on a regular basis and intensify dialogue at various levels. Along with meetings between the leaders of the two countries, this envisages regular meetings between the USSR Foreign Minister and the U.S. Secretary of State, as well as between the heads of other ministries and agencies. They agree that the recent mutual visits by the heads of ministries and departments in such fields as agriculture, housing and protection of the environment have been useful.

Recognizing the usefulness of the already held exchanges of views on regional issues, including those at expert level, they agreed to continue such exchanges on a regular basis.

The sides intend to expand the programs of bilateral cultural, educational, scientific-technical ex-

changes, and also to develop trade and economic ties. The General Secretary and the President attended the signing of the agreement on contacts and exchanges in the scientific, educational and cultural fields.

They believe that there should be greater understanding between our peoples and that to this end they will encourage greater travel and people-to-people contact.

The sides agree on the importance of resolving matters concerning individual citizens in the spirit of cooperation.

The two leaders noted with satisfaction that, in cooperation with the government of Japan, the Soviet Union and the United States have agreed to a set of measures to promote safety on air routes in the north Pacific and have worked out steps to implement them.

They acknowledged that delegations from the USSR and the USA have begun negotiations aimed at resumption of air services. The two leaders expressed their desire to reach a mutually beneficial agreement on that score at an early date. In this regard, an agreement was reached on the simultaneous opening of consulates-general in New York and Kiev respectively.

Both sides agreed to contribute to the preservation of the environment — a global task — through joint research and practical measures. In accordance with the existing Soviet-American agreement in this area, consultations will be held next year in Moscow and Washington on specific programs of cooperation.

The two leaders agreed on the utility of broadening exchanges and contacts including some of their new forms in a number of scientific, educational, medical and sports fields (inter alia, cooperation in the development of educational exchanges and software for elementary and secondary school instruction, measures to promote Russian language studies in the United States and English language studies in the USSR, the annual exchange of professors to conduct special courses in history, culture and economics at the relevant departments of Soviet and American institutions of higher education, mutual allocation of scholarships for the best students in the natural sciences, technology, social sciences and humanities for the period of an academic year, holding regular meets in various sports and increased television coverage of sports events. The two sides agreed to resume cooperation in combating cancer diseases.

The relevant agencies in each of the countries are being instructed to develop specific programs for these exchanges. The resulting programs will be examined by the leaders of the two countries at their next meeting.

The two leaders emphasized the potential importance of the work aimed at utilizing controlled thermonuclear fusion for peaceful purposes and, in this connection, advocated the widest practicable development of international cooperation in obtaining this source of energy, which is essentially inexhaustible, for the benefit of all humankind.

Pravda, November 22, 1985

Understanding Capital Volume II A Reader's Guide John Fox

Chapter summaries, questions and glossary — a sequel to the highly popular guide to Volume I.

Paper 136 pp \$8.95

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

Communiqué on a Meeting of Leaders of the Warsaw Treaty Member-States in Prague

A meeting of leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member-states took place by their mutual agreement in Prague on November 21, 1985.

The meeting was attended by Todor Zhivkov, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and Chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria; Gustav Husak, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic; Erich Honecker, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic; Janos Kadar, General Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party; Wojciech Jaruzelski, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party and Chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic; Nicolae Ceausescu, General Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and President of the Socialist Republic of Romania; Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and also, on the Czechoslovak side, by Lubomir Strougal, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and Chairman of the Czechoslovak Government, and Vasil Bilak, member of the Presidium and Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

The meeting was also attended by foreign ministers Petr Mladenov of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Bohuslav Chnoupek of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Oskar Fischer of the German Democratic Republic, Peter Varkonyi of the Hungarian People's Republic, Ilie Vaduva of the Socialist Republic of Romania, and Eduard Shevardnadze of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mikhail Gorbachev gave a detailed account of the course and results of the Soviet-American Summit in Geneva, which had ended that day.

The leaders of the fraternal parties and countries voiced full support for the constructive stand presented by Mikhail Gorbachev at his talks with U.S. President Reagan, in the spirit of the joint line put forward in the Statement of the Warsaw Treaty Member-States of October 23, 1985.

The leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member-states spoke highly of the exceptionally important contribution made by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee at the Geneva meeting to the advancement of the jointly developed peace posi-

tions of the countries of the socialist community. It was noted unanimously that the direct and frank discussion which had taken place at the Summit was necessary and that its results were useful.

Though specific problems of arms limitation and reduction were not resolved in Geneva, it is important that the Summit reiterated the Soviet-American accord reached in January 1985 on the need to seek ways to prevent an arms race in outer space and to terminate it on Earth.

The joint statement on the inadmissibility of nuclear war and on the sides' renunciation of the pursuit of military superiority that was included in the final document of the Geneva Summit is of fundamental importance.

The Geneva meeting is very important also because it marked the start of a dialogue with a view to achieving changes for the better in Soviet-American relations and in the world in general.

On the whole, the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with U.S. President Reagan create more favorable opportunities for improving the international situation and for a return to détente. It is important for these opportunities to be translated into practical deeds by both sides.

Mikhail Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union for its part would make every effort to achieve practical solutions to the problems of folding up the arms race and strengthening peace.

The meeting reiterated the allied socialist countries' principled course aimed at removing the threat of nuclear war, ending the arms race on Earth and preventing its extension to outer space, ensuring a transition to real disarmament measures and strengthening universal peace. The Warsaw Treaty member-countries state anew that they are not seeking military superiority but will not allow anyone to achieve military superiority over themselves.

The participants in the meeting stated the resolve of the parties and states represented at it to work in concert and to continue doing everything they can to achieve a turn for the better in European and world affairs. They are unanimous that under difficult international conditions, the unity and cohesion of the allied socialist countries, class solidarity and growing cooperation in every field are of paramount importance.

The meeting was held in an atmosphere of friendship and complete unanimity of views on all questions under discussion.

Pravda, November 22, 1985
Rude pravo, November 22, 1985

In the Political Bureau of the CPSU CC

The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, having considered the results of the meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU CC Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan of the United States at Geneva, fully approved the work carried out by Mikhail Gorbachev and the understandings and the joint statement resulting from the negotiations.

It was noted that the Geneva meeting has become a major political event of international life. One fundamentally important outcome of the meeting is that the leaders of the USSR and the United States declared in a joint document: nuclear war must not be started. They emphasized the importance of averting any war between the USSR and the United States, whether nuclear or conventional, and undertook not to strive to attain military superiority. In this sense, the results of the Geneva negotiations can have a positive influence on changes in the political and psychological climate in present-day international relations, in improving them, and in reducing the danger of an outbreak of nuclear war. The meeting has made a start on a dialogue aimed to bring about changes for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations, and the world generally.

It was emphasized that the results of the meeting once again provide convincing confirmation of the correctness of the initiatives and acts taken in the recent period by the CPSU and the Soviet state for the purpose of settling the key issues of international security: a reduction in the threat of war, and a radical turn for the better in inter-state relations in the world arena.

The Political Bureau said that security, with the problem of preventing the militarization of space and reducing nuclear weapons in organic connection with each other as its core, will continue to be the crucial sphere in Soviet-U.S. relations. The results of the meeting must be used to speed up negotiations on nuclear and space weapons on the basis of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement of January 8, 1985, now reaffirmed at the summit level. The proposals of both sides have points of contact and make it possible to seek mutually acceptable solutions for radical cuts in nuclear weapons, provided there is a ban on the development of strike space weapons. At the same time, the fact of the continuing negotiations should not in itself serve as justification and cover for the arms race. The cardinal task is to remove the nuclear threat by preventing the arms race from moving into space, and by curtailing it on the Earth. Its fulfillment calls for a responsible approach, further efforts and a contribution on the part of all the states and peace-loving political and social forces.

The long-term significance of the Geneva meeting will be manifested in concrete practical acts and depends on the readiness of both sides to act on the basis of the joint statement adopted at Geneva. The Soviet Union, for its part, will do all that is necessary

to fulfil this task, and expects the U.S. administration to do likewise.

The CPSU's foreign policy will continue to be undeviatingly premised on the fact that every people has the sovereign right to go its own way, and to choose its own friends and allies. The correctness and effectiveness of policy is determined by the ability to reckon with the realities of the modern world and its diversity, with the existence of different and frequently conflicting interests of numerous and differing states, and to subordinate the solution of controversial international problems to the attainment of the main goal: the prevention of a nuclear war. That is just what the CPSU has been doing.

The Political Bureau said that it believed to be necessary not to relax the efforts in seeking a radical reduction of armaments, normalizing and improving Soviet-U.S. relations on that basis, and eliminating the threat of a world war. The Geneva understanding and a continuation and deepening of the dialogue between the USSR and the United States, including a dialogue at the summit, has a substantial role to play in these efforts.

There are no contradictions fatally dooming the USSR and the United States to confrontation, let alone war. The problems arising between them can be solved only with scrupulous observance of the principle of equality and equal security, and non-infliction of harm to the interests of third countries. The practical issues in bilateral relations between the USSR and the United States must be settled on the basis of mutual advantage and non-interference in domestic affairs.

In the nuclear age, there can be no reasonable alternative to the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems — and there is none. This incontrovertible truth determines and will continue to determine the Soviet Union's relations with all countries, including the United States.

The Political Bureau of the CPSU CC noted with satisfaction that at a meeting in Prague on November 21, 1985, the highest leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member-states assessed the work done by Mikhail Gorbachev at Geneva as an exceptionally important contribution to advancing the common peaceable positions of the socialist community countries, and their foreign policy program adopted at a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee in Sofia in October 1985.

It is of fundamental importance that the participants in the Prague meeting reaffirmed their readiness to continue to do their utmost to bring about a turn for the better in European and world affairs, and unanimously expressed their resolve to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the fraternal countries and their class solidarity and interaction in every sphere of cooperation.

Pravda, November 26, 1985

Our Policy is Clear: It is a Policy of Peace and Cooperation

Report by CPSU CC General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev
at a Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet
on November 27, 1985

Comrade deputies,

The most important questions of the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state are up for discussion at the present session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The laws on the State Plan for the USSR's Economic and Social Development and the State Budget for 1986, adopted at this session, are of great importance for our country, for its present and future, for every work collective and for every Soviet family. The coming year of 1986 opens not just the first year of the 12th five-year plan period. It opens a qualitatively new stage in the development of Soviet society.

The 1986 plan is a reflection of the party's strategic line of accelerating the country's economic and social development. Written into it are higher rates of growth of the national income, industrial and agricultural output, and labor productivity. The use of material resources is to be more efficient. Priority development has been determined for industries which are to ensure scientific and technical progress and higher product quality.

Measures have been mapped out to accelerate the reconstruction, renewal and modernization of production, and improvement of management and the economic mechanism. A further rise in the people's well-being is envisaged.

It is important, comrades, for all of us constantly to bear in mind the specific features of the 1986 plan.

A clear rhythm must be set for the whole five-year plan period in its very first year. Accordingly, the rate of economic development provided for 1986 is such that its fulfillment, with a gradual growth of intensiveness over the years ahead, will give scope for realizing the targets of the five-year plan period as a whole. This will make it possible to avoid the situation that existed in the past five-year plan period, when lower indicators were set for the first years, while the bulk of the increment was shifted to the last years. The negative results such practices have had are well known.

The second specific feature of the plan is its formation with a maximum account of the need to accelerate scientific and technical progress. Starting from the directions of the June meeting at the CPSU CC, targets for accelerating scientific and technological progress envisaged by the decisions on the development of the key lines of science and technology in the sectors of the national economy have been primarily included in the plan. The established practices in planning have simultaneously been largely reviewed. For the first time, the plan provides for key synthetic indicators of scientific and technological progress in the sectors and its efficiency. And these indicators are set for the purpose of activating

practical work by ministries, associations and enterprises in ensuring advance to the forefront of scientific and technological development.

The next specific feature of the 1986 plan is its orientation toward effecting a practical transition to intensive methods of economic management. This is dictated by life itself, the complex situation taking shape with respect to labor and material resources, and the depletion, in the main, of the extensive factors of economic growth. Next year we shall have to have the increase in the volume of production ensured to the utmost from resource-saving. In other words, economies in practice are becoming the main source for the resource backup of the whole increment in output volume, as the following figures show. Next year, 97 per cent of the national income growth will be obtained from growing labor productivity, the metal-intensiveness of the national income is to decline by 2.7 per cent, and energy-intensiveness by 3 per cent.

Finally, this is a broad transition to the new methods of economic management which have recommended themselves in a positive light. From January 1986, industry is to turn out more than one-half of its product at enterprises working in the new conditions.

On the whole, comrades, the line taken is the right one. It is now up to us to realize it — in the process of further working up the plans in the sectors, republics, territories and regions, in the associations and at the enterprises and, of course, in concrete practical work. This aspect also needs to be emphasized because many functionaries at the center and in the localities, including those in the economic planning bodies, have yet to comprehend fully the importance of assessing and solving the country's economic, social and financial problems in a new way.

The present session is being held in the highly responsible pre-congress period. The CC's April 1985 plenary meeting worked out the line of accelerating society's economic and social development, made a start on the substantial changes in the approaches to tackling economic and political tasks, and set a new rhythm for all the activity of party, state and local government organizations and of all our cadre and work collectives.

The most important theoretical and political documents, which are to be put before the 27th congress of the CPSU for its consideration — the drafts of the new edition of the CPSU program, the changes in the party rules, and the guidelines for the USSR's economic and social development in 1986-1990 and in the period until the year 2000 — are the fullest reflection of the party's political line, both on

matters of internal life, and on international problems.

The earliest results of the party's wide-ranging consultation with the people which is now under way shows that there is a sense of profound satisfaction among the Soviet people with the documents brought out for discussion. The active support of the party's strategic line — support both by word and by deed — is the source of our optimism, of our confidence in the correctness of the chosen way, and in that what has been mapped out will be fulfilled without fail.

As you are aware, comrade deputies, the party's Central Committee and the Soviet Government have lately taken a number of major measures aimed to accelerate the switch of the economy to intensive development, and to raise the efficiency of economic management. Practical steps are being taken in further establishing order, tightening up labor and state discipline, and the regime of stringent economies, and in combating drunkenness and alcoholism. In other words, important and intense efforts are under way in every sphere of social life, and they have already begun to yield fruit.

The Soviet people have been roused and their creative forces activated by the new elements entering our life today, showing again and again the vast reserves and potentialities latent in the socialist system.

We can now safely say that things have begun to change for the better. The production growth rate is going up, and other economic indicators are improving. Despite the hitches in some sectors of the economy at the beginning of the year, the Soviet people succeeded in righting the situation and ensuring the advance of the economy to the planned positions. Positive shifts are also taking place in the country's agrarian sector.

Much of the credit for what has been achieved goes to our heroic working class, which has done everything to fulfil the set plans, surmounting the difficulties unsparing of effort or energy. The positive results reflect the intense labor effort of the collective-farm peasantry and of everyone working in the agro-industrial complex. Our achievements reflect the creative thought of our scientists, engineers and people's intelligentsia. Many important beginnings were sparked off and initiated by the Soviet young people, who tackle the solution of difficult and complicated tasks boldly and vigorously, and actively support the changes under way in society, linking their own future with them.

We also connect these changes with the more vigorous activity of party, local-government and trade union bodies and of all our cadre.

In short, comrade deputies, much is being done. However, it would be a mistake to overrate all this, and it is not a tradition of ours to do so. We are at the beginning of the charted way, a way that is difficult and intense, and that calls for a blend of the creative approach to the tasks life puts before us with a sense of purpose, a high level of discipline and selflessness. We have vast reserves and potentialities, and we shall have to work hard to set them in motion and to use them with the maximum returns. This needs

to be done along every line of economic, social and cultural development, above all where the situation remains complicated and there is slowness in overcoming the lag.

Just now, at the end of the five-year plan period, we need to work well so as to start next year our confident and dynamic advance, to ensure the attainment of the projected positions, and to create the prerequisites for a further qualitative transformation of the country's productive forces.

Comrades,

The 1986 plan visually demonstrates the peaceable and constructive character of our concerns. With this peaceful orientation of our internal policy are closely connected our foreign policy aspirations and the Soviet state's international policy.

The foreign policy directives of the April 1985 plenary meeting of the CPSU CC are a concrete expression of our Leninist foreign policy at the present stage. The plenary meeting stressed the need for invigorating in every way the USSR's peaceable policy along the broadest front of international relations. It urged that everything should be done to prevent the forces of militarism and aggression gaining the upper hand, emphasized the urgency of ending the arms race and activating the process of disarmament, and came out in favor of developing equitable, correct and civilized relations between states, and expanding and deepening mutually advantageous economic ties.

These directives of the plenary meeting were dictated by the present period, by the peculiarities of the existing situation, and by the requirements of the socialist policy of peace and progress. The CC Political Bureau's assessments were premised on the fact that events were becoming ever more unpredictable as a result of the continuing arms race. The possible militarization of space signifies a qualitatively new leap in the arms race, which would inevitably lead to the disappearance of the very concept of strategic stability — the basis for the preservation of peace in the nuclear age. A situation would be created in which fundamentally important decisions, irreversible in their possible consequences, would essentially be taken by electronic machines, without the participation of human reason and political will, and without regard for the criteria of ethics and morality. Such a course of events could lead to a universal catastrophe — even if its initial impetus came from an error, a miscalculation, a technical hitch in the extremely intricate computer systems.

In other words, world developments have come to a point at which there is a need for especially responsible decisions, and when failure to act or delay in acting is criminal, since the issue today is the preservation of civilization and life itself. That is why we believed and continue to believe that it is necessary to take all the measures in order to break the vicious circle of the arms race and not to miss a single chance to turn the course of events for the better. The question now stands most acutely and definitely: there is a need to rise above narrow interests and to comprehend the collective responsibility of all the states in the face of the danger lying in wait

for the human community on the threshold of the third millennium.

That is the approach we were authorized to take by the April 1985 plenary meeting of the CC in implementing foreign policy, and it is an approach that fully meets the interests of the Soviet people and the peoples of the other socialist states and, as we have seen, it has been met with understanding in other countries of the world. Within a period that was short in terms of time but that abounded in major international events, the Soviet Union strove to cooperate in the interests of peace with the broadest possible circle of states. It was and continues to be our premise that it is possible to move out of the period of dangerous tensions only through the efforts of all countries, big and small.

In the past few months, the political and economic ties between the socialist-community countries have been considerably activated and deepened. Long-term programs for cooperation in the economic sphere and in scientific and technological progress have been worked out. A mechanism for operation and concrete ties has been set up, and foreign policy activity is being more closely coordinated. The meetings of the leaders of the fraternal countries in Moscow, in Warsaw, in Sofia and in Prague have become important milestones along the way of the socialist community's further cohesion. Ties with all the socialist countries are developing and growing stronger.

Cooperation with states which have been liberated from colonial oppression and which are a part of the non-aligned movement is becoming broader. Considerable steps have been taken in developing relations with many of these countries. This is a factor of great significance in the tempestuous ocean of present-day international relations, a factor operating in favor of peace, and the equality, freedom and independence of the peoples.

The Soviet Union has also made efforts to improve ties with the capitalist states. Let me spotlight the recent Soviet-French meeting in Paris, in the course of which substantial steps were taken in further developing bilateral cooperation, strengthening European and international security, and returning to détente.

We shall go on building our foreign policy on a multi-tiered basis, on the basis of sound and stable bilateral relations with all the countries. But the reality of the modern world is such that there are states in it on which falls a special responsibility for the character of world development, for its course and consequences — in virtue of their military, economic, scientific and technical potential and international weight. In the first place, such responsibility — responsibility, and not a privilege, I emphasize — is borne by the Soviet Union and the United States.

If one approaches the matter from these positions, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting held last week is, according to the assessment of the CC Political Bureau, an important event — and not only in our bilateral relations, but also in world politics as a whole. I have already had occasion at the press conference in Geneva to speak of my initial impres-

sions of the negotiations with the President of the United States. The final document of the meeting — the joint statement — is also known.

In addressing the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet today, I should like to assess the results and significance of the Geneva meeting in the context of the present situation, and with regard to the experience of the past and the prospects for the future, to the problems we shall have to tackle.

The first thing I must say is that the way to the Geneva dialogue was long and hard for many reasons. The U.S. administration which took office at the beginning of the 1980s frankly took a line of confrontation, rejecting the very possibility of a positive development of Soviet-U.S. relations. I think that even today everyone remembers the heat of the anti-Soviet rhetoric of those years, and the "strength" character of the acts of the U.S. ruling circles.

The joint efforts of many years in building up the necessary minimum of confidence in these relations were consigned to oblivion, and virtually all the threads of bilateral cooperation were ruptured. Détente was itself declared to conflict with the interests of the United States.

Having taken the line of attaining military superiority over the USSR, the administration got down to realizing its programs for nuclear and other rearmament of the United States. The deployment of U.S. first-strike missiles was started in Western Europe. A situation fraught with a high level of military-political uncertainty and the consequent risks was being created.

Finally, there came, in addition, the Star Wars program, the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). This idea caught on in Washington like an infection, and not very much thought was given to the grave consequences that were inevitable in the event of its realization. The idea of going out into space with weapons is an extremely dangerous one for all the peoples of the world — without exception.

But we were also aware of something else: such a U.S. policy was bound to clash with reality. And that is what actually happened. The Soviet Union and its allies clearly declared: no military superiority over themselves would be allowed.

There was confusion even among the allies of the United States in the face of such obvious contempt of the interests of their security and Washington's readiness to stake all in the drive for the chimera of military superiority. In the United States itself, this line has also caused grave doubts. And the announcement of the plans of preparation for Star Wars sounded like a real tocsin of alarm across the globe.

Those who had assumed that their line of confrontation would become definitive for international development likewise miscalculated. Let me, perhaps, add in this connection that the visions of world domination are defective at root, both in what concerns the end and what concerns the means. Just as perpetual-motion projects originate from an ignorance of the elementary laws of nature, imperial claims spring from notions of the modern world that are a far cry from reality.

The Soviet Union paralleled its firm resistance to the U.S. line of breaking up the military-strategic equilibrium with the presentation of large-scale peace initiatives, and with a display of restraint and constructiveness in its approach to the central issues of peace and security.

By our initiatives — and they number quite a few — we have clearly shown what we are seeking to attain in the world arena, and to what we call the United States and its allies. Such actions of the USSR met with warm approval by world public opinion, and they were highly appreciated by the governments of many countries.

Under the influence of these factors, Washington was forced to maneuver. Notes of demonstrative peaceableness appeared in the statements of the U.S. administration. They were not backed up with deeds, but their very appearance was symptomatic.

At the beginning of the year, on our initiative, an understanding was reached on new negotiations between the USSR and the United States, negotiations which should cover an interconnection the whole complex of space and nuclear weapons, and have for their objective the prevention of an arms race in space, and its termination on Earth.

Changes began to occur in the atmosphere of Soviet-U.S. relations and, to some extent, in the international behavior of the United States, something that, of course, necessarily had to be reckoned with in the consideration of the question of a possible summit meeting.

In taking such a decision, we took the firm premise that the central place at the negotiations should be taken up by the questions which determine our relations and the whole situation in the world — the questions of security. We also took account of the political and strategic realities in Europe and the world, the opinion of our friends and allies, the positions of governments and public circles of many countries, and their insistent requests that the Soviet Union should do its utmost to have the summit meeting held. We realized how many hopes were pinned on this meeting throughout the world, and took concrete steps to improve the international climate and make it more favourable for the meeting.

At the negotiations on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva, we put forward concrete and radical proposals. What is their essence?

We proposed above all the complete prohibition of strike space weapons. We proposed this because no one's security would be strengthened by the start of an arms race in space, or even the deployment in near-earth space of anti-missile systems alone. Covered with a space "shield," nuclear means of attack will become even more dangerous.

The appearance of strike space weapons could turn the present strategic balance into strategic chaos, cause a feverish arms race along every line, and undermine one of the most important foundations for its limitation, the ABM Treaty. As a result, the mistrust between the countries would grow, while security would be markedly reduced.

Furthermore, with a complete ban on strike space weapons, we proposed a halving of all the nuclear weapons available to the USSR and the United

States and capable of reaching each other's territories. A ceiling of 6,000 units would be put on the total number of nuclear charges on them on each side. These are radical reductions measured in thousands of nuclear charges.

That is a fair approach. It encompasses all the means forming the strategic balance of forces, and makes it possible to take account of the scope of the nuclear threat actually existing for each of the sides, regardless of how and from where the nuclear charges are delivered to their territory — whether by missile or aircraft, from their own territory, or from the territory of their allies.

We regard the halving of the nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States as a beginning. We are prepared to go farther — all the way to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons — naturally, with the participation of the other nuclear states as well.

The European peoples are understandably especially worried by the nuclear arms race. We well understand their anxiety. Europe is oversaturated with nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union favors Europe's complete liberation from nuclear weapons — both medium-range and tactical. But the United States and its NATO partners will not have that. So we have proposed that a start should be made at least with intermediate decisions, so as then to go on to further cuts. We are sure that our proposals meet the hopes of the European peoples of reducing the nuclear threat and strengthening security in Europe.

I should like to emphasize the principled aspect of the matter: along the three lines of negotiations — on space, on strategic offensive weapons, and on nuclear medium-range weapons — we do not propose to the United States anything that would reduce its security. What is more, our proposals also make it possible to solve problems which the U.S. side has elevated to the rank of its "special concerns."

Much is being said, for instance, about Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles. Our proposals provide for a reduction in the number of such missiles and for a limitation of the share of their warheads in the overall level of nuclear charges. Or, say, another example. There is much noise in the West over the Soviet SS-20 missiles. We propose their substantial reduction in the context of a solution of the problem of nuclear medium-range weapons in Europe.

The nuclear weapons of Britain and France are presented as a stumbling-block. It is said that they cannot be discussed at Soviet-U.S. negotiations. Well, even here we are prepared to seek a way out. We propose the start of direct exchanges with these countries concerning their nuclear weapons.

The Soviet proposals have met with a broad and positive response throughout the world. They are backed by the authority of the Warsaw Treaty member-states, which unanimously support our constructive position. Also largely consonant with our approach are the joint statements by the leaders of the six countries: Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, India, Sweden and Greece. The Soviet initiative has been met with approval and hope by the communist and workers' parties, by major public bodies in vari-

ous countries and continents, world-famed scientists, and prominent political and military leaders. It met with a positive response from most parties of the Socialist International.

That is apart from the thousands of letters from Soviet and foreign citizens addressed to me on the eve of the meeting at Geneva and in the course of it. I should like to take this opportunity to express gratitude to their authors for their good wishes, for their advice and support, and for the profound and sincere concern for the preservation of peace.

On the eve of the meeting, the Americans put forward their own counter-proposals, a positive fact in itself. One of our numerous initiatives met with a favorable response.

Much has been written in the press about the substance of these counter-proposals. I shall not reiterate their content. Let me merely say that these are indeterminate and in many ways unfair proposals. They are based on a one-sided approach clearly dictated by the urge for military superiority for the United States and NATO as a whole.

But the main thing is that the U.S. position does not provide for a ban on the creation of strike space weapons. On the contrary, there is a desire to legitimize their development. The stand taken by the U.S. side on the Star Wars issue is the main obstacle in the way of an agreement on control of armaments. Nor are we alone in taking that view. The governments of France, Denmark, Norway, Greece, the Netherlands, Canada and Australia have refused to take part in the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. On the eve of the Geneva meeting, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution calling on the leaders of the USSR and the United States "to work out effective agreements aimed at averting an arms race in space and ending it on the earth." And it was only the United States with several of its allies that deemed it possible not to support this clear call by the world community. A fact that requires no comment, as the saying goes.

There is also a need, perhaps, to recall that powerful political forces were acting in the United States and trying hard if not to torpedo the meeting, then at least to erode its content and nullify its significance. I think many still remember quite well such acts as the testing of the anti-satellite system, the appearance of the battleship *Iowa* with long-range Cruise missiles in the Baltic, the stepped-up deployment of Pershings in the FRG, the decision to develop binary chemical weapons, and finally, the adoption of a new and record-breaking military budget, etc.

What is more, the President was already on his way to Geneva, when news came of a letter from the U.S. Secretary of Defense, adjuring the President not to enter into any understandings with the USSR that could confirm the treaties on the limitation of strategic armaments and on anti-missile defense. In other words, giving the United States a free hand along all the lines of the arms race both on Earth and in space.

But was the whole matter confined to the Pentagon alone? It did not escape our attention that a sort of "mandate" was given to the U.S. President by the U.S. ultra-rightist circles as represented by their

ideological headquarters, the Heritage Foundation. It prescribed that the President should continue the arms race, not allow the Soviet Union the possibility of switching any funds to the fulfillment of economic and social programs, and eventually try to get the USSR ousted from international politics. These gentlemen went so far as to put before the U.S. administration the task of forcing us to change our system, our constitution! These are well-known tunes, comrades. We have already had to hear all that on many occasions. In short, the attacks were many.

Still, we decided in favor of a meeting with the U.S. President. We took such a decision because we had no right to neglect even the slightest chance of effecting a turn in the dangerous developments in the world. We took the decision being aware that if a direct and frank conversation could not be started today, tomorrow it would be a hundred times more difficult to do so, and perhaps even too late altogether.

The differences between us are undoubtedly great. But in today's world the interconnection and interdependence between us are just as great. The acuteness of the present moment leaves the leaders of the USSR and the United States, the peoples of the USSR and the United States no other alternative, except comprehending the great science of living together.

From our very first conversation with the President tête-à-tête — and such conversations had a big place at the meeting in Geneva — the question was explicitly presented that the Soviet delegation had come to seek a solution for the most burning problem which is at the center of international life — the problem of averting a nuclear war and checking the arms race. As I told the President, that was the principal meaning of our meeting, and it would also determine its results.

I must stress that the negotiations at Geneva were now and again very sharp and, I should say, of the utmost frankness. Here it is impossible either to outwit each other or to toss off a few political and propaganda clichés — too much depends on these pivotal issues of war and peace.

In the course of the meeting, the U.S. side stubbornly insisted on implementation of its SDI program. We were told that it was a matter of developing purely defensive facilities which would allegedly not be weapons at all. We were also told that these facilities could help to stabilize the situation and to get rid of nuclear weapons altogether. An offer was even made, in some foreseeable future, to "share" these facilities and to throw open the doors of laboratories to each other.

We frankly told the President that we do not agree with such assessments. We have thoroughly analyzed all these questions and have reached a straightforward conclusion. Space weapons are not defense weapons at all. They are capable of producing the dangerous illusion that a nuclear first strike can be delivered from under the space "shield," while averting or, at any rate, weakening any retaliatory strike. And what are the guarantees that space weapons could not themselves be used as a means

for hitting targets on Earth? There is every indication that the U.S. anti-missile space system is not at all conceived as a "shield," but as a part of an integral offensive complex.

We cannot, of course, accept the assertion that the space facilities envisaged in its program are not weapons at all. Just as we cannot rely on the assurances that the United States will share with us that which it will succeed in creating in this field.

If the laboratories are to open up, it should be done only for the purposes of control over the prohibition to develop strike space weapons, and not at all for their legalization.

They tell us of a desire to eliminate the fear of missiles and to secure the liquidation of nuclear weapons generally. Such a desire can only be welcomed, and it fully accords with the goals of our policy. But it is, after all, much simpler to liquidate these weapons, and without creating any space strike systems for the purpose. Why spend tens and hundreds of billions of dollars and pile up mountains of space weapons in addition to the nuclear ones? What is the point?

I asked the President: Does the U.S. leadership seriously believe that while U.S. space weapons are being developed we shall reduce our strategic potential, so helping the United States to weaken it with our own hands? That is something one should not count on. The very opposite will happen: in order to restore the equilibrium, the Soviet Union will be forced to enhance the effectiveness, accuracy, and power of its weapons in order to neutralize, if the need should arise, the electronic space machine of Star Wars being developed by the Americans.

And will the Americans feel more comfortable if our own weapons are added in space to the echelons of space weapons planned by Washington? After all, they cannot hope in the United States to become monopolists in outer space. At any rate, all of this is not serious.

However, the U.S. administration is still tantalized by the prospect of trying to obtain military superiority. Once again, venturing on its arms race in space, it is now hoping to outstrip us in electronics and computers. But, as it has already happened repeatedly in the past, we shall find an answer. And it will be an answer that is effective, sufficiently swift and, perhaps, less costly than the U.S. program. That is something we also told the President with the utmost clarity.

I think that for a real turn in our relations that would meet the interests of the USSR and the United States, and the interests of the peoples of the world, there is a need for new approaches, a fresh view of many things and, most importantly, the political will of the leadership of both countries. The USSR — and this is something I emphasized at Geneva — does not feel any hostility for the United States and has respect for the American people. We do not base our policy on a desire to infringe the national interests of the United States. Let me say more: we should not want, for instance, to have a change in the strategic balance in our own favor. We should not want it because such a situation would increase the suspicion of the other side and increase the in-

stability of the overall situation.

Life has been shaping in such a way that both our countries will have to accustom themselves to the strategic parity as a natural state of affairs. We shall have to go on to a common understanding concerning the level of armaments on each of the sides that could be regarded as relatively adequate from the standpoint of its reliable defense. We are sure that the level of such a sufficiency is much lower than that which the USSR and the United States now in fact possess. And this means that tangible practical steps in limiting and reducing armaments are quite possible. Measures which, far from weakening, will in fact, strengthen security both of the USSR and of the United States and the entire strategic stability in the world.

What can one say about the other questions discussed at the meeting?

Let me start with the problem of regional conflicts. Both sides expressed concern over the continued existence of such "hot spots." And that is understandable. Such conflicts are a dangerous thing, especially with the threat of their expansion in the nuclear age.

But our approaches to the causes and ways of removing such conflicts are, one could say, not just different, but diametrically opposite. The United States, accustomed to thinking in the categories of "spheres of interest," reduces these problems to rivalry between East and West. But in our day that is an anachronism, a relapse of imperial thinking, which denies the right of the majority of the peoples to think and decide for themselves.

The deep-seated origins of such conflicts are multifaceted — they are partly rooted in history, and, most importantly, in the social and economic conditions in which the newly liberated countries have been placed. There is good reason, of course, why, when speaking of the problem of regional conflicts, the United States says nothing about the atrocities of apartheid in South Africa, that country's aggression in respect to its African neighbors, the wars of the U.S. puppets in Central America and Southeast Asia, Israel's in the Middle East, and many other things. Washington tries to put on the same footing the legitimate governments of states taking the way of national liberation and social progress, and counter-revolution.

It goes without saying that we have been unable to accept such an interpretation. The President was told that we stand for a recognition of every people's inalienable right to freedom and independence and to its own choice of way. Our stand is that this right should not be trampled by anyone, that there should be no attempts at external interference, and that freedom, instead of tyranny, should triumph. We have been and will continue to be on the side of the peoples standing up for their independence. This is our principled line.

The President touched on the question of Afghanistan. In this context, it was once again reaffirmed that the Soviet Union consistently stands for a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. We want our friendly neighbor Afghanistan to be an independent non-aligned state, with the

establishment of a regime of guaranteed non-intervention in the affairs of Afghanistan. That would also settle the question of a withdrawal of the Soviet troops from that country. That is something the Soviet Union and the government of Afghanistan are entirely in favour of. Indeed, if anyone is hampering the earliest settlement of the question, it is above all the United States, which is financing, supporting and arming gangs of counter-revolutionaries and frustrating the efforts to normalize the situation there.

Questions of bilateral relations took up a considerable place in the negotiations. The enlightenment which has been in evidence here in the recent period has now been backed up with concrete agreements on exchanges and contacts in the sphere of science, education and culture, and on the re-establishment of air links between our countries.

But it is much easier, of course, to bring out to the full the potential latent here in conditions when a start is made on the settlement of the security issues which determine our relations with each other. And if there is to be cooperation, it should be on an equal footing, without any discrimination and preconditions, and without any attempts at interference in the internal affairs of the other side. Our position here is firm and consistent.

How then can one evaluate the main results of the meeting at Geneva?

The meeting was undoubtedly a considerable event. The frank, clear and concrete conversation is useful, and the possibility of making a clear comparison of the positions is useful. There is too great an accumulation of explosive and acute problems which had to be seriously examined and hopefully moved off dead ground.

We value the personal contacts established with the President of the United States. A dialogue between top leaders is always a moment of truth in relations between states. The important thing is that such a dialogue has taken place — and in these difficult times, it is itself a stabilizing factor.

But we are realists and must say frankly that at the meeting it was not possible to find the solution of the most important problem connected with ending the arms race. The U.S. leadership's unwillingness to give up the Star Wars program did not allow us to reach at Geneva any concrete understandings on actual disarmament and, above all, on the central problem of nuclear and space weapons. As a result of the meeting the quantity of weapons accumulated on both sides has not lessened, and the arms race continues. This cannot but cause disappointment.

The USSR and the United States are also still divided by major differences on a number of other fundamental questions of the situation in the world, and developments in individual regions. But we are also far from minimizing the importance of the understandings reached at Geneva.

Let me recall the most important of these. There are, first of all, the common understanding written into the joint statement that nuclear war must never be started and that there can be no victors in it, and the commitment by the USSR and the United States to base their relations on this incontrovertible truth,

and not to strive for military superiority.

We believe that this understanding, put on record jointly and at the highest level, must be put in deed at the basis of the foreign policy of both states. Now that it has been recognized that by its very character nuclear war cannot serve the attainment of any rational goals whatsoever, it means that there must be an even stronger incentive for averting it, ending the development and testing of the means of mass destruction, and completely liquidating the accumulated stockpiles of nuclear weapons. And it is even more intolerable to open up new lines in the arms race. Of course, the joint statement is not a treaty, but it is a statement of principle by the leaders of both countries which commits them to a great deal.

Furthermore, the USSR and the United States clearly reaffirmed their commitment to promote the utmost enhancement of the effectiveness of the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and have agreed on joint practical steps in this direction. In the present troubled international situation, this is of much importance for maintaining stability in the world and reducing the risk of an outbreak of nuclear war.

Of fundamental importance is the joint statement by the leaders of the two countries for a general and complete ban on and destruction of such barbarous weapons of mass destruction as chemical weapons. One should like to hope that in practical politics as well the United States will abide by this important understanding.

The understanding between the leadership of the USSR and the United States to promote, jointly with other states participating in the Stockholm Conference, its earliest completion with the adoption of a document including both concrete commitments on the non-resort to force, and mutually acceptable confidence-building measures.

The fact that as a result of the meeting a number of useful understandings has appeared along many lines of development of bilateral cooperation between the USSR and the United States is, of course, to be welcomed. I think that they will serve as a good basis for raising the level of confidence between our countries and peoples — provided, of course, what has been worked out is treated carefully and all the good elements it contains developed, instead of artificial pretexts being sought to upset them.

The significance of the understanding reached at Geneva on a continuation of political contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States, including new summit meetings, needs to be specially pointed out.

We are entitled to say, therefore, that the overall balance of Geneva is a positive one.

Our country's constructive and consistent policy has without doubt crucially promoted the achievement of such an encouraging result. At the same time, it would be unfair not to say here also that elements of realism were manifested in the position of the U.S. side at the meeting, and that this helped to settle a number of issues.

The true significance of everything useful on which we agreed at Geneva can, of course, be brought out only in practical deeds. I should like to

declare, in this connection, that the Soviet Union, for its part, intends not to slow down the pace and to strive, with the utmost resolve and in a spirit of honest cooperation with the United States, for a fold-up of the arms race and a general improvement of the international situation. We expect the same approach to be displayed on the part of the United States as well. Then, I am sure, the work done at Geneva will yield its true fruits.

Such is our evaluation of this event and of its role in international relations. I can say with satisfaction that this evaluation is shared by our allies — the fraternal socialist countries — as witnessed with the utmost clarity by the meeting of the leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member-countries in Prague just after the Soviet-U.S. summit negotiations ended.

The participants in the Prague meeting stressed that the situation does, of course, remain complicated. The struggle for its improvement continues, but the conditions of this struggle — and this can now already be said — have improved. The Geneva meeting is an important element of our long-term, joint and closely coordinated efforts aimed to ensure peace.

It is natural to ask this question: What is then to be done in the light of the results of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue at Geneva? As I have already said, we attach much importance to the understanding reached at Geneva on holding new Soviet-U.S. summit meetings. I want to stress that on this matter we go beyond a purely formal approach. Importance is attached not only to the fact itself that a new meeting of the leaders of the two countries is to take place, but to what kind of results it will have. The peoples will expect a practical advance along the way mapped out at Geneva. That is precisely what we shall be working for. Now is the time to start preparing for the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, and this should be done primarily in the sphere of practical politics.

If the achievement of future understandings is not to be hampered, both sides, we are convinced, need above all to refrain from acts undermining what has been achieved at Geneva. To refrain from acts that would block negotiations and erode the effective constraints on the arms race. This presupposes, in particular, honest and precise observance of the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Missile Defense Systems, and also further reciprocal observance by the parties of the relevant provisions of SALT II.

But the main thing, of course, consists in creating the possibility of truly ending the arms race and getting down to practical steps in reducing the accumulated nuclear arsenals.

Does such a possibility exist? We are firmly convinced that it does exist. It is true that just now our proposals and the U.S. proposals for cutting back nuclear weapons differ in many ways. But we do not dramatize this circumstance. Here compromise solutions are possible, and we are prepared to seek them.

There is no doubt that with such a development of events there would also be a solution of the problems of reliable verification in which the Soviet Union has a most immediate interest. Here one cannot rely on

words, especially when it comes to disarmament, to the country's defense.

But in order to solve these problems, it is absolutely necessary to shut tight the door through which weapons could penetrate into space. Without this, radical reductions of nuclear weapons are impossible. That is something I want to declare with the utmost responsibility on behalf of the people and its supreme organ of power.

An understanding is attainable if it reckons with the interests of both sides. The stubborn urge of the U.S. side to continue developing space weapons can have only one result: it could block the possibility of ending the nuclear arms race. Such an outcome would, of course, cause bitter disappointment among the peoples of the whole world, including, I am sure, the U.S. people.

There is now a real chance of sharply reducing the danger of nuclear war, and then also entirely eliminating the possibility of it. It would be a fatal mistake to miss this chance. We hope that what was said at Geneva concerning the SDI is not the last word of the U.S. side.

We agreed with President Reagan to authorize our delegations at the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space weapons to speed up the negotiations, conducting them on the basis of the January understanding between the two countries. Consequently, it has been confirmed at the highest level on both sides that it is necessary to avert an arms race in space, settling the question in a complex with nuclear-weapons cuts. That is exactly what the Soviet Union will work for. That is exactly what we urge on the United States. We shall justify the hopes of the peoples of the whole world by fulfilling in deed our jointly made commitment.

The question of ending nuclear tests tends to become more acute as time goes on, and that primarily because it would put an end to the development of new and improvement of existing types of nuclear weapons. Because, furthermore, without testing, without a renewal there would be a gradual withering away of the nuclear arsenals, and immobilization of nuclear weapons. Because, finally, nuclear explosions — and their number runs to hundreds — can no longer be allowed to mutilate our beautiful Earth, increasing the alarm over how future generations will live on it.

That is why the Soviet Union declared a moratorium until January 1, 1986, on all types of nuclear tests, and is prepared to extend this moratorium, if there is reciprocity on the part of the United States. We expect of the U.S. leadership a concrete and positive decision, which would have a very favorable effect on the whole situation, would largely change it, and strengthen confidence between our countries.

We addressed this question to the U.S. President at Geneva.

Silence was the answer. Indeed, there are essentially no reasonable arguments at all against the banning of nuclear tests. Reference is sometimes made to the difficulties of verification. But the Soviet Union clearly demonstrated that it is fully possible to carry out such verification with national facilities.

This year, we recorded an underground nuclear explosion of a very low yield which was staged in the United States and not announced by it. We are also prepared to examine the possibility of establishing international control. In this context, the considerations put forward in the appeal by the six states, proposing the establishment of special stations on the territory of their countries to monitor compliance with a test-halt understanding deserve attention.

The whole world has raised its voice for a halt to nuclear tests. The UN General Assembly has just passed a resolution calling for such a halt. And only three countries — the United States, Britain and France — voted against. This is to be profoundly regretted.

But there is still time. I think that the leaders of the United States and other nuclear powers will take the opportunity which has presented itself to display the necessary sense of responsibility in the light of the interests of peace. I should like to give this reminder: our moratorium remains in force, and we hope that the discussion of this question at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will be appreciated as a persevering call for a realistic prohibition of all nuclear tests without delay.

On the whole, the Soviet Union has proposed a comprehensive complex of measures shutting off all the ways of the arms race — whether in space or on the Earth, whether nuclear, chemical or conventional weapons. The concrete proposals on this score are well known — in Vienna, in Geneva, and in Stockholm. They remain in force and fully retain their urgency.

There is a need to say a few words particularly about Europe. As never before, it is acutely faced with the task of preventing any further rise in the level of the military confrontation. The European home is our common home, in which the destinies of dozens of countries and nations have been closely bound up with each other by geography and history. Only through collective effort and abiding by the rational norms of international intercourse and cooperation can the Europeans safeguard their home and make it better and more secure.

Our premise is that Europe, which has given the world so much in the sphere of culture, science, technology and progressive social thought, is also capable of setting an example in solving the most complicated problems of present-day international life. The basis for this was laid at Helsinki 10 years ago. It is our most profound conviction that the whole world, including the United States, will ultimately gain from a positive development of the situation in Europe. We have worked and will continue to work to help more vigorously consolidate the principles and policy of détente, overcome the blockages of the past and the consequences of the confrontation over the past several years on the long-suffering European continent.

I should like to speak here in particular about trade and economic ties. The business circles of many countries in the West would like to establish broader economic contacts with us. I have had occasion to hear from some very influential representa-

tives of these circles about this, about their readiness for large-scale contracts, for starting big joint projects. And, in my view, the political leaders who try to restrict this natural urge for business cooperation in the hope of "punishing" someone and harming the partner are simply acting unwisely. Such a policy has long since outlived itself. It is much more useful to apply efforts for a different purpose, for having trade, and scientific and technical exchanges strengthen the material basis of concord and confidence.

In the struggle for lasting peace and cooperation between the peoples — in Europe and on other continents — we shall continue to cooperate closely with our Warsaw Treaty allies and with all the other countries of the socialist community. Under no circumstances will the Warsaw Treaty member-states forego the security of their peoples. They will also increasingly pool their efforts within the CMEA framework for the purposes of accelerating scientific and technological progress and economic and social development.

Cooperation with the non-aligned movement, including all-round cooperation with the Republic of India, for whose people and leadership we have the most profound respect, is of tremendous significance for improving international relations.

The Soviet leadership attaches serious importance to the Asian-Pacific region. The Soviet Union has its longest borders in Asia; here we also have our true friends and reliable allies — from neighboring Mongolia to socialist Vietnam. It is extremely important to prevent this region from being a source of tension, a sphere of military confrontation. We want a broader political dialogue between all the states situated there for the benefit of peace, good-neighborliness, mutual confidence and cooperation.

We welcome the stand of the People's Republic of China, which has come out against the militarization of space, and its statement repudiating the first use of nuclear weapons.

We want an improvement of relations with Japan and believe that this is a realistic prospect. It springs from the very simple fact that our countries are immediate neighbors. On the vital issue of removing the nuclear threat the interests of the USSR and Japan cannot but be identical.

We have established relations of equitable cooperation with many states of Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. The Soviet Union will continue to work purposefully to develop these relations. We especially value the close ties that have taken shape with the socialist-oriented countries situated on the various continents.

The peoples of the whole world now face a multiplicity of issues which can be settled only together and certainly in conditions of peace. Only a few decades ago, people were virtually unaware of any grave ecological problems. But this generation of ours is already witness to the mass destruction of forests, the disappearance of species, the contamination of rivers and other bodies of water, and the spread of desert areas. What will the world look like to future generations? Will they be able to live in

it if the predatory destruction of Nature is not halted, if modern economic, technical and scientific achievements are applied to the improvement of weapons of destruction, instead of the needs of ensuring the conditions for human existence and development, of improving the environment? Or take energetics. For the time being, we live mainly at the expense of what lies in the entrails of the Earth. But what lies virtually on the surface is being depleted, and the further use of minerals is ever more costly and ever more difficult. Nor is this source an everlasting one either.

The widening gap between a handful of highly developed capitalist countries and the developing countries — and they are the vast majority — whose lot has become poverty, hunger and despair, is also fraught with dangerous upheavals. The gulf between these two polar worlds yawns ever wider, and their relations are ever more antagonistic. Nor can they be different, unless the developed capitalist countries change their egoistic policy.

Today humankind can well cope with the solution of these problems if its forces and reason are united. New heights in the development of civilization will then become attainable.

Militarism is hostile to the peoples. The arms race, which is being whipped up by the military-industrial complex's thirst for profit, is reckless. It hits at the vitally important interests of all the countries and peoples. That is why when we are invited to spread the arms race out into space, instead of destroying nuclear weapons, we firmly say *no*. We say *no*, because such a step means a new and insane squandering of funds. We say *no*, because it means increasing the danger hanging over the world. We say *no*, because life itself calls for joint action for the benefit of peace, instead of competition in armaments.

The Soviet Union is a resolute advocate of developing international life in such a direction.

On the initiative of the USSR, with the participation of scientists from various countries, work has been started on a Tokamak thermonuclear-reactor project holding the prospect of a radical solution of the energy problem. Scientists say that a "terrestrial sun," an inexhaustible source of thermonuclear energy, could well be created before the end of this century. We note with satisfaction that it was agreed at Geneva to continue this important work.

Our country put before the United Nations a full-scale program for peaceful cooperation in space, and the establishment of a world space organization to coordinate the efforts of countries in the exploration of space. The potentialities for this are truly inexhaustible. There are the basic research and application of its results in the sphere of geology, medicine, the study of materials, and studies of the climate and the natural environment. There is the

development of global satellite communications systems and long-distance probing of the Earth. There are, finally, the development and use for the benefit of all the peoples of new space facilities, including large orbital scientific stations, various manned spaceships, and in the long term, the industrialization of near-earth space. Such is the real alternative to the Star Wars plans and it is oriented toward the peaceful future of humankind as a whole.

The Soviet Union was one of the active participants in the conclusion of the international convention on the regime governing the economic use of the resources of the World Ocean. The solution of this problem is likewise of great importance for ensuring the progress of human civilization, and expanding and multiplying the potentialities at the disposal of the society today.

We propose to the whole world, including the world of capitalist states, an extensive long-term and comprehensive program of mutually advantageous cooperation, taking account of the new potentialities opened up before humankind by the era of the scientific and technological revolution. And in realizing this program, cooperation between two such states as the Soviet Union and the United States could play a far from minor role.

Our policy is clear: it is a policy of peace and cooperation.

Comrades,

The successes of our foreign policy are rooted in the internal nature of the socialist system. The Communist Party well feels and highly values the support of its domestic and foreign policy by the whole people. This support lies in the daily practical labor effort of millions upon millions of people. The results achieved in the economy are not only an economic result, but also a most important moral and political result which testifies that the line we have taken is the correct one.

Ahead of us lie important and difficult endeavors: "But difficulty," the great Lenin taught us, "is not unfeasibility. What is important is confidence in the correct choice of way, and this confidence multiplies the revolutionary energy and the revolutionary enthusiasm a hundred-fold." And the party and the Soviet people have such confidence, which multiplies our force.

We are sure that every communist, every worker, every peasant, every engineer and scientist, every work collective will do their duty to their country with a high sense of responsibility.

We are sure that everything will be done at every workplace to have the 1986 plans successfully fulfilled and overfulfilled, so as to make our country even richer and mightier, and the cause of peace on Earth stronger and victorious.

Pravda, November 28, 1985

Great Responsibility for the World's Future

Mikhail Gorbachev's Reply to the Joint Message from Six Heads of State and Government

Mr. Raul Alfonsin, President of Argentina,
Mr. Miguel de la Madrid, President of Mexico,
Mr. Olof Palme, Prime Minister of Sweden,
Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, Prime Minister of India,
Mr. Julius Nyerere,
Mr. Andreas Papandreou, Prime Minister of Greece,

Dear Sirs,

The Soviet leadership has considered your joint message with the utmost attention. The message is confirmation that we pursue common goals and that your proposals concerning curtailment of the arms race — above all the nuclear arms race — and prevention of the militarization of outer space are consonant with our approach.

You justly link your hopes for positive change in international relations with the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. For our part, we vigorously advocate attainment at the meeting of specific, tangible accords that would help to build up security and confidence in the world and make it possible to check the increasingly rapid stockpiling and perfection of weapons. This is what the world's nations are expecting.

Aware of its responsibility for the future of the world, the Soviet Union has put forward a package of new initiatives concerning virtually all questions connected with the cessation of the arms race and with disarmament. We have declared our readiness for a 50 percent cut in the number of Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory, if a ban on the development of assault space weapons is imposed. This is a feasible and practical formula for preventing an arms race in outer space and for truly radical nuclear arms reductions on Earth. Besides, the USSR has taken, especially in the recent period, a number of well-known unilateral steps.

I would like to dwell on the question you single out particularly in your message — that of a 12-month-long Soviet and U.S. moratorium on nuclear explosions.

We share your assessment of such a move. You are fully justified to link your hopes for a reliable obstacle to the nuclear arms race, for a turn toward actual elimination of nuclear weapons with a cessation of the tests.

A cessation of nuclear tests would indeed make it possible to drastically put a brake on, and in many cases virtually rule out, the qualitative perfection of nuclear weapons, the development of their new types and the enhancement of their already deadly characteristics. This would seriously undermine the nuclear arms race.

That is precisely why the Soviet Union attaches such great importance to a comprehensive and universal prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, why it pursues this objective steadfastly and consistently.

In an effort to break the deadlock concerning the solution of this problem, the USSR unilaterally suspended, as of August 6, 1985, all nuclear explosions for the rest of the year. We also announced that the moratorium will remain in effect after the end of the year if the United States, for its part, accedes to the moratorium, that is, refrains from carrying out nuclear explosions. So whether the Soviet moratorium continues beyond the date referred to depends wholly on the United States.

There exists now a real opportunity to take, at long last, the decisive, literally historic step so as to end the tests forever. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, let me repeat that we could agree to an extension of our moratorium beyond January 1, 1986 if it is joined by the United States. Moreover, we are already prepared now, today, for a permanent contractual ban on all nuclear weapon tests.

We are convinced that if political will is displayed, it will be entirely possible to solve the question of verification too. The current state of the national technical means of the USSR and the United States makes it easy to ascertain whether nuclear explosions are being carried out or not. This is borne out by the latest facts.

As agreement on banning nuclear weapon tests fully and universally is reached, one could, in addition, look for other mutually acceptable verification procedures, including methods using the possibilities you refer to in your message.

A solution to the issue involving both a comprehensive ban and a temporary moratorium on nuclear weapon tests calls for mutual accommodation, for mutual consideration of each other's security interests. It is groundless to expect to secure any one-sided advantages in this regard.

We continue to believe in the force of a good example, in the triumph of common sense which, after all, must prevail when one deals with an issue affecting the very existence of civilization.

Allow me to express the hope that, stimulated by the stand of highly respected leaders of Delhi Declaration signatory countries representing different continents, efforts in this direction will bear fruit. You can always count on the Soviet Union in this noble endeavor.

Mikhail Gorbachev
Pravda, November 8, 1985

A Path Leading to a World Without Wars

Statement by the Communist Party of Canada Central Executive Committee

President Reagan's United Nations statement will come as a shock to those who harbored illusions that the U.S. administration wants arms control on the basis of the Gromyko-Schultz joint statement of last January. This statement, which set the basis for the Geneva talks, linked the prevention of the militarization of space to reductions in strategic and intermediate weapons.

The Reagan UN statement exposes utterly the false claim of equal responsibility for the arms race.

The U.S. President's statement was intended to divert world public opinion from what is primary — arms control and arms reductions — and into an ideological exercise aimed at stepping up the Cold War and sharpening international tensions. It ignores the latest Soviet peace initiatives for cooperation, not confrontation, at the Geneva summit.

The Soviet Union has and always will support the right of peoples to their national and social liberation. On the other hand, the Reagan administration has moved heaven and earth to interfere both directly and indirectly in the internal affairs of other countries and to prop up or restore fascist dictatorships.

Who intervenes in the internal affairs of Nicaragua, El Salvador, Chile, Grenada, the Middle East, India, Vietnam, Korea and South Africa? Who tries to impose a Pax Americana on the world in the

name of its "national interests"? Who is pressing to integrate Canada into plans for the militarization of space and for a first-strike nuclear strategy?

It is more than unfortunate that Prime Minister Mulroney, not to speak of the other NATO allies of the USA, has chosen to remain silent or to go along with the Reagan administration's dangerous course instead of condemning it.

These leaders do not speak for their peoples who overwhelmingly want peace and the prevention of nuclear war, who want détente not confrontation.

The Geneva summit provides the opportunity to break the ice jam and open the door to disarmament. The Canadian people must prevent this from being sidetracked. The Geneva summit can and must succeed. The roadblock to success is the U.S. administration and the military-industrial complex which battens on war orders and the huge profit from war orders.

Canadians must demand of the Mulroney government — speak up for Canada, speak up for the Canadian people, speak up for peace, speak up for arms controls and arms reductions based on parity and equality of security as the path leading to a world without war.

Ottawa, October 29, 1985

congresses & plenary meetings

France: With Courage and Confidence

Closing Speech by Georges Marchais at a National Conference of the French Communist Party*

Our conference is coming to a close. After the meaningful report presented by André Lajoinie and the constructive debate we have passed decisions that will define our actions until March 1986.

We have adopted a document proving that a "way out of the existing situation is possible." We have shown that the main trump of the French working people today and tomorrow is the Communist Party, its influence, and its deputies in elected bodies. Proceeding from this we have decided that already today our entire party — all its members and organizations — should join in the struggle to ensure voter support for the communists. Each of us, delegates to this national conference, is duty bound to contribute to the fulfilment of the adopted decisions.

I shall not go into all the details of the work we have accomplished. But I should like to take this opportunity to address, from this hall, the French

women and men, who are today, half a year before the elections, thinking of the choice they will have to make.

I should like to tell them the following. The question confronting electors in 1986 is a question of assessing the results of the past five years.

I am referring to an entirely different problem as compared with what we had in 1981. Prior to 1981 the Right was in power for 23 years. Their policy of austerity condemned you and your families to privation, led to increased unemployment, accentuated social inequality, and weakened France. Neither Giscard, nor Barre, nor Chirac ever needed your opinion. They only cared for businessmen and big employers. Throughout those 23 years all of us jointly fought the Right, voted against the Right. In 1981, we at last defeated them.

Within a few months we shall have to vote again but this time in an entirely new situation. To listen to the Socialist Party one gets the impression that nothing has changed since 1981. It talks ceaselessly

*This conference was held in Nanterre on October 12-13, 1985.
—Ed.

about the Right. But for five years the nation has been led not by the Right but by Mitterrand and the Socialist Party. Of course, we should not forget what the Right did in its time! Naturally, they have to be fought! But you, the electors, have to assess the period between 1981 and 1986. What had today's leaders promised you? What have they actually accomplished? What has this yielded? Under no circumstances should this experience be left out of sight, because on its basis you will have to decide to vote for the continuation of the present course or for changes.

Let us consider the experience of the past five years.

Let us recall the big hopes that we had in 1981. But these hopes gradually gave way to disenchantment and then to discontent. Austerity has returned, stronger than ever. The unemployment rate has broken all records. All of the people's gains are under attack, and the French economy has been further weakened. The nation's leaders continue to ignore your opinion. Yet in the past five years profits have grown by 83 per cent. And, as in the times of the Right, the privileged remain privileged, while ordinary people like you continue to bear all the hardships.

Such is the experience that you have acquired. Nobody can, nor is anybody trying, to dispute the fact that Mitterrand and the Socialist Party have not honored their promises. In a televised speech a few days ago minister Chevènement put it explicitly, saying: "We have changed in the sense that in the past we were in the opposition, while now we are the ruling party. Naturally, as long as we were in the opposition we had to reckon with grievances." The socialist leaders used you for their own purposes. They took advantage of your trust so as to come to power, but once they found themselves in the government they began pursuing the same policy as their predecessors.

What are they telling you now? That in 1986 you will have no alternative to voting either for the Right or for them, for the socialists. The only sensible and "beneficial" way out, they declare, will be to vote for the socialists.

But let us together think how sensible this is.

Is it sensible to vote for a continuation of what we observe today? All the leaders of the socialists, whether Mitterrand, Fabius or Rocard, are of the view that the present governmental policy is the best of what is possible, and that if they are permitted they will stick to the same course without changing anything. But this is not at all what you want.

Is it sensible to vote for a policy that would help to reinforce the Right? If the results of the government's work were not so pitiful, the Right would not have had the least chance. However, discontent is so great that virtually everybody is allowing for the possibility of a return of the Right to power. But this is even less what you want.

Lastly, will it be sensible to vote for a party that is thinking of collaboration with the Right? True, at the recent Socialist Party convention in Toulouse, Jospin declared that his party would not enter into an alliance with the Right. But in the same breath he

amended his assertion, adding that if in 1986 the socialists find themselves "in a predominant position" and if "in that situation some elements split away from the conservative bloc and tilt toward the Socialist Party that prospect could be considered in a favorable light." That could not have been put more clearly. The leaders of the socialists obviously intend to conclude an alliance with a section of the Right. They even do not insist that the prime minister of such a government should necessarily be a socialist. The only condition they are insisting on for the conclusion of such an alliance is that the Socialist Party is assured of a position strong enough to put it in a "predominant position." In other words, it has been publicly declared that the more votes the socialists get the more realistic will be the possibility of forming a coalition government of the Right and the Socialist Party. This is nothing less than a return to the practice of 30 years ago, when the Socialist Party regularly collaborated with the Right. This you do not want, either, of course.

In this light the situation is absolutely clear.

Let us now consider what voting for the communists will give. The essence of such voting is likewise perfectly clear.

First, to vote for the communists is to vote for a better, more dependable defense of your interests. It means voting for a party that has always told you the truth, for a party that preferred fidelity to you rather than participation in government as soon as the communists saw that they were no longer able to prevent the Socialist Party from pursuing an austerity policy. It means voting for a party that has always been on your side, a party that with its militants and deputies has always fought together with you for your demands and recommendations, and for respect of your rights.

Second, to vote for the communists is to vote for a different policy. We assert that crisis is not fatally inevitable. A way out can be found. Your difficulties, the difficulties of the entire country, can be transcended. One and the same cause underlies all of them. They are the outcome of the fact that in France everything is decided in accordance with the interests of the financial oligarchy. In order to continue enriching the privileged strata — owners of large fortunes, financial speculators, big employers — they are sacrificing everything: the economy, jobs, your living standard. To fight the crisis effectively a choice must be made in favor of a different way based on your interests and the interests of the nation. We are showing that the conditions for this exist.

You want a more just life. This is possible. We are suggesting a large series of effective measures to invigorate the economy, provide jobs for all who need them, increase your purchasing power, and improve the system of social security.

You want greater freedom and you want your opinion to be taken into consideration. This, too, is possible. We are suggesting every support for the initiative and responsibility of the working people, of all citizens. There must be a further extension of freedoms in France.

You want a more dignified life, you want to be

esteemed by people. This is also possible. We want effective measures against racism, against the inequality of women, and against disregard for the needs and aspirations of young people. Solidarity is central to our struggle.

You want to live in an independent France, in a situation of world peace. This can be achieved. France must have the possibility of making an independent, free choice. She must decide for herself with whom to establish links and develop cooperation. We are opposed to the arms race.

Lastly, to vote for the communists is to vote for the disruption of all the designs and calculations now being built around the idea of "coexistence." This means effectively contributing to the defeat of the Right, helping the 1986 elections bring something new. We are and intend to remain a governmental party. We believe that our proposals are effective. And if we are given the opportunity to prove this in deeds, we shall be prepared to undertake the entire responsibility and cooperate loyally with other forces, particularly with the Socialist Party. As we have already declared at the FCP's 25th congress, "we are always prepared, now and in the future, to take part in government jointly with other political forces in order to help resolve the problems of the people and country and ensure a way out of the crisis and changes in society."

Can an advance be made along that road in 1986, in other words, can the Right be defeated and changes started? We reply in the affirmative. In our country there are forces strong enough to achieve this.

Are there not many people in France, women and men, who stand in need of a policy of economic growth consonant with present-day aspirations and potential, of precisely the policy that we are suggesting? Look how many people have no work, are under threat of dismissal, and are keenly interested in having priority being given to job security. How many citizens are finding their life becoming harder every day? How many of our fellow citizens desire an improvement of their condition, safeguards for their purchasing power, and an end to social injustice? How many wage and salary workers of the most diverse categories — factory workers, office employees, junior technical personnel, engineers, and management workers — are seeing their rights attacked, their gains and guarantees menaced, need an improvement of their skills, and an improvement of the conditions of their everyday life and work? How many farmers are there whose incomes are diminishing or who are compelled to leave their land? How many intellectuals are rejecting the conformism that they see around them and endeavoring to place the great achievements of scientific and technological progress in the service of society? How many women whose aspirations for equality are being suppressed? How many young people who are, after leaving school, condemned to enter a life of frustration and uncertainty in tomorrow, and to come face to face with unemployment?

How many of our fellow citizens are against our society becoming unsuitable for life, the continuing deterioration of the relations between people, the

further entrenchment of violence, insecurity and racism? How many of our people do not regard the concepts of decency, solidarity and magnanimity as outdated? How many of our fellow citizens are opposed to France's growing economic and cultural dependence, the decline of its actual role in the struggle for peace and disarmament?

How many there are of them? They number millions upon millions — men, women and young people throughout the whole of our country. This, I repeat, is a colossal force sufficient, if united, to prevent the Right from coming to power in 1986 and to create the conditions for the implementation of a new governmental policy aimed at eradicating the causes of the crisis and furnishing a genuine solution of the serious problems confronting our people and country.

Of course, to achieve this it is crucial to answer the question facing us of the place and role of the Communist Party, of voting for the communists in 1986. We repeat our appeal to you to consider this cardinal question carefully.

In 1972 the Communist and Socialist parties concluded an agreement on joint participation in government. The two parties were posed with the task of ensuring the broadest possible unity against the Right. But virtually one day after this agreement was signed Mitterrand declared that his purpose was to deprive the Communist Party of three million votes. Precisely this was the objective of the Socialist Party in the course of many years, in order to acquire "freedom of action." It ultimately achieved this in 1981, when the Communist Party's positions weakened, and those of the Socialist Party were significantly strengthened.

What followed cannot be considered in isolation from this fact. For five years the Socialist Party enjoyed full power and had all the means for imposing its will. Despite all its efforts, the Communist Party was unable to prevent the Socialist Party from going back on its own promises. In order to allow a new situation to take shape, to ensure the triumph of your striving for a different policy, the obtaining situation must be rectified. The Communist Party is the sole guarantee that what you desire is finally given a hearing. That is why it is so important to vote for the communists in 1986.

That is why for all of you — for those who vote for our party's candidates at all elections; for those who voted for the communists in 1981 but then refrained from participation in the voting because the policy of the socialist government in which we participated, evoked their discontent; for those who in 1981 voted for the socialists in the belief that this was the only way to ensure changes and now feel themselves cheated; and for the young people who do not want to be a sacrificed generation — for all of you a vote for the communists is a possibility for using your ballot effectively and sensibly. It is only in unity that you can play the decisive role.

You must clearly realize that in this political battle nothing has as yet been finally decided. Our party continues the struggle. Wherever you look you can see rank-and-file members of the FCP and communist deputies working energetically for your cause.

The strength, the opinion of those who, whatever their persuasions, will unite by voting for the communists, will have to be reckoned with. What, if not this circumstance, explains the recent vituperations of the republic's President against our party? How is one to understand the promise made by Chirac — whom some people see as the Prime Minister of a future Mitterrand government — to expel the communists from all positions of responsibility? The answer is very simple — our party is a hindrance to them. It hinders them painfully. And this is a good sign! We are firmly determined to continue pursuing

our course so that the interests of our people and country prevail.

It is therefore the duty of each one of us, comrades, to join in this battle, to display determination and confidence in our own strength. The victory of the Right is by no means certain! It is possible to prevent their return to power, their collaboration with the Socialist Party that is aggravating the difficulties and the decline in the country. A way out of the crisis can be ensured by contributing to the only sensible and effective voting, to the voting for the communists!
l'Humanité, October 14, 1985

New Aspects of the Political Situation and Preparations for the Eighth GCP Congress

Extracts from a Speech by Herbert Mies, GCP Chairman, at a Plenary Meeting of the Party Board

The Board of the German Communist Party held a plenary meeting in Düsseldorf on October 26 and 27, 1985. GCP Chairman Herbert Mies spoke at the meeting (extracts from his speech follow). The meeting also heard and discussed a report of the GCP Board Presidium and Secretariat on preparations for the next party congress.

Signs of new political and social conflicts are multiplying in the Federal Republic. While expressing concern at the rulers' socio-reactionary and anti-democratic policy, we put it on record that the struggle against mass unemployment and for employment programs is assuming the character of a broad movement. Protest actions against social dismantling, the curtailment of the rights of labor and its unions, curbs on the right to demonstration, police terror, the reactionary revision of the general law on institutions of higher learning, the disfranchisement of women — in short, acts of resistance to injustice — are indicative of a desire to form an active democratic counter-force opposing the federal government's policy for a swing to the right.

Now as in the past, we must open people's eyes to the dangers threatening them. However, today we must couple this in greater measure with elucidation of today's increased opportunities in the fight for peace and for social and democratic rights. It is now particularly important to show that the more aggressive and reactionary forces must and can be held off and their plans foiled if the peace and democratic forces and the working class movement actively continue and step up their struggle.

SAVE HUMANITY FROM NUCLEAR DISASTER

There is no task more important than that of removing the threat of nuclear disaster and safeguarding peace, for humanity is faced with a choice between living together and dying together. Our draft theses note that either developments will be given a turn for the better — away from confrontation and the arms race to détente and disarmament — or humanity will be threatened with falling into the precipice of nuclear annihilation. Therefore all who want peace must

and can join efforts. The advocates of Star Wars and a suicidal nuclear first-strike, of arms race and political adventurism, must not be allowed to win the upper hand. It is the forces opposing the militarization of space and declaring for disarmament on earth, for cooperation and détente, for reason and realism in international relations that must prevail.

We strongly emphasize that the forces of peace and reason are really in a position to succeed. The latest peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and the socialist community have provided new opportunities for this. There is a truly historic chance to prevent humanity from falling into the precipice of nuclear disaster, to break the vicious circle of the arms race.

In line with the interests of peace and the national interests of our country, we welcome the vast peace program announced by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, during his visit to France. We Welcome the fact that all the Warsaw Treaty countries have identified themselves with these proposals, and that at their Sofia meeting they took new important disarmament initiatives and announced a truly historic peace program.

The disarmament proposals of the socialist countries, if put into practice, would radically improve the international situation in terms of safeguarding peace. They would make peaceful cooperation among states possible irrespective of the social system or military alliance to which they belong.

Since the socialist community had taken new important steps toward safeguarding world peace, we consider that it is now up to the United States and its allies, especially the Federal Republic.

OUR DEMAND ON THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Our demands on the Federal government are, now as before, as follows:

Insist that the U.S. government take a constructive approach to talks on the proposals of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Contribute in the spirit of peaceful east-west cooperation to the prevention of an arms race in space and to the discontinuance of the arms race under way on earth.

Say an unqualified no to involvement in the Strategic Defense Initiative. Reject any general agreement on participation of the industry of the Federal Republic in the militarization of space.

Contribute actively to cooperation among European countries on peaceful research projects. Give constructive support to the Soviet proposal to the UN concerning international cooperation in the peaceful use of a non-militarized space.

Work actively to ensure that the Pershing II missiles are withdrawn from the territory of the Federal Republic and that the deployment of Cruise missiles planned for 1986 is called off. Signify readiness to negotiate the creation of zones free from chemical and nuclear weapons in the center of Europe. Revise the measures adopted lately for the further militarization of the Federal Republic, in particular the extension of the call-up period to 18 months.

Most of our people reject all involvement in the SDI program of the United States. It is not the militarization of space but peaceful cooperation in exploring and using it that will enable our people to safeguard their security.

NEW POSSIBILITIES OF SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC-COMMUNIST UNITY OF ACTION

"At no time since inception of the GCP," we state in the draft theses for our eighth party congress, "have we gained so much experience of the working class unity of action as since the early 80s . . ." It is "more obvious than before that the social democrats' and communists' common interests in defending peace and in the social sphere, and their common anti-fascist convictions are far more important than the political and ideological differences dividing them. Substantial changes have occurred in the political attitudes of the SDP since 1982 when it joined the opposition. The SDP accepted the substantive demands of the peace movement. Its yes to the deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles has become no, and its earlier rejection of actions in defense of peace has given way to appeals for participation in them. The SDP has also identified itself with important trade union demands. In certain areas of economic and social policy and environmental protection, it has evolved concepts meeting the working people's interests . . . These developments have resulted in better relations between the Social Democrats and the Communists."

We can register similar positive changes at the international level. We consider it highly important that noted social democrats of the Federal Republic, Britain and Sweden contribute to *World Marxist Review*, the international journal of communist and workers' parties. We hail the fact that the SDP is extending its contacts with the CPSU, the SUPG, and the communist and workers' parties of other socialist countries, particularly where this produces

positive results, as in the case of the draft agreement on a chemical weapons free zone in central Europe and what we hope will soon be a nuclear-free zone. Lastly, we think it is very important in terms of the fight for peace that the Vienna Appeal of the Socialist International takes a stand against Reagan's SDI program and that the SDP presidium resolutely supports this.

It is thus a question of fundamental processes in the working class movement that are central to the shaping of our policy line both toward the struggle for peace and in the interest of an overall change in the political balance in the Federal Republic.

We are for genuine cooperation because we know that without greater unity of action peace cannot be made more durable, nor can the working class make real gains in its fight against encroachment on jobs and social achievements.

We do not conceal distinctions between the positions of the social democrats and the communists. But we believe that no controversy over fundamental ideological issues, however bitter, need hinder cooperation in the actual struggle for common objectives. Both the dimensions of the danger threatening humanity today and the concrete historical experience of the German working class movement prompt us to attach special importance to the promotion of unity of action.

CHANGE THE CONTENT OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

To put pressure on the government and prevent it from pursuing its rightist policy is the decisive political task in our current struggle for peace and work. This should be on the agenda of any serious debate on extra parliamentary movements. It should also be discussed in taking a stand on the Bundestag elections due in January 1987. A debate on it is going on in the SDP and the trade unions. A similar debate is under way among the Greens. To a greater or lesser degree, it has started everywhere.

This debate is necessary. However, it should not divert the democratic forces from exerting concrete pressure on the Kohl/Genscher government now.

What is particularly urgent as well as realistic at the moment, in view of the existing balance of forces? Our country needs primarily the following:

- a change in favor of disarmament, that is, first and foremost, rejection of all support for the SDI;
- a change in favor of an effective struggle against mass unemployment, that is, first and foremost, the implementation of an employment program and a struggle for the repeal of laws encroaching on social gains;

- a change in favor of restoring democratic rights, that is, first and foremost, an end to the ban on professions (*Berufsverbote*) and the abrogation of the rightists' laws and draft laws designed to worsen the conditions for the struggle of the working class and other democratic forces.

Needless to say, we communists, like other democratic forces, are interested in the removal in 1987 of a conservative government which refuses to carry on a constructive disarmament policy, combat mass unemployment under an employment pro-

gram, and respect democratic rights. But precisely in order to bring this about, we must even now force the government to the defensive in political spheres and block its rightist policy. This would provide the best prerequisites for a change of government in 1987. It would also be a major guarantee that there would be not just an external change in the government's "color" but primarily a change in its real policy.

Thus it is by no means immaterial to us communists which party or parties will form the next federal government. But what we are interested in most of all is, of course, the actual content of government policy. There is a need for both a different government and a different policy. The two are inseparable. After all, the right-wing coalition can be replaced only if the working people, youth and women come to realize that a corresponding government alternative is, as far as its content is concerned, an alternative to the policy of submission to Washington, to acquiescence in mass unemployment, and to encroachments on social and democratic rights.

Considerable sections of our people hope that the changes which have come about in SDP policy since the change of government, as well as the appearance of the Greens in the Bundestag, will provide new opportunities of uniting forces to the left of the CDU/CSU. We firmly support this political idea, even though it encounters numerous difficulties, obstacles and doubts about its feasibility. The idea is not an abstract scheme. It gives food for thought and offers a line of activity, and it should not be considered unrealistic. We stand for the emergence of new forms of cooperation among all democratic and left forces, especially with due regard to the upcoming Bundestag elections.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF EXISTING SOCIALISM OFFER ALL PROGRESSIVE FORCES BETTER CONDITIONS FOR STRUGGLE

The progress of existing socialism is a major source of our strength. We are now looking with tremendous interest and great expectations at the Soviet Union, where preparations for the 27th CPSU congress are under way and where the draft program of the CPSU and the Guidelines of the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986-1990 and up to the Year 2000 have been published. In his important speech to the October plenary meeting of the CPSU CC, Mikhail Gorbachev outlined the tasks facing Soviet communists in this connection. It is a question of "accelerating economic growth while at the same time accomplishing strategic tasks, such as improving the people's well-being, building up the economic potential, and maintaining the defense might at a proper level. . . ." It is perfectly evident that this will substantially enhance the international appeal of existing socialism and at the same time create much more favorable political conditions for solving a fundamental problem of today, which is to "curb the forces of militarism and war and to provide durable peace and dependable security."

The German Democratic Republic is engaged in

preparation for the ninth SUPG congress, of which we have every reason to say even now that it will sum up exceptionally good results and pave the way for new successes. We are all aware, especially today, that the very existence of the socialist German state, whose policy is inspired by the idea that no war menace must come from German soil ever again, has a strong impact. The fact that the socialist GDR is pursuing a consistent policy for peace and is linked with the Soviet Union by inseparable bonds is vastly important, above all now that influential sections of the ruling class in the Federal Republic submit to the U.S. policy of confrontation and arms race. At the junction of the two opposed social systems, we see with particular clarity how very important it is that practical proof is furnished on German soil that mass unemployment, poverty, social insecurity and fear of the future can be overcome where power belongs to the working people and not to big capitalists.

The achievements of our comrades in the Soviet Union and the GDR are a source of inspiration to us and strongly support us in our struggle. They show the way to a future without war, exploitation or oppression.

The better we explain it to the working people and youth of our country that existing socialism is both a social system of peace and a system which can and does solve fundamental problems of human existence, such as capitalism cannot cope with, the faster awareness of the need for our country to adopt a socialist alternative will spread, and the more favorable conditions we will have for our struggle. Popularization of the successes of existing socialism will contribute appreciably to our party's more rapid advance at the present stage as well.

CURRENT TASKS

Let us sum up our current tasks with regard to preparations for the Eighth Party congress.

1. Further development of the peace movement remains a paramount task of the party. In the process, the struggle against the militarization of space, a meaningful orientation to action, and a continued debate on the strategy of safeguarding peace should constitute the main lines.

This is why we are doing our best to help translate the social struggle into direct actions mobilizing the masses. From this point of view, it is very important to orient the whole party to publicizing our proposals concerning programs for the creation of jobs in every field. The orientation to social struggles is closely bound up with the struggle for democracy, particularly with the defense of the rights of labor and with a further expansion of the movement against *Berufsverbote*.

2. To promote unity of action, we need, first of all, a broad dialogue with the social democrats at all levels. The communists' and social democrats' common responsibility for the further growth of the peace movement, and their joint or parallel support of the trade union struggles should be the main content of the dialogue.

As regards the further development of our policy of alliances, we aim at strengthening all the alliance

that spring up in the course of extraparliamentary struggles, and above all at carrying forward the idea of broad democratic electoral alliances. It is necessary, first of all, to ensure support for the Peace List. We are seeking greater variety in our debates with the Greens. It is a question of our common responsibility for the further advance of the peace movement and extraparliamentary movements, as well as of the possibility of cooperation in anticipation of the 1987 Bundestag elections.

3. The discussion of the pre-congress theses going on throughout the party is intended to heighten politically and ideologically the party's ability to fulfil its political tasks. The Thalmann Enrolment campaign is aimed at considerably reinforcing the party ranks, primarily by winning new members. Along with this, we must work steadfastly to win *Unsere Zeit* a larger readership.

We firmly keep our sights on the need to increase our influence among the working class and to strengthen our organizations at the enterprises. Nor

do we overlook the need to intensify our work among youth, women and cultural workers.

We couple the discussion of the theses in the party and the Thalmann Enrolment campaign with our orientation to action and to political work among the masses.

4. In making preparations for the party congress, we are working to strengthen and develop the spirit of proletarian internationalism. This purpose is served by our participation in anti-imperialist solidarity actions. It is also served by Existing Socialism Week. The current preparations for congresses of the CPSU and the SUPG are of special political and ideological significance to us. We are going to purposefully use the results of the fraternal parties' congresses in strengthening our party, the publication of the new CPSU program, the general mobilizing role of the successful development of existing socialism, and its important peace offensive.

Supplement to *Unsere Zeit*,
October 31, 1985

Greece: For a Policy in the Interests of the People

Report of the Presidium of a Plenary Meeting* of the CC of the Communist Party of Greece

1. On the basis of a report presented by the Political Bureau a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece summarized the discussions held in party organizations on the resolutions passed by the CC at its plenary meeting in June 1985.

Upon considering the political situation in the country, the plenary meeting underlined that the substance of the government's program declarations and practical steps became clearer after the elections.** They can be characterized as a policy aimed at some modernization of state institutions and maneuvering while preserving the system of dependent capitalism.

The plenary meeting noted that in its foreign policy the government was applying its pre-election theory of "tranquil seas" in Greek-U.S. relations. Departing entirely from its initial stance relative to

the EEC, the present Cabinet has in fact agreed to be a party to the further integration of Europe, confining itself to a few reservations in relation to the EEC. These reservations are designed for "domestic consumption" and to obtain some financial indulgences and other temporary benefits. The latter do not in any way compensate for the adverse impact of EEC membership on the national economy, an impact that will deepen with the close of the five-year "transition period" on January 1, 1986.

The plenary meeting pointed out that in the light of the results of political development in the period since the elections, in a situation witnessing an exacerbation of the crisis of Greece's capitalist economy and society, it is becoming clearer than before that the only solution in the interests of the people is, as the Communist Party is suggesting, to form a democratic government and ensure genuine changes in the direction of socialism. Under these conditions the CPG is becoming the crucial factor for the formation of an alliance of social and political forces interested in real changes of a socialist character in the nation's life. An important contribution to the efforts to form such an alliance would be made by unity among the left forces.

2. The economic measures announced by the government are an expression of its overall approach, of its attempts to resolve the problems of a dependent capitalist economy and emerge from its crisis at the expense of the working people. Devaluation of the national currency and soaring prices will virtually limit the operation of the mobile wage scale, which takes the rising cost of living into account. In addition to the reduction of budget alloca-

* The meeting was held in Athens in October 1985. — *Ed.*

** At the general parliamentary elections in Greece on June 2, 1985 the ruling Pan-Hellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK) polled 45.8 per cent of the votes and the right-wing opposition New Democracy (ND) received 42.5 per cent. Nearly 10 per cent of the electorate voted for the CPG (11 per cent in 1981) as a result of which there are 12 communist deputies in parliament. In terms of absolute figures, 630,000 people voted for the CPG (620,000 in 1981). At the June 1985 plenary meeting of the CPG Central Committee it was noted that the Communist Party had withstood an exceedingly hard battle on account of the discrimination against it by the bourgeois parties and the mass media. For example, under the electoral system bill forced through parliament by PASOK, to win one seat in parliament the communists had to poll 52,500 votes, while PASOK and New Democracy needed 18,100 and 20,500 votes respectively. The CPG Central Committee feels that the elections showed that the party's strategy and tactics are correct. — *Ed.*

tions for social requirements, these measures are used by the government to deprive the working people of a portion of their incomes and turn it over to big capital.

This policy will not lead to a solution either of the problem of investments or the problem of the national economy's competitiveness. It spells out a big gift to foreign and local capital. This policy encourages a drive for profits, ensuring easily gained superprofits by means of cutting wages and through the devaluation of the drachma.

The plenary meeting put it on record that the measures being taken by the government are striking the heaviest blow in recent years at the earnings of blue and white-collar workers, at their living standard. The peasants will likewise have to spend more to make their farms produce and, at the same time, together with other working people, they will be hard hit by the rising prices as consumers. Moreover, the government has announced that the prices of farm produce will be frozen at a level far below the runaway inflation. Craftsmen and artisans will have to bear the burden of new taxes, while the tax and other privileges of big capital will remain intact.

The plenary meeting considered the immediate and long-term impact of the government's measures. It was noted that these will cause further unemployment and aggravate the problem of health services, education and social security. There will be growing expenses on the payment of the external debt and increasing dependence upon foreign capital. The problem of development will be even more acute. In the long run the government's measures will lead to a further exacerbation of the general socio-economic crisis now being experienced by the nation. This aspect of the government's policy is totally at variance with the country's requirements, running counter to the interests of the people today and in the future, as has been borne out by the results of similar measures in 1983 and earlier in Greece and in other countries.

The government's measures have nothing in common with ensuring national independence. On the contrary, they are aimed at carrying out the directives of the Association of Greek Industrialists, the International Monetary Fund and the EEC. They are entirely consistent with the economic aspect of New Democracy's election platform. For that reason the ND's belated critical statements about them are purely demagogic and do not go beyond the bipartisan political game.

The plenary meeting pointed out that the measures announced by the government will not only have grave consequences for the people, for they offer no prospect for development, but are paving the way for further anti-people actions, for further concessions to foreign and local monopoly capital. In this situation there is a particularly vital need for prompt and united militant actions by all working people, regardless of their political affiliation. Acting through the trade unions the communists will be in the vanguard of this struggle to transcend the difficulties generated by the anti-people measures, for a policy meeting the interests of the people.

3. Noting the explosive nature of the present

international situation resulting from imperialism's cold war policies, the plenary meeting stressed that for the destinies of the Greek people and the whole of humanity growing significance is being acquired by the struggle to ease international tension, for peace and disarmament. This struggle is intimately linked, especially in the present period of grave economic crisis in the capitalist world, with hopes for an improvement of people's lives by means of re-channelling for peaceful development the colossal resources now being spent on armaments. Proceeding from this premise, the CPG Central Committee welcomes and approves the new Soviet proposals advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev as constituting a qualitatively new contribution by the Soviet Union to the cause of peace. Acceptance of these proposals would signify a fundamental turn in the international situation toward nuclear disarmament and détente. The CPG Central Committee underscores that the communists and all other progressive forces must do everything in their power to make the new Soviet proposals known to peace opinion in our country.

Athens, October 12, 1985
Rizospastis, October 13, 1985

The Unbroken Record Soviet Treaty Compliance

Daniel Rosenberg

paper 111 pp

In the USA:

**International Publishers
381 Park Ave. S.
New York, NY 10016
\$3.25**

In Canada:

**Progress Books
71 Bathurst St.
Toronto M5V 2P6
\$4.50**

The Party Will Carry the Cause of the Kampuchean Revolution to the Victorious Conclusion

Report of Heng Samrin, General Secretary of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea

The fifth congress of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea (PRPK) was held in Phnom Penh from October 13 to 16, 1985. The main report was delivered by Heng Samrin, General Secretary of the PRPK Central Committee (summary follows). The delegates discussed the report and unanimously approved a resolution noting the outstanding importance of the fifth congress of the PRPK in the life of the party and all working people currently taking up the first five-year plan of the country's rehabilitation and socio-economic development (1986-1990).

At a plenary meeting of the new PRPK Central Committee Heng Samrin was again elected General Secretary.

In his report, Heng Samrin noted that the Kampuchean revolution has advanced confidently over the past four years. Guided by the decisions of the fourth congress of the PRPK, the party succeeded in mobilizing the Kampuchean people to defend the gains of the revolution, to rehabilitate and develop the economy. As a whole, the Kampuchean revolution has grown stronger; revolutionary forces — a firm basis of the people's government — have developed in the nation.

These accomplishments are even more impressive if one takes into account the fact that during the years of its rule, Pol Pot's clique turned cities and towns into ruins, exterminated millions of Kampuchea's finest sons and daughters and destroyed the country's social and economic structures. The PRPK was forced to defend revolutionary gains simultaneously with building things anew. Since the very inception of People's Kampuchea, the forces of imperialism, of international and emigré reaction have been trying to eliminate the gains of the Kampuchean revolution; they have tried to achieve this goal acting through the gangs of the Pol Pot clique and other armed counter-revolutionary groups based in Thailand.

Past years prove that in the overall context, the enemy has already lost the battle and that he will suffer an inevitable and ultimate defeat. Of particular importance are the successes scored by the People's Revolutionary Army of Kampuchea and the Vietnamese volunteers in the dry season of 1984-1985. The chain of subversive bases and "bridgeheads" the enemy tried to set up, with foreign assistance, along the Kampuchean-Thai border, was completely eliminated.

Tempered in battle, our armed forces have gained strength and are confidently defending the accomplishments of the revolution and the people's peaceful work. In the enemy camp, disunity and disintegration are in evidence. The people who were deceived by reactionary propaganda in the past are deserting from these gangs and crossing over to the side of the popular government. Many express the wish to take up arms against our common enemy.

Dealing with the party's economic policy, Heng Samrin stressed that the selfless efforts of the people

and the comprehensive assistance of the Soviet Union, Vietnam and other socialist countries enabled the PRK to advance significantly in the rehabilitation and development of production.

The party's orientation on collective forms of work in agriculture has proved fully justified. Land has become property of all the people; it has been handed over for cultivation to labor-through-mutual-assistance groups which currently total over 100,000. The 1983 output of rice and other food crops reached two million tons, that is, approached the pre-war level. The first steps have been taken to intensify agricultural production. We should advance further along this road so as to increase gross food output to three million tons by 1990.

Aside from providing food, agriculture should produce goods for export and meet part of the demand for industrial raw materials. This makes it necessary to strengthen the labor-through-mutual-assistance groups, recultivate the lands allowed to lie fallow during the war and restore and rebuild irrigation facilities.

Heng Samrin paid special attention to the need to rapidly increase the output of natural rubber. Currently, more than half the rubber plantations have been restored in the PRK. This figure is to be doubled.

Compared to 1980, the PRK's industrial output has almost tripled and now meets part of the domestic and export requirements. At the same time, Heng Samrin noted, many enterprises are not yet working stably enough. There is an acute shortage of spare parts, raw materials, financial resources and electricity. The first five-year program of the country's socio-economic development lays principal emphasis on the construction of medium and small-scale enterprises and on increasing electric power production.

The financial system created in Kampuchea and the development of the government trade sector have helped to consolidate the ties between urban and rural areas and to improve the working conditions of enterprises and the living conditions of the people. Still, national income is not yet up to the necessary standard, and imports outweigh exports. During the next five years, production of goods for

export must be stepped up; it should develop faster than other branches. The national financial system is to be perfected; increases in revenue are to come above all from domestic sources; the network of socialist trade outlets is to be expanded, thus improving the supply of goods to working people.

The report stresses that cooperation with the Soviet Union, Vietnam and other socialist countries is the most essential condition of success in building the material and technological base of socialism. The Kampuchean economy is based on four types of production — the state, collective, family and private sectors. The party will work to comprehensively strengthen the state sector so as to assign it the leading role in the national economy.

The collective sector comprises various labor-through-mutual-assistance groups in agriculture, handicrafts and several other branches. These groups will be strengthened to provide the people's government with reliable support in the tackling of economic problems. They will serve as a channel for the party's ideological and political education of the masses.

The private sector, tolerated so as to ensure fuller use of the available economic potential, is operating under strict government control. The state uses this sector in the interests of the people.

The rapid rehabilitation and socialist-based development of the educational system is an important accomplishment of the people's government. Today, 95 per cent of the children are able to go to school. There are eight institutions of higher learning and specialized secondary education operating in Kampuchea. Thousands of Kampuchean are studying in the colleges, universities and vocational training schools of the fraternal socialist countries.

The party will exert every effort to bring about even more significant changes in the socio-economic sphere by 1990 and thus further the revolutionary cause.

The People's Republic of Kampuchea is a form of government by the working people of Kampuchea. It is currently at the initial stage of the transition to socialism. The PRK is a state of working people which directs their efforts toward the creation of the necessary conditions for a gradual transition to socialism. Leadership by the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea is the decisive factor of success in the advancement of the Kampuchean revolution.

Accurately reflecting the aspirations of the masses, the correct policy of the PRPK leads the people to a new, happy life. The party accords great attention to the education of its cadre and other members in the spirit of loyalty to Marxism-Leninism and to the interests of the working class. Marxist-Leninist education combined with practical participation in the revolutionary struggle must be an integral element in the life and work of party members.

The years that have passed have been a period of important victories in the development of the nation's political system, above all of the People's Revolutionary Party. The political headquarters and the leading force of the revolution, the party has

been steadily gaining political and ideological maturity and adding new members to its ranks.

Since 1979, when there remained 62 members in the party, it has increased its strength to 7,500 people, most of them peasants, PRAK servicemen, industrial and office workers. Continuous efforts are being undertaken to prepare new members for admission into the PRPK, to bring up communists dedicated to the cause of revolution and to the people. The party apparatus at the local level has grown noticeably stronger. The party is establishing itself increasingly firmly in work collectives and is consolidating its ties with the masses.

Given its small membership, the PRPK attaches great attention to fostering groups of activists who pursue the party's policy wherever party organizations have not yet been set up. Together with Youth League organizations, these groups act as centers for the selection and preparation of worthy applicants for party membership. These groups comprise 37,000 people.

Today, the PRPK Central Committee regards efforts to establish a network of party organizations at the regional and district level as a task of paramount importance. Members of the cadre of the party's central apparatus are sent there to provide the necessary assistance. The stronger the party's influence at the local level, the stronger the people's government. In the course of these efforts, the PRPK Central Committee will uphold its principled course aimed at improving the quality of the party membership.

The PRPK holds that it is very important to study the experience of the fraternal parties and to apply it creatively in the distinctive conditions of Kampuchea.

The PRPK sees one of the objectives of its policy in shaping the new man of the socialist type, devoted to his country, to the cause of socialism and to his work, taking good care of the people's property and maintaining a high level of scientific and technological knowledge and expertise. The new man is to be a patriot whose ideology is based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, who can combine genuine national interests with those of the international communist movement, who is intransigent to any manifestations of nationalism.

The party pursues its policy relying on the support of various civic organizations. They help to strengthen the alliance of the working class and the peasants, the basis underlying the integrated front which builds and defends Kampuchea. To shape the working class is the foremost task of the entire party and the direct mission of the trade unions. Trade unions must become a mass organization, a school teaching working people to manage the economy and administer the state.

The People's Revolutionary Youth League of Kampuchea is a trustworthy reserve of the party; it is to raise young people in the spirit of dedication to the interests of the people and to the principles of international solidarity. The Youth League should prepare its best members for joining the party. The PRPK will continue to pay great attention to work among intellectuals. Simultaneously, it is necessary

to encourage the trend of expanding this social layer by the addition of people with a working class or peasant background. This policy is an urgent demand of the revolution.

The ethnic policy of the PRPK is aimed at ensuring full equality of all of Kampuchea's ethnic groups. The party will take effective steps to raise the development level of the areas inhabited by national minorities.

The PRPK's strategic course is to unswervingly promote solidarity, friendship and cooperation with the three revolutionary currents of our age — first and foremost, with the socialist community and its mainstay, the great Soviet Union.

The PRK conducts a foreign policy that is a combination of patriotism and internationalist solidarity. This principled policy has frustrated the schemes of the world's imperialist and reactionary forces to isolate People's Kampuchea. The international prestige of the PRK keeps growing.

The conditions in which the Kampuchean revolution is developing objectively call for the consolidation of its alliance with Vietnam and Laos on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, of respect for the independence, sovereignty and legitimate interests of each country.

Promotion of Kampuchea's ties with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is the crux of our party's foreign policy, our internationalist duty and an essential factor of our success in the defense of our country and in the building of socialist society on Kampuchean soil. The Kampuchean people are profoundly grateful to the USSR and other socialist countries for the support and assistance they render

to the just cause of the Kampuchean revolution.

Firmly supporting the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, the PRK will continue to struggle, together with the fraternal countries and all peace-loving peoples, against the policy of aggression, the arms race, preparations for nuclear war and military uses of outer space. Kampuchea resolutely condemns the aggressive course of U.S.-led international imperialism.

The PRK is ready to develop relations of friendship and cooperation with the countries of Southeast Asia irrespective of their socio-political system, on the basis of respect for the national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of each country. We are prepared to enter into a dialogue with the ASEAN countries so as to settle the problems of the region and transform Southeast Asia into a zone of peace, stability, friendship and cooperation.

Having undertaken the historic mission of national leadership, having overcome the most difficult period in the development of the Kampuchean revolution, the PRK has won great and very impressive victories in different spheres over the past seven years.

We are full of optimism. Heng Samrin said in conclusion. We are confident that, deriving its strength from its unity, the unbreakable bonds linking it with the people, and its loyalty to the principles of proletarian solidarity, the PRK will carry the cause of the Kampuchean revolution to the victorious conclusion.

Summarized by
the Vietnam Information Agency

Communiqué on an Enlarged CC Plenary Meeting of the Iraqi Communist Party

An enlarged plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Iraqi Communist Party, which was attended by a number of leading party workers, was held in late October and early November 1985.

It discussed the internal situation, the course of the Iraq-Iran war, the deepening of the political, economic, social and ideological crisis of the dictatorial regime and the mounting campaign of terrorism against the popular masses. It emphasized the need to mobilize all the forces to struggle for an end to the war without delay.

The plenary meeting analyzed the activity of party organizations in the period since the preceding CC plenary meeting in July 1984.

A positive assessment was given to the campaign carried on in the party in preparation for the convocation of the fourth national congress of the Iraqi communists, involving the study and discussion of general party documents relating to the draft program of the ICP and assessment of its policy in the period from 1968 to 1979. The campaign showed the great attention being given by party members, party organizations and friends to the ICP's policy and programmatic documents.

The enlarged plenary meeting considered the activity of the communist guerrilla movement and its successes, and discussed ways of raising its level and enhancing its role in the people's heroic struggle for the overthrow of the dictatorship in alliance with the guerrilla forces of the parties united in the Democratic National Front, and also those not forming a part of it.

The plenary meeting devoted great attention to the problem of a national alliance, to the activity of the Democratic National Front, and to the efforts to set up a broad national front. It analyzed in depth the successes along this way, the problems hampering the strengthening of the patriotic alliances, and the methods in enlarging the activity of the Democratic National Front in the political, military and information spheres, and its work in the midst of the masses.

The participants in the enlarged CC plenary meeting discussed the situation in the Arab world, the developments experienced by the Arab national liberation movement and the anti-imperialist regimes in the Arab countries, the shifts in the development of the Palestinian problem, the moves

by Arab reaction and the anti-popular axes which it has knocked together, the activity of imperialism and Zionism and their aggressive schemes.

The plenary meeting also examined the international situation and the dangers posed by the aggressive policy of world imperialism headed by the reactionary Reagan administration. The participants in the plenary meeting voiced wholehearted support for the peace policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community states, and their persevering efforts and initiatives designed to preserve peace

and safeguard life on the Earth.

The enlarged plenary meeting of the Central Committee considered in detail the question of convening the fourth national congress of the party. It took a decision to circulate a document on the assessment of the ICP's policy to all the party organizations and cells, and to continue preparation for holding this most important function in the life of the party, which is of exceptional significance, at the due date. The plenary meeting also adopted a political statement. *Al-Itihad*, November 13, 1985

Seym Election Results Again Confirm the Polish People's Patriotic and Responsible Attitude

Speech by Wojciech Jaruzelski,
First Secretary of the PUWP CC

A regular plenary meeting of the PUWP Central Committee was held in Warsaw under the chairmanship of Wojciech Jaruzelski, First Secretary of the PUWP Central Committee, on November 5, 1985.

A report by the Political Bureau of the PUWP Central Committee on the party's participation in the October 13 elections to the Seym of the Polish People's Republic was presented by Tadeusz Porebski, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the Central Committee.

The second part of the plenary meeting was held on November 11, at which Henryk Bednarski, Secretary of the PUWP Central Committee, reported on the role and tasks of the intelligentsia in Poland's socialist development.

Organizational questions were also considered. The plenary meeting relieved Kazimierz Barcikowski, Political Bureau member of the PUWP Central Committee, of his post as Secretary of the PUWP Central Committee in connection with his election as Deputy Chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic. Marian Wozniak, Political Bureau member of the PUWP Central Committee, was elected Secretary of the PUWP Central Committee. Jerzeg Majka, released from the duties of chief of the PUWP Central Committee information department, was appointed editor-in-chief of *Tribuna Ludu*. The plenary meeting complied with the request of Stefan Olszowski to release him from the post of Political Bureau member of the PUWP Central Committee.

Following is PAP News Agency presentation of the speech made by Wojciech Jaruzelski at the November 5 plenary meeting on the results of the Seym elections.

The results of the election to the Seym are consonant with the interests of our people and our socialist state and an indication of how far the processes of concord, normalization and restoration of development growth rates have advanced. The most important thing is that an overwhelming majority of the population yet again demonstrated a sense of patriotism, responsibility and steadfastness in the face of the forays made by those who tried to force Poland to take the wrong road. The results of the elections are giving us a new impetus to tackle our problems. We have grown stronger and can thus display greater resolve in overcoming weaknesses and resisting all that hampers us and tries to drag us backward.

We can attain further progress only by acting jointly with working people, with the public. The votes cast by more than 20 million people are, to us, a source of hope and support, but they do not free us from our obligations either. The party must become a real center of initiative and innovative spirit. It must safeguard the gains of the socialist state and perform its leading role effectively.

We have been shown once again that one must not be afraid of sharp debate rooted in a sense of responsibility, of harsh, critical assessments. They do not serve to erode our socialist reality but, on the contrary, impart new powerful impulses to it. The course of the elections bears out that it is useful to steadily improve and promote the practice of consultations, discussions, public opinion studies and ready availability of information about public matters.

Life is again prompting us to think about ways to combine democratization, promotion of self-government and broader civil rights with the urgent need to enhance the sense of duty and responsibility, about ways to shorten the distance between proposal and implementation, criticism and improvement, project and application, word and deed.

We have created a new structure of rights and duties in recent years, a structure that serves socialist renovation. The people's councils, elected bodies and self-government agencies have been granted broader powers. However, the exercise of these powers is often inadequate and irregular.

Things of concern to the people must be of concern to the party too. Indifference to the people's problems would be a negation of the true party spirit. Our party's substantial and fruitful pre-election efforts are proof that its mobility is growing steadily and that it is capable of effectively tackling important political tasks. Most party members spared neither time nor effort and emerged victorious from yet another serious trial. But there were also those who kept aloof, although their numbers keep diminishing. Given this measure of a passive attitude, it is necessary to consistently keep up our ideological, educational and organizational work. This is particularly important on the eve of the 10th congress of the PUWP. The party must come to the congress with greater strength and militancy, its ranks serried.

We invariably proclaim our readiness for dialogue and accord with all those who place the interests of socialist Poland above personal grudges and differences of opinion. Specifically, this is borne out by the support rendered to the new humanitarian initiative of the Patriotic Movement of National Revival.

We never lose sight of the enemy. Unscrupulous psychological warfare against our country is continuing. The better the state of Polish affairs, the worse the position of the forces that would like to swamp us in internal conflicts. That is precisely why the U.S. administration tried to use different ways to interfere in our elections. That is why aggressive anti-Polish propaganda is fomented again across the Atlantic, why there is support for the sanctions and interference in our internal affairs.

We must express our regret that various "competent sources" — so-called friends of our people — are silent on this score. There is no doubt that the

truth about those who consistently uphold the good name of Poland and its people will be noted and remembered.

Answers to the questions relating to the country's development path will be reflected in the socio-economic development plan for 1986-1990 and in the program up to the year 1995. The immediate economic tasks will be considered at the 10th regular plenary meeting of the PUWP Central Committee.

A great deal remains to be done: we have to take radical steps too. The entry into the 1980s is a problem facing us to which we must find a thrifty economic way. We must pay attention to the cost/benefit ratio of the various measures — as seen from the point of view of the people — instituted under the new economic system. As concerns the quality, many enterprises are still lagging behind. Huge losses result from the misuse of machinery, means of transportation and equipment — sometimes amounting to sheer vandalism.

The Secretariat of the PUWP Central Committee will soon issue another set of recommendations on bringing order to the party's own economic structure, on further enhancing financial discipline. Here, too, we are putting our own house in order first.

Voices are sometimes raised to the effect that exposure of weaknesses reduces the prestige of the party and the state. That is a fallacious view. The stronger we grow, the greater the confidence in the party, in popular government. The period of preparations for the 10th congress must be a period of intensive efforts for strict compliance with the law, for unblemished social relations, for moral renovation.

The party wants the Sejm to be strong and efficient, to enjoy prestige and respect, to care both for our sovereign socialist state and for all regions and provinces.

I am convinced that the new government will uphold the current course steadily, follow unswervingly the path of socialist renovation, fight vigorously against drawbacks, and enhance smoothness and discipline in the implementation of our laws, political guidelines and the government's own decisions in both domestic and international activities of our state.

The consolidation of Poland as a strong link of the socialist system is essential in today's dangerous international situation. In this sense, the elections were of great international importance too. Their results help to strengthen Poland's position and increase its prestige in the eyes of world public opinion.

The recent meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee advanced an alternative to the imperialist policy of tension and confrontation and outlined the conditions essential for a turn to détente and equitable cooperation. Tangible disarmament proposals were formulated, and full support was expressed for the new peace initiatives of the USSR. The unity and concerted action of the socialist community's Marxist-Leninist parties were forcefully affirmed again.

PAP News Agency. Abridged

Draft

The Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

A New Edition

pamphlet \$1.50

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

Brutal Betrayal of National Interests

Statement by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bolivia (CPB)

I. EXTREME ECONOMIC LIBERALISM

The economic measures announced on August 29, 1985, by the government of the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement (Historical) (NRMH) are a brutal betrayal of the interests of the country and the people. The Bolivian people demanded that something should be done to solve such problems as inflation, erratic supplies, speculation and unemployment, and hoped to see a revival of production. However, an attempt is now being made to impose a sharp switch of the main lines of the economic policy: a handover of the state's regulating economic functions to the marketplace, the introduction of the "free play" of supply and demand instead of the state deciding on the strategic aspects of economic policy such as the type of foreign exchange, interest rates, the prices of prime necessities, and wages.

The NRMH's so-called New Economic Policy reflects a clear-cut class oligarchic and pro-imperialist position and accords with the recommendations of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which wants to intensify the subordination of the Latin American countries' economy to the interests of the international monopolies, a course leading to a reduction of the working people's real incomes to below subsistence level, worsening the terms of trade for our export products (raw materials) and adding to the external debt burden. All these mechanisms are designed to help overcome the world crisis of capitalism at the expense of the popular masses, of the Latin American countries' national interests and of the Third World, that is, of the dependent and backward countries as a whole.

This orientation is, therefore, not only antinational, but also cuts across the common interests of the Latin American peoples fighting for a New International Economic Order.

It appears to be a historical paradox that this is the same party which was once pressured by the working masses into laying the foundations of state capitalism, and which is now trying to travel the way in the opposite direction and to set up at any price a regime of economic liberalism carried to an extreme, so depriving the working people and our non-renewable natural resources of any means of protection. For all the errors, vacillations and inconsistencies of the NRMH's economic policy after 1952, it has never before — in virtue of its populist orientation — openly proposed measures like putting down the working people and keeping the trade unions in place by creating a reserve labor army helping to provide exceptionally favorable conditions for big local and foreign capitalists and to cover the budget deficit at the expense of the working

people's already meager wages, the budget deficit originating from the tax evasions of the members of the ruling classes.

The Decree 21060 is the first step on the comprehensive reconstitution of the ruling classes' bloc, which is now to be led by the private export and big import sector and the big banks and regional oligarchic groupings. The national industrial enterprises, above all the small and medium ones, like the whole private enterprise sector not linked with the oligarchy and imperialism, are mainly to go to the wall or to be gobbled up in the process of the concentration of production and capital that is being deliberately whipped up by the NRMH's New Economic Policy. In order to survive, private enterprises in the production sector will have to withstand fierce competition against import products turned out in other countries by enterprises which are much more advanced and highly productive. This will result in numerous bankruptcies, the shutdown of enterprises and mass layoffs of working people. There is, in fact, nothing new about this policy: with equally fatal consequences, it was purposefully conducted by Videla and Martinez de Os in Argentina, and by Pinochet in Chile, although that did not produce even a hint of some way out of the economic crisis in those countries.

On the contrary, such experiments destroyed the production base and plunged the society into even greater poverty, with political repression and the emergence of powerful oligarchy groupings organically bound up with imperialism and the transnational corporations. Such is the true meaning of the economic strategy of the NRMH government.

The other edge of the economic aggression against the people's interests is aimed to liquidate the basic enterprises and associations in the state sector, so as to deprive them of their leading role in mobilizing production and obtaining profits within the framework of the national economy, and to turn them into mere adjuncts of the program for the regional reorganization of economic and political power.

That leads to a weakening of the central administrative agencies, a strengthening of the positions of the regional oligarchy (which will control the now centrally-allocated profits) and to an enrichment of its most aggressive, greedy and powerful members. The backward and poor regions will be hurled even farther back. All of this will make it impossible, in principle, to plan coordinated development on the scale of the country.

A switch into private ownership of the potentially most profitable enterprises and deposits is envisaged in the long term within the framework of the new politico-economic model, the first legal instruments

of whose implantation are contained in the above decree.

The dismantling of Bolivia's national mining corporation COMIBOL marks the first step in the denationalization of the mines, in accordance with the programmatic statement issued by Paz Estenssoro at a meeting of members of the oligarchy at the Hotel Sheraton, when the incumbent president promised to set up mining enterprises with mixed capital, to turn other enterprises in the industry into cooperatives and to shut down "marginal" mines, something that coincides with the plan for the "rehabilitation" of COMIBOL.

The lot of the national steel enterprise ENAF and Karachipampa has also been decided: the right of freely marketing the products of the mining industry makes it impossible to supply these state metallurgical enterprises with concentrates and so dooms them to disappearance, because the smelting is now to be done in other countries. Consequently, there is an actual return to the period of the one-product economy oriented exclusively towards the mining sector.

The same is in store for the state oil company YPF, one of the main pillars of the national economy in energy supply with the use of liquid fuel, and also in terms of foreign-exchange earnings. Its decentralization will reduce the possibilities for complex planning in which the whole country has a stake. The marketing of products which this state enterprise used to control, for instance, is now being effectively handed over to speculating private entrepreneurs. Oil prospecting and extraction as a whole is being largely jeopardized.

The abolition of the Bolivian Development Corporation (CBF) and the re-subordination of its individual enterprises to regional development corporations (as envisaged by the statutes governing the activity of the CBF) will in this case lead to the transfer entirely into private hands of enterprises which have already become profitable. In view of the state of the administrative organs in the country's departments, this restructuring will proceed in conditions favoring neither the local organs of administration, nor the people. It will only serve the interests of the oligarchy controlling "public" movements for its own benefit. The penetration into the country's departments of foreign capital from such neighboring countries as Brazil, Argentina, Peru and Chile, will be more pronounced than ever before, so eventually leading to the establishment of foreign capital in the mining, oil companies and former CBF enterprises.

II. THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY FOR THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Apart from the complex sale of the whole of our country to foreign capital, Paz Estenssoro's economic policy saddles the people with an atrocious burden of hunger and redoubled super-exploitation.

Thus, the pretension of allowing the free hire of manpower is, in effect, an expression of the urge on the part of the private entrepreneurs to assure them-

selves of cheap labor-power and to damp down the workers' protests against the sharp wage cuts. The right to lay off any number of workers is an additional mechanism for intensifying labor. For example, some of the fired personnel can be replaced by other workers but on less favorable terms. Those fired earlier can be rehired on terms which turn out to be worse than the earlier ones. Free labor contracts are also an instrument in the hands of the employers and the state against the trade-union liberties and the working people's struggle for better living and working conditions.

While the present level of unemployment is already at an alarmingly high level, the realization of Decree 21060 is bound to lead to a further significant increase in the number of unemployed, and the effects for working-class living standards are obvious. The most essential of these, as has been said, consists in strong pressure on those who have jobs from the jobless, who are prepared to work on any terms. That tends to increase the number of persons working without any labor guarantees and hired in breach of the provisions of the General Labor Law. That is why the above-mentioned government Decree is an attempt to sidestep social and labor legislation as a whole.

The problem of unemployment will be still further compounded by the neoliberal model, which has a destructive content for the national industry, because many enterprises in manufacturing will have to go on reducing their staffs especially in view of the incipient trend toward a commercialization of the production sectors.

In terms of wages, the blow is being dealt along two lines. First, the established national wage-minimum is being abolished, together with the "sliding scale," both of them won by the working class after long years of struggle. These two instruments used to protect the working people from arbitrary acts on the part of their employers in fixing wages, and also to some extent against the ravages of inflation. Wages are now to be fixed by the employers in accordance with their own views of maximising profits. The working people will be defenseless in the face of mounting inflation caused by spiralling prices.

The rigid freeze on wages together with the farming out of price-fixing to the big and small speculators, on the pretext of allowing the "play of supply and demand," will lead to a sharp reduction in the working people's real earnings and purchasing power with an extreme impoverishment of the popular masses.

On the other hand, Decree 21060 is a brazen trampling of the rights won by the working class in wages and the social sphere. One of the tricks used for that purpose is to include all the fringe benefits into the basic rate, with the effective abolition of one of these benefits whose amount tends to differ depending on the shift schedule and the cost of travel to work.

The inclusion of that amount in the basic pay means its effective abolition in view of the steady rise in transit fares and the inflation.

But while the working people lose in terms of

absolute wages, they lose even more in view of the reduced seniority benefits.

In addition, fixed prices for rice, sugar, bread and meat for the workers of COMIBOL and other enterprises are being abolished, and while the basic pay is increased by a corresponding amount, the compensation is bound to go the same way as the other benefits: erosion through inflation. Consequently, the NRMH's New Economic Policy is a frontal attack on the working class and the broad popular masses because it leads to a reduction both in the absolute amount of incomes and in their purchasing power.

The government has argued that its economic "model" is beneficial to the peasants and has made great play of the "free prices." However, this model deals a heavy blow at the earnings and general social condition of the peasants, who consume manufactured products and also the farm produce not grown by themselves. The dissolution of the National Road Transport Enterprise (ENTA) and the National Public Health Institute (INASME), the rising cost of transit, the prices for gas and kerosene, the restrictions on farm credit and the excessive prices for fertilizers, insecticides and various implements will also have an unfavorable impact on their condition. Very soon the peasants will find it hard to sell their produce in the towns and mining centers, which are full of unemployed and impoverished urban dwellers.

The talk about "agro-power" merely serves the interests of the new big landowners and latifundists and members of the big agro-industrial capital, but does not benefit the peasants, who are deprived of land or only have small plots.

The aim of the NRMH's propaganda is to split the popular camp, the alliance of workers and peasants, by means of demagoguery, corruption and manipulation of the peasant trade union movement.

III. PEOPLE WILL DEFEAT PAZ ESTENSSORO'S AGGRESSION

The whole content of the New Economic Policy of Paz Estenssoro's government testifies that it is a serious attempt to bolster and restructure the system of dependent capitalism, geared to U.S. imperialism, and to slow down our country's independent development. That being so, the Bolivian people, led by the working class, must join in organized struggle to defend the country's interests, and to fight the anti-national economic "model." This popular struggle should be aimed to attain the following:

- (1) to prevent the decentralization of COMIBOL and YPFEB;
- (2) to maintain the participation of the working majority in running enterprises in the state sector;
- (3) to prevent the liquidation of CBF, ENTA and INASME enterprises;
- (4) to protect the right of all Bolivians to work, and to abolish free labor contracts. Not a single worker must be laid off;
- (5) to fight against the reduction and freezing of wages, and for the preservation of the National Minimum Salary and for the Sliding Scale;

(6) to fight against the abolition of fixed prices for the four types of staple products for miners and working people in other production sectors;

(7) to preserve the state subsidized prices for bread, meat, medicines and transit fares;

(8) to establish fixed prices for goods in daily demand and control of these prices.

The attainment of these goals is closely bound up with the working people's resolute mobilization, with their use of diverse methods and forms of struggle in accordance with the concrete circumstances, and with the centralization of leadership in the struggle at the Bolivian Workers' Center (BWC).

It is also necessary to combine most broadly democratic, popular and revolutionary demands. A joint struggle against the anti-national and anti-popular New Economic Policy will help to set up a strategic front capable of paving the way to popular power. In this connection, the United People's Front (UPF) is making a real contribution to uniting all the forces and overcoming the sectarian and separatist tendencies which harm the struggle for the common goals.

This urge for unity must rest on the support of the church which sides with the poor and the oppressed, voices solidarity with them and comes out in defense of human rights and popular freedoms.

Generals, officers and other ranks of the Armed Forces, who helped to effect the process of democratic change after October 1982 by bringing military institutions closer to the interests of the country and the people, must continue — in the new situation as well — their consistent defense of Bolivia's economic and political sovereignty.

We, for our part, will continue in our combat post, in the front ranks of the working class and the popular masses. We are redoubling our efforts to strengthen the people's unity, to extend and improve its organization, and to mobilize the popular masses for successfully tackling the problems of the present stage. We shall enhance our party's revolutionary spirit in order to fulfil our militant duty.

La Paz, September 1985

Abridged from *Unidad*,
September 7, 1985

There Shall Be Retribution

V. Molchanov

Exposé of nazi war criminals now
in North America.

Paper 200pp \$3.95

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst St.

Toronto, Ont. M5V 2P6

The Main Lines of the Country's Policy Require a Radical Change

Document of the Italian Communist Party Leadership

1. The dramatic events which led to the latest government crisis induce the democratic forces to give pride of place in their debates on programmatic matters to problems of the country's foreign policy, independence and security. The new Cabinet should explicitly reaffirm and consistently pursue its earlier policy toward the Israel-Palestine conflict, the Israeli raid on Tunisia, the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro*, and the interception of the Egyptian plane. Italy has a right and sees it as its duty to carry on a foreign policy of its own along with other countries of the Atlantic alliance, to take initiatives in favor of détente and peace in the region to which it belongs, and to guarantee its autonomy and sovereignty within the alliance.

Every effort must be made to end tension and eliminate the seat of the war that is tormenting and bleeding the Middle East, and most important of all, to re-establish the conditions for talks capable of settling the Palestinian problem. These talks, which should also result in guaranteeing the existence and security of the State of Israel, are unthinkable without recognizing a genuine representation of the Palestinian people.

It is in this direction that relations between the Italian government and the PLO have been developing according to a guideline of the Venice Declaration on the Middle East approved by the European Community (EC) that the political and diplomatic activity of our country should go more than ever. The EC should also take new initiatives in view of the need to bring in all Mediterranean countries and encourage a constructive involvement of the major powers in a search for a guaranteed peaceful settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The new government must enhance Italy's role in strengthening the democratic unity of Europe and transforming the EC into a political alliance. But not one of the major democratic countries of Europe may, any more than the EC as a whole, refuse to commit itself specifically to the removal of the grave threat to peace, the development of the Third World or the reduction of imbalances between North and South.

These problems, like those of security in the Mediterranean, are particularly acute in Italy. To solve them, it is necessary to carry on a policy intended to call a halt to the alarming growth of forcible actions and violence in the region and help establish new relations of political and economic cooperation. From now on, Italy's security is linked not only with the maintenance of the balance and the evolution of relations between East and West but also with a guarantee of security in the Mediterranean.

To this end, Italy must be prevented from becoming involved — through the use of NATO bases and unilateral military actions by U.S. forces — in provocations, counter-measures or hostilities against

any country of the region. Nor can there be any question of automatically extending the obligations flowing from the Atlantic alliance beyond the area defined by treaties. Acts of terrorism, whatever their origin, must be condemned. They must be firmly combated but this effort cannot justify any abuse of powers or arbitrary initiatives with reference to common membership in NATO.

All this and the events surrounding the *Achille Lauro* are evidence of the need for real guarantees in regard to the use of the NATO bases in Italy. Parliament should be acquainted with the agreements governing the status of the bases. On a more general plane, the government's conception of the presence of Italy in NATO needs to be clarified. The ICP does not question this presence recognizing its necessity for reasons of international politics already set out in no uncertain terms. However, Italy must within the framework of NATO and its relations with the United States call, in common with its European allies, for a rethinking of the concept of security, effective consultations and control over respect for the rules of the functioning of the alliance, and should be able to protect its sovereignty and national dignity, and state its position autonomously.

The touch-stone of this autonomy will be non-acceptance of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative and of the hitching of our country to it as an unequal partner, support for the Eureka project as a joint technological initiative of Europe, active contribution to a positive course of the Geneva and other disarmament talks, primarily on nuclear arms limitation (in particular by creating nuclear weapons-free zones), a general effort in favor of détente in relations between East and West, and an active contribution to the peaceful settlement of all crisis situations.

2. It is necessary to radically change the lines of the socio-economic policy of recent years, which not so long ago found an expression in the draft budget submitted to parliament by the previous government. In regard to this draft, the communists reaffirm their negative opinion expressed earlier.

The ICP believes that the program of the new government should be based on several fundamental options in favor of an entirely new socio-economic policy.

Therefore, the policy toward the South and the policy toward employment (primarily among youth), must be key provisions of the program of the new government.

Equally important are the programmatic options which the new government should make — with a view to gradually loosening the fetters of the balance of payments — in the sphere of energy, agriculture, research, modernization, and a selective industrial policy, as well as the environment, in particular soil protection, the preservation and utilization of the

cultural heritage, housing, territorial renewal and major infrastructural projects.

A decisive change must be effected in education and vocational training by thoroughly revising their pattern and orientation at all levels. The aim is to assure everyone an education making it possible to cope with new technological problems and guaranteeing the civic and cultural advancement of Italian society. This also implies revising and completing the reforms under discussion in parliament.

3. The chairmen of both chambers of parliament have taken an important initiative by declaring for and promoting particularly urgent institutional reforms.

The provisions that can be included in a program really offering the prospect of an early solution of the problems of the country in the short or long term are those that parliament has long been discussing. They concern the law on local autonomy, the structural adjustment of the presidium of the Council of Ministers, a reform of the procedure of preferring charges, and parliamentary immunity. Besides, it should be possible to have parliament approve at last a series of important laws ranging from the criminal trial code to norms governing the disciplinary responsibility of magistrates.

At the same time, work could start on the implementation of other important reforms, such as the reorganization of ministries and other government agencies, as well as on a reform of public administration.

There is a need to tackle the problem of a reform of parliament and the eventual reforms of electoral legislation, and to discuss the problem of expressing confidence to the head of the Cabinet alone, as well as certain measures relating to the management of public finances.

4. Incomplete recognition of the role of the constitutional democratic opposition, which the ICP has played to this day is one of the most negative facts of the past period from the point of view of the proper functioning of democracy. To recognize this role is to actively seek close cooperation on a broad basis among all democratic forces, both the majority and the opposition, in preserving fundamental values, such as peace, independence and democracy, that is, in the sphere of international policy and institutional reforms.

But this requires full respect for the right of the opposition both to perform its legislative functions and to supervise the activity of the executive authority in parliament; it means renouncing arbitrariness and discrimination, which drastically limit the opportunities of the constitutional opposition to express its opinion and have access to relevant information, that is, bars it from representative and leading bodies of the state apparatus.

An equally important and urgent problem is that of adopting new norms and proper approach as regards the appointment of heads of financial institutions and economic agencies of the state.

Abridged from *l'Unità*,
October 25, 1985

Israel's Terroristic "Mailed Fist" Policy Must be Thwarted

Statement by Arab East Communist and Workers' Parties

The communist and workers' parties of the Arab East countries have watched with profound anxiety the fascist terroristic acts committed by the Israeli occupation authorities against the masses of the Palestinian people and against its patriotic forces on the West Bank of the Jordan and in the Gaza sector.

The officially organized campaign of terror committed by the Zionist occupation troops on the basis of the extraordinary statutes of the period of the British mandate, which has come to be known as the "mailed fist" policy, has assumed dangerous proportions over the past several days. Hundreds of fighters and patriots have been subjected to administrative detention without trial. Decisions have been taken to deport dozens of trade union activists, journalists and municipal council members. The latest was the decision by the Israeli occupation authorities to deport patriotic fighters Dr. Azmi ash-Shueibi, Ali Abu Khilyal, Zasan Abdel Jawed Faraj and Zaki Abu Satit.

Operations to block towns and villages, to mount so-called mass repression and demolish houses have become more frequent. People have been killed in broad daylight. Gangs of Zionist settlers are taking

part in these crimes, which are similar to the atrocities of the fascists, with the connivance and encouragement of the official circles. The aggravated situation is being used for the further confiscation of Arab lands and the establishment of new settlements on them. Palestinians are being subjected to ever graver privation: they are subjected to new taxes, and their property is confiscated. Tens of thousands of Arab workers have to join the army of jobless and hungry. The Zionist invaders are preparing more massacres in order to "liberate" Palestinian lands from their owners.

The "mailed fist" policy is also aimed to undermine the heroic resistance of the masses to the Israeli occupation. For that purpose, the Zionists have been spreading feelings of disappointment and hopelessness which have spread among the capitulationist circles, especially after the signing of the Amman agreement. The main objective of this policy is to strike out at the patriotic cadre and leading functionaries in preparation for implementing the plot, whose purpose is to put paid to the Palestinians' national problem with the aid of another Camp David, thereby depriving the Palestinians of the

right to return to their homeland, to self-determination and the establishment of an independent national state.

The communist and workers' parties of the Arab East countries acclaim the struggle and steadfastness of the masses of the Palestinian people on the occupied territories and their solid patriotic unity, express their full solidarity with this struggle, voice their protest against the Zionist invaders' atrocities, and brand with ignominy the Israeli rulers' crimes, which are similar to those that were and are committed by the fascists and South African racists.

Our communist and workers' parties address all the patriotic forces in the Arab countries and all the

mass organizations and institutions cherishing people's dignity and their legitimate rights, urging them to voice their solidarity with the Palestinians' struggle on the occupied territories, to condemn the Zionists' "mailed fist" policy, to demand an immediate end to the deportation of patriotic fighters, and the release of persons subjected to administrative detention, and a halt to the campaign of killings, blocking of populated localities, and forced starvation mounted by the Israeli invaders against the Palestinian people, demonstrating their devotion to their land and their inalienable national rights.

November 2, 1985

Nidal ash-Shaab, mid-November 1985

For a Democratic Solution to the Current Dangerous Situation

Statement by the Central Executive Committee of the Colombian Communist Party

The prospect of open participation by the Patriotic Union in the 1986 election campaign makes it possible to impart an upward impulse to popular action not only through the struggle for the just demands of the masses but also through vigorous participation in the elections.

At the same time, the following adverse factors affect preparations for the elections: continued and increasingly severe martial law; the growth of militarism and its repressive and destabilizing plans; and the cynical and scandalous campaign against the Patriotic Union accusing it of "preaching armed struggle."

We are thus dealing with a combination of positive factors conducive to progress and elements posing a serious threat to the popular movement. All democrats must therefore exert considerable efforts to advance a new project making it possible to break out of the political vicious circle created by the reactionaries.

DANGEROUS POLITICAL SITUATION

New factors are compounding the deterioration of the political situation: the demands of big capital for broader reprisals; the campaign against the earlier gains which the working class has achieved and which the employers want to abolish; the veiled attempts to impose censorship on the press; and the calls for "strong arm" measures against action by the peasants. These factors give rise to a new and dangerous political situation in which the element of provocation plays a fundamental role.

The earlier physical attacks against comrades Hernando Hurtado and Jaime Caycedo have been followed by an attempt on the life of comrade Alvaro Vasquez, a prominent leader of the CCP, and the assassination in Riohacha of Cesar Florez, a Socialist leader and an ally of the Communist Party. Amid the hysteria provoked by a very suspicious attack on General Samudio Molina, Commander of the Army (we denounced this act because, among

other things, it plays into the hands of the rightists), the wave of "disappearances," arrests and raids, including the recent raid on the offices of *Voz*, the Colombian Communist weekly, is growing.

ADVANCES

The factors conducive to progress include: the establishment of the New Commission on Peace, Dialogue and Verification; the debate of the truce issue in the Senate which showed the collapse of reactionary plans; the three successive defeats in the Chamber of Deputies of the fraudulent article of the electoral reform bill (Article 72 on "preaching armed struggle"); the positive attitude of a certain part of Liberal, New Liberal and Conservative quarters to the truce issue; the broad public support for criticism of the IMF; the large-scale demonstrations organized by the Patriotic Union; and the combination of mass peasant marches on urban centers with the wave of civic strikes again on the rise.

NEGATIVE ELEMENTS

The following negative elements should be singled out: the military operations conducted in various parts of the country; the assassinations of peasants; the military operations launched by the army command in various cities; the plans for the extermination of revolutionary leaders, specifically, "Operation 85," exposed by the Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (CRAF); the attempts to railroad reactionary anti-labor legislation through the Congress; the blocking of the alcaldes election reform and its postponement until 1988; the militarist campaign mounted by retired army officers such as Landazabal; and the boycott of the Commission on Peace, Dialogue and Verification by the pro-government Liberals.

SCHEMES OF THE REACTIONARIES

A democratic solution does exist. This solution is advocated by the Patriotic Union in the 1986 elec-

tions. The Union's approach differs radically from the platform of Barco and Gomez, the two candidates of the traditional parties, who insist that everything should remain unchanged and that even a retreat is in order since "there is no basis for a democratic alternative."

Ignoring Colombia's fundamental problems, both Barco and Gomez in fact oppose the positive aspects which, despite its numerous zigzags, the policy of the Betancur government nevertheless displayed: the government's dialogue with the guerrillas and the democratization of foreign policy. This is the situation in which the right-wing forces are mounting their offensive, bent on aggravating the political atmosphere still more. The reactionaries are banking on President Betancur's vacillation and on General Vega Uribe's behind-the-scenes maneuvering.

Powerful capitalist and militarist interests are doing all they can to close the door to an extension of the truce. They regard as a victory the fact that they have managed to again provoke armed action by the M-19 and they hope to do the same with regard to the Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces and the People's Liberation Army. That is why they have programmed a hostile campaign against the CRAF and are trying to politically block the Patriotic Union, rejecting even the slightest hints at reform and consolidating the old legal system which includes legal absurdities, such as the bill proposed recently by Cabinet Minister Jaime Castro on "annulling" the votes won by the coalitions the government accuses of "preaching armed struggle" — a direct reference to the Patriotic Union.

ALLIANCE OF THE EXTREME RIGHT AND THE EXTREME LEFT

The attempt to close all doors on the people and push their vanguard against the wall has led to the emergence of an actual and increasingly obvious alliance between the army services dealing in provocation and groups of fanatics of the terrorist and anarchist type.

Both these forces are trying to stymie and even eliminate the prospect for democratic change referred to at the 13th and 14th congresses of the Communist Party and in the agreements signed in La Uribe.

The mercenaries of the extreme Right and the assassins from the so-called Franco Group are increasingly unanimous in their determination to attack Communist Party and CRAF leaders. We are facing a strategy aimed at destroying everything achieved during the truce. The objective is to force the CRAF, Colombia's strongest guerrilla organization, to violate the truce agreement and again resort to military operations.

Without repeating the mistakes of his indiscreet predecessors, the current defense minister, closely aided by the U.S. Military Mission, is rapidly preparing for war. Vega Uribe holds that "Colombia is at war" and therefore demands huge budgetary appropriations. The "black propaganda" conducted by the military pulls the strings of provocation and instigates the pseudo-Left to engage in terrorism.

Opposing these schemes, we reiterate our firm conviction that any attempt to install a despotic regime will be rebuffed resolutely, will intensify armed resistance and lead to an upsurge of the guerrilla struggle.

However, this does not at all mean that the people must wage their struggle at the time and on the terms imposed by the class enemy.

THE COLOMBIAN COMMUNIST PARTY AND M-19

Our party has condemned and continues to condemn the systematic persecution that forced M-19 to start a new cycle of the guerrilla struggle. The assassination of Toledo Plata, the attempt on the life of Navarro Wolf, the raid on Camp Yarumales and the death in action of Ivan Marino Ospina are all links in the chain of tactics used by the army command. M-19 has failed to respond to it politically. The CCP holds that in order to ensure new democratic prospects, the present Commission on Peace, Dialogue and Verification, as well as the government, should resume talks with M-19.

While maintaining ties of friendship with the leaders and the grassroots organizations of M-19, we nevertheless refuse to agree with their current tactics. The exaggerated tone of victory present in their statements is designed to hide the obvious fact that current developments only play into the hands of the more aggressive militarist quarters. The CCP has stated repeatedly that the government cannot defeat the guerrillas militarily. However, in order not to bleed the country white, it is imperative to approach a resumption of the dialogue and to conclude effective accords so as to carry out urgently needed reforms that would open the way to an advanced democracy in Colombia.

REJECT ALL FORMS OF TERRORIST ATTEMPTS

Pursuing its new tactics, M-19 announced that it has established an alliance with the so-called Franco Group, dedicated to assassination of the leaders of the Communist Party and the CRAF.

It is perfectly clear that by concluding this agreement, M-19 has made a serious mistake not only because it has thus, in a way, linked itself with the suspicious record of the group in question but also because M-19 refuses to acknowledge infiltration of the group's leadership by the militarists. There may be genuinely misled people in the Franco Group. Nevertheless, its leading cadre works in concert with the enemies of the Left and of the entire democratic movement.

Ensuring their self-defense and debunking terrorism in political terms in the eyes of the masses, the communists should simultaneously uphold the interests of the party as a whole as resolutely as possible. In order to defeat the enemy, we must expand our alliances and show how the alliance between the right-wingers and the fanatics from the pseudo-left groups works against the people's vanguard. We must strive for a new level of combat readiness and for unity in our ranks.

The Colombian Communist Party has proposed a general outline of a democratic solution to the existing problems.

The current situation in many respects resembles that of 1979, when the Turbay-Camacho Leyva duo institutionalized torture. At that time we succeeded in drawing up a political program for democratic change.

Having charted, at the 13th congress in 1980, the course of the struggle for the country's democratization, we kept repeating tirelessly that this path would not be free from danger or difficulty. At that time it was already clear that the ruling classes, used to the most brutal and savage methods of government, would not passively accept a contraction of the sphere of their domination. Perhaps we underestimated the stubbornness of resistance to any change. At the same time, we did not expect our line to spread so rapidly among the masses, nor did we anticipate such large-scale positive shifts.

WHAT WE DEMAND NOW

Today, a political alternative is possible for which we demand:

— that the government lift martial law forthwith because if the 1986 election campaign is conducted in the situation that exists now, this will mean blatant favoritism vis-a-vis the two traditional parties;

- that the military operations against the CRAF and the People's Army through which the army high command strives to wreck the truce be terminated;
- that the government resume its talks with M-19;
- that the paramilitary groups be disbanded;
- that high-ranking army quarters cease their support and protection of the so-called Franco Group;
- that effective guarantees be given ensuring Patriotic Union participation in the forthcoming elections.

The broadest masses must be mobilized for this new way to open.

The objectives which led the working class to stage the general strike of civic protest of June 20 still stand. The factors that prompted the guerrilla organizations to sign the historic agreement of La Uribe and other truce accords have not lost their topical significance but have become even more vital.

The forthcoming elections of 1986 and the Patriotic Union congress of November 14 to 16 can and must play the decisive role in resisting, exposing and defeating the plans of the reactionary oligarchy and U.S. imperialism.

Bogota, November 5, 1985
Voz, November 7, 1985

Against Terror, Torture and the Disappearance of Prisoners

Message from the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front to the People of El Salvador and the International Community

The FMLN officially informs the people of El Salvador and the international community of the following:

1. On September 10, 1985, our Pedro Pablo Castillo urban commando carried out an operation called "Stop Terror, Torture and Disappearances in the Prisons of the Dictatorship."

The purpose of the operation, carried out in the capital, San Salvador, was to capture President Napoleon Duarte's daughter, Ines Guadalupe Duarte Duran, a functionary of the Christian Democratic Party and manager of Radio Libertad, which is linked with the apparatus of psychological counter-insurgency warfare.

The commando accomplished the mission with precision. It destroyed Ines Duarte's body-guards and transferred her, unscathed, to a zone controlled by the FMLN.

All the stages of the operation came to a successful close despite considerable efforts by the puppet army.

2. To make it possible to hold talks, the FMLN refrained from spreading information on the matter and from publicly admitting its responsibility for the capture of Ines Duarte.

3. Originally our Front demanded the release of 34 political prisoners nine of whom were "missing"

in prisons of the Duarte regime. Throughout the talks, we firmly persisted in demanding information on the fate of the nine "missing" comrades. Napoleon Duarte proved unable to give a coherent and satisfactory answer concerning these comrades.

The talks revealed to public opinion at home and abroad the actual situation created by the rule of a regime which resorts to kidnapping, torture, "disappearance," selective and massive killings, and indiscriminate bombings of the civilian population.

For all the propaganda efforts of the Christian Democrats, who make themselves out to be victims, their regime has betrayed its criminal nature.

The legitimacy and justice of our operation were borne out by facts like the "disappearance" in Duarte's prisons of the nine comrades listed above, the killing of many others, including Comandante Doroteo Gomez Arias, as well as torture and constant flouting of all the human rights of the dictatorship's prisoners.

Over 50,000 of our compatriots' families, over 50,000 fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, have gone through the ordeal of the death or "disappearance" of their children, relatives, husbands or wives.

And now Napoleon Duarte has gained a little per-

sonal experience of the distress of numerous poor families, whose position is incomparable to his, for he lives in abundance and comfort. Despite the fact that the Duarte government tortures, kidnaps and kills patriots, the FMLN did not infringe on the rights of the captured government official, the President's daughter, in any way. It accorded a similar treatment to the alcaldes taken prisoner by it. They were only threatened to a degree by the regime's air raids and shellings.

4. The talks included discussion of the position of the 23 alcaldes and other municipal officers taken prisoner by the FMLN, since they are involved in the implementation of the political provisions of the counter-insurgency plan being promoted in our country by the Reagan administration.

The government tried to the last minute to exclude the release of the alcaldes in the talks despite these officials' role as tools of the Duarte project and despite the intercession of their relatives.

It was only with the aid of other countries and the Church that the matter was included in the talks; as for the government, it had intended to leave the alcaldes as prisoners and to seek the release of only the President's daughter, an official of the Ministry of Communications.

5. Several weeks of direct talks, whose last stage was mediated by the Church and representatives of other governments, ended for the FMLN in a major victory of national significance.

Agreement was reached on the release of 26 political prisoners, 4 of whom were set free during the talks and the remaining 22, on October 24, 1985.

Three of the released comrades, who needed special medical aid after being tortured in Duarte's prisons, were taken abroad so that they could recover their health; as for Julio Romero Talavera, a Costa Rican citizen, he returned to his country.

The other 18 comrades who were turned over to the FMLN in Tenancingo, have rejoined the ranks of the revolutionary army and are on diverse fronts in the zones controlled by us. They are continuing the armed fight against the dictatorship and imperialism.

Our comrades were set free in exchange for the release of Ines Duarte and her companion. Besides, despite the government's stubborn resistance, it was guaranteed in exchange for the release of the alcaldes and municipal officers that no obstacles would be made to the departure of 96 wounded combatants of the FMLN with a view to receiving the requisite medical aid abroad.

The U.S. Embassy in El Salvador recommended that the regime agree to talks on the departure of the wounded combatants. The government's attempts to dodge to the last minute the settlement of this matter were a violation of the provisions of the Geneva Convention regarding persons injured during hostilities and also a violation of the provisions of the Ayagualo accords concerning wounded persons.

This is the second time that Napoleon Duarte, the Americans and members of the military high command have been compelled to keep to norms evolved and followed by countries and governments which respect human rights and international agreements.

The government's behavior laid bare before the whole world the criminal and brutal nature of the Duarte regime, which tramples human rights underfoot. The attacks launched against our field hospitals and aid stations, as well as disregard of the fate of the alcaldes and municipal officers, whose places of detention on the territory controlled by us were bombed on several occasions with the aim of killing these prisoners of war, are self-explanatory.

6. The complete success of the operation carried out by the Pedro Pablo Castillo commando and the recent destruction of U.S. Marines in a district of San Salvador speak of the high level and efficiency of our combat operations deep in the enemy rear. Also, they are evidence of the capability, cohesion and solid unity of the FMLN.

The exchange of prisoners effected on October 24, 1985, with the participation of the International Red Cross and with diplomatic representatives of a number of countries mediating, as well individual operations involving the exchange of prisoners, specifically in Morazan, Chalatenango, San Vicente, Tres Calles, Jucuaran, Guazapa, Santa Ana, San Salvador and Tenancingo, are added proof of the spread of our influence and the growing international recognition of the FMLN. This victory is an unmistakable indication of the growth and consolidation of the Front.

Besides, the operation "Stop Terror, Torture and Disappearances in the Prisons of the Dictatorship" taught the Duarte regime a graphic lesson concerning our Front's respect for human rights.

We stated clearly and emphatically that we would not allow a continued policy of kidnapping, torture, "disappearance," bombing and terror against our people. We serve warning that we will continue our effort to ascertain the whereabouts of all "missing" patriots.

The operation is the biggest victory so far in the struggle for the release of the finest sons and daughters of our country imprisoned by the regime. They had shown sterling moral qualities as revolutionaries, as people enduring torture in the name of their people's happiness.

Furthermore, the successful operation of the Pedro Pablo Castillo commando revealed to public opinion at home and abroad the weakness of the Christian Democratic government. While it was in progress, insurmountable differences came out between Napoleon Duarte and the Christian Democratic Party, between the Christian Democrats and the puppet army.

The success of the operation has even more demoralized and weakened a regime whose President has lost hope and begun to evacuate members of his family from the country because he does not feel safe even with 50,000 troops.

The decay of the puppet government shows that the U.S. plan is doomed and the projects of winning military victory over the FMLN are illusory. Bearing this in mind, we reaffirm our readiness for a political dialogue and a search for negotiated solutions.

The FMLN publicly expressed gratitude to the

governments of Mexico, Panama, Colombia, Switzerland, Cuba, the FRG, France, Sweden, Costa Rica, Spain and Peru.

We thank Dr. Ignacio Ellacuria, Rector of the Central American University, Archbishop Rivera y Damas of San Salvador, Mr. Willy Brandt and Mr. Mijail Wischnewski. We thank the International Red Cross, which secured for humanitarian reasons the requisite guarantees of a successful exchange of prisoners and of the evacuation of wounded combatants to enable them to receive the medical aid they need.

The chief command of the FMLN sends revolutionary greetings to the combatants of the Pedro Pablo Castillo commando as well as to the former political prisoners who have now regained freedom

and who were tortured by enemies of the Salvadoran people while in prison.

We salute all the FMLN combatants who on October 10 carried out a successful operation by attacking and routing an army training center. We salute the combatants who are accomplishing their tasks all over the country. The FMLN command sends heartfelt greetings to the imprisoned patriots who are fighting on against the torturers and killers of the people.

We declare again that it is our unshakable resolve to fight until the ignominious policy of state terrorism is completely eradicated in our country.

El Salvador, October 24, 1985
Abridged

from the press

“New Poverty”: Mark of Cain of an Inhuman Social System

Ursula Schönfelder

Klaus and Eva B., both 25 years old, and their two children (aged 6 years and 18 months), live in an urban house for the homeless. Klaus has been out of work for two years now. The plight of the family is hopeless. The social insurance money they get twice a month is not enough to pay for the barest necessities. Such are the living conditions of the “new poor” in the FRG and other capitalist countries.

“Mass unemployment, a phenomenon once believed to have been banished and become a subject of history books, haunts again the homes of millions of people,”¹ says a selection of documents published recently by the Communist Party of Great Britain. The myths that were woven by bourgeois ideologists to extol the “golden” years of economic growth, the welfare state and the end of class society! And now this — “new poverty.” From what forecasts by bourgeois experts say, it will go on growing. In the United States, poverty now hits over 35.3 million people, or more than 15 per cent of the population. Joblessness in the southern states of the Union is the lot of 39 per cent of the Afro-American population. In Britain there are 12 million poor people and in France, about 6 million. In the FRG, over 1.2 million families, or roughly 3 million people, are among the “new poor.”

Is this the fate of “inefficient” individuals who cannot achieve anything? Such is the view taken by George Gilder, a U.S. neoconservative economist, one of the most zealous advocates of the reactionary social policy of the present Washington administration, who has “discovered” that “poverty is not so much a matter of income as one of spiritual attitude,” and that “social relief cripples most of those who become dependent on it.”² It follows that drastic curbs on the social rights and guarantees won by

the working class in hard struggles are perfectly justified. What a mockery of the victims! What spiritual attitude should a worker evolve to escape want at a time when his labor is no longer needed and he has no means of production?

Refuting the idealist views of the Young Hegelians, who believed that to eliminate wage labor it is enough to abolish all thought about it, Marx and Engels showed that property, capital, and wage labor “are no ideal figments of the brain” but realities which must be abolished really, in practice, “for man to become man not only in *thinking*, in *consciousness*, but in *mass being*, in *life*.”³

The main roots of poverty in developed capitalist countries do not lie in either people’s nature or their spiritual attitude. Their nature is social, and they are generated by capitalist production relations and the political power structures based on them. *Le Monde Diplomatique*, the French monthly, comes much closer to the real roots of this phenomenon than Mr. Gilder; it notes that “new poverty” is spreading in crisis-stricken Western countries like a malignant tumor. The crises that are going from bad to worse in these countries, increasing poverty, the deepening contradictions between labor and capital, the deteriorating plight of the working people, primarily as a consequence of the arms race policy which the more aggressive imperialist forces are pursuing, and a further polarization between wealth and poverty are all typical of the new stage in the general crisis of capitalism, symptoms of the incurable illness of the imperialist social system.

The concept and dimensions of poverty are open to debate, for poverty is always compared to the potentialities of the society. Poverty in Third World countries differs unquestionably from poverty in

developed capitalist countries. However, the very fact that in these countries, which possess a powerful industrial potential, it has become a grim reality for many is only too striking an illustration of the inhuman nature of the social system prevailing there.

Poverty is nothing new in the capitalist world. It has been there at every stage of capitalism's development, and has invariably hit the working class hardest of all.

It is now put on record with a fair degree of unanimity that a new category of poor people has emerged, namely, the chronically jobless, who have no chance to find work. They include highly skilled steelworkers, shipbuilders and construction workers suffering from the effects of a structural crisis; they include trained and untrained wage and salary earners whose jobs have been abolished as the result of a rationalization of production dictated by capitalism's drive for profit: they include teachers, doctors and other professionals who have received a higher education; and millions of young men and women who can find no job after leaving school, completing a course of vocational training or graduating from an institution of higher education, and are automatically denied social relief. Speaking to a meeting devoted to the problem of "new poverty," Gerd Muhr, Deputy Chairman of the Association of German Trade Unions, said that in the FRG last year the number of those receiving social relief — they make up the majority of the "new poor" — went up by 18 percent. One in every four was in need of relief for the simple reason that he had lost his job or had been unable to find employment after finishing school. It is these people that Gilder cynically describes as "inefficient" and "loafers."

Poverty has many faces. Many also suffer from its harshest manifestations, such as hunger and homelessness. This is how matters stand, not only in Africa's Sahel, in Pakistan or some other country listed among the world's poorest, but in capitalist citadels as well. A report published in Washington by a doctors' commission states that 20 million U.S. citizens, including roughly 10 million children, are suffering from hunger or malnutrition. Yet there is no reason to say that the United States does not have enough to feed everyone. Farmers are complaining of the difficulty of selling their produce; every year sees thousands of tons of fruit and vegetables destroyed in the United States and, for that matter, in other capitalist countries, where farmers are paid bonuses for holding up production to keep prices high. There is talk about growing "mountains" of butter and other food products.

We cannot help recalling the reports which came last winter, saying that the hostels of New York, Chicago and other American cities were overcrowded because tens of thousands of jobless people, unable to pay rents raised to scandalous levels, sought refuge from the cold there. In the FRG the number of those who are "vegetating rather than living"⁴ in urban asylums for the homeless ranges from 500,000 to 800,000 according to a conservative estimate. Besides, there are from 80,000 to 100,000 so-called non-residents. Surely this confirms the

anachronism of a system under which there are numerous vacant flats but few solvent tenants, for even trade in housing is seen as a business like any other.

In a society centered on profit, its appropriation and utilization, the working people's condition and interests are pushed into the background. Military business earns companies fabulous profits. Billions of public money, which could have provided the poor with a livelihood, with food and a home, are spent on escalating the arms race and carrying out insane plans for the militarization of space, which the Pentagon strategists imagine will enable them to blackmail the socialist countries. And it is the working people who foot the bill. Truly, this policy is sad proof of the inhumanity of the system pursuing it.

Still, the material want of the poor, however distressing, is only one aspect of the matter. The other is the overall oppressive impact of this situation, which increasingly robs people of their human dignity. After all, they are compelled to beg for social relief, feeling ashamed because they need it and tormented by the thought that this may gradually turn them into outcasts. Lacking a job and an adequate income, people feel like misfits or nobodies in a society in which prestige is all that matters; they dare not invite friends because they can no longer "keep pace." Where the motto is "I am what money can buy"⁵ and one's social prestige is conditioned by money and property, he who lacks both is a nobody from the point of view of the prevailing morality.

No opportunities for apprentice training, and unemployment right after leaving school or a little later — how many shattered hopes! A mood of frustration is spreading; it often drives young people to despair, and they become alcoholics or drug addicts. This is precisely the meaning of the growing moral crisis, a component of the deepening general crisis of capitalism.

Against the background of these revealing signs of "new poverty" in capitalist citadels, the abstract talk of some imperialist politicians about human dignity and freedom is certainly meaningless. Many nice-sounding words are spoken about freedom but Martin Andersen Nexø, the Danish novelist, was right when he commented that "nothing in the world makes one so unfree as poverty."⁶ Poverty rules out freedom and human dignity. Those who cannot provide the millions dominated by them with conditions fit for human beings and for the really free development of their individualities would do well to renounce the role of instructor where it is a question of human dignity and freedom.

The monopoly bourgeoisie today uses every available means to rapidly advance the productive forces, science and high technology. But since all this serves the one aim of making maximum profit, the remarkable opportunities offered by scientific and technological, progress become factors injuring the working people's interests, depreciating labor and spreading poverty wider. Indeed, when these opportunities are used by the more aggressive imperialist forces for achieving military strategic superiority to realize their plans for the winning of

world domination, they become factors endangering the very existence of humanity. As far back as 1856, Marx revealed in the following terms the contradictory trend which is coming out more and more today, under monopoly capitalism: "The new-fangled sources of wealth, by some strange weird spell, are turned into sources of want. The victories of art seem bought by the loss of character. At the same pace that mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own infamy . . . This antagonism between modern industry and science on the one hand, modern misery and dissolution on the other hand; this antagonism between the productive powers and the social relations of our epoch is a fact, palpable, overwhelming, and not to be controverted."⁷ The capitalist mode of production has had its day; it has long been too limited for the powerful productive

forces brought into being by it. The increasingly social character of the productive forces militates against serving the interests of capital.

"New poverty" is the mark of Cain of an inhuman, antiquated social system, a further indication that capitalism has become a drag on social progress, that it cannot solve urgent problems of our times.
Einheit, No. 9, 1985

1. Quoted from *Neues Deutschland*, July 6/7, 1985, p. 6.
2. George Gilder, *Reichtum und Armut*, Berlin (West), 1981, p. 24.
3. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 53.
4. *Die Zeit*, May 31, 1985, p. 24.
5. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 324.
6. Martin Anderson Nexø, *Erinnerungen*, Aufbau-Verlag, Berlin and Weimar, 1966, p. 553.
7. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, pp. 655, 656.

SPECIAL OFFER!

Unique Marxist Reference Books

Dictionary of Philosophy
cloth 465 pp \$12.95

A Dictionary of Political Economy
cloth 397 pp \$10.95

A Dictionary of Scientific Communism
cloth 288 pp \$9.95

**Until March 31, 1986, receive all three dictionaries for the special price of \$25.00. This offer available in Canada only.
PROGRESS BOOKS, 71 Bathurst Street, Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6**

New Books

The Russian Revolution: What Actually Happened

A popular introduction in cartoon form.

Paper 160 pp \$4.95

Washington Silhouettes

Yakovlev

Post-war U.S. history with focus on U.S. presidents from Truman to Reagan.

Paper 375 pp \$5.95

De Gaulle: His Life and Work

Molchanov

Biography of De Gaulle and examination of Gaullism.

Cloth 400 pp \$8.95

An Economic History: The Age of Imperialism

Polyansky

The economies of the most developed capitalist countries in the period 1870-1917 — the emergence of imperialism.

Cloth 342 pp \$6.95

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst Street Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6

New Books

Blacks in United States History

Ivanov

From the Colonial Period to the post-war — the struggle against discrimination, for freedom.

Cloth 268pp \$6.50

Studies in Psychology: The Collective and the Individual

Petrovsky

One of the first Soviet books on social psychology available in English. Name index.

Cloth 253 pp \$6.95

The Contemporary Revolutionary Process

Krasin

Theoretical essays by a prominent Soviet philosopher — guest lecturer at the 1985 *Communist Viewpoint* conference.

Paper 221 pp \$4.50

Western Aid: Myth and Reality

Baskin

Forms and methods of western "aid" and its impact on the socio-economic processes in the recipient countries.

Paper 181 pp \$3.95

Soviet Foreign Policy: Objectives and Principles

Petrenko and Popov

Valuable summary of Marxist-Leninist theory of foreign policy and analysis of Soviet foreign policy today.

Cloth 310 pp \$5.50

PROGRESS BOOKS

71 Bathurst Street Toronto, Ontario M5V 2P6