

information bulletin

The Moscow Summit / 3

**Hungarian Party
Conference / 15**

China / 19

Israel / 23

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

August 1988

contents

- 3 Joint statement at the Moscow Summit
- 7 Mikhail Gorbachev gives press conference

CONGRESSES AND PLENARY MEETINGS

- 15 Hungary: on the course of renewal/*From the resolution of the all-Hungarian Party Conference*

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

- 17 Chile: freedom has never been won anywhere through a compact with the oppressors/*CP Chile*
- 19 China: the next five years will be a key stage/*Li Peng, member, standing committee, Political Bureau, CP China CC*
- 23 Israel: our foremost duty is to help both peoples/*Interview with T. Toubi, Deputy General Secretary, CP Israel*
- 24 Sudan: lessons of the uprising/*Interview with M.I. Nugud, General Secretary, Sudanese CP CC*

FROM THE PRESS

- 26 Dublin must repudiate the accord/*J. Stewart, General Secretary, CP Ireland*
- 27 In support of the uprising/*Al-Djamahir, organ of the Jordanian CP CC*
- 27 Ecuador: immediate measures to overcome the crisis/*United Left Front of Ecuador*
- 29 Morocco: a big step to reconciliation/*Party of Progress and Socialism of Morocco CC Political Bureau*
- 29 Strike tactics — new and old theories/*John Case, People's Daily World*
- 30 USSR-Cyprus: developing fraternal relations/*joint CPSU-AKEL communiqué*

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

15-16 (607-608) Volume 26
PRICE: \$1.50

Joint Statement at the Moscow Summit

In accordance with the understanding reached during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva in November 1985, and confirmed at the Washington summit in December 1987, Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, met in Moscow May 29-June 2, 1988.

Attending on the Soviet side were Andrei Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU CC, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU CC, Foreign Minister; Alexander Yakovlev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU CC, Secretary of the CPSU CC; Dmitry Yazov, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU CC, Defense Minister; Anatoly Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU CC; Anatoly Chernomyaev, assistant general secretary of the CPSU CC; Alexander Bessmertnykh, deputy Soviet Foreign Minister, and Ambassador of the USSR to the United States of America Yuri Dubinin.

Attending on the U.S. side were Secretary of State George P. Shultz; Secretary of Defense Frank C. Carlucci; Presidential Chief of Staff Howard H. Baker, Jr.; Assistant to the President for National Security Colin L. Powell; Ambassador at Large and Special Adviser to the President and the Secretary of State on Arms Control Matters, Paul H. Nitze; Special Adviser to the President and the Secretary of State on Arms Control Matters, Ambassador Edward L. Rowny; Ambassador of the U.S. to the USSR Jack F. Matlock; and Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs Rozanne L. Ridgway.

The General Secretary and the President view the Moscow summit as an important step in the process of putting Soviet-U.S. relations on a more productive and sustainable basis. Their comprehensive and detailed discussions covered the full agenda of issues to which the two leaders agreed during their initial meeting in Geneva in November 1985 — an agenda encompassing arms control, human rights and humanitarian matters, settlement of regional conflicts, and bilateral relations. Serious differences remain on important issues; the frank dialogue which has developed between the two countries remains critical to surmounting these differences.

The talks took place in a constructive atmosphere which provided ample opportunity for candid exchange. As a result, the sides achieved a better understanding of each other's positions. The two leaders welcomed the progress achieved in various areas of Soviet-U.S. relations since their last meeting in Washington, notwithstanding the difficulty and complexity of the issues. They noted with satisfaction numerous concrete agreements which have been achieved, and expressed their determination to redouble efforts in the months ahead in areas where work remains to be done. They praised the creative and intensive efforts made by representatives of both sides in recent months to resolve outstanding differences.

Assessing the state of Soviet-U.S. relations, the General Secretary and the President underscored the historic importance of their meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington, and Moscow in laying the foundation for a realistic approach to the problems of strengthening stability and reducing the risk of conflict. They reaffirmed their solemn conviction that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, their determination to prevent any war between the Soviet Union and the United States, whether nuclear or conventional and their disavowal of any intention to achieve military superiority.

The two leaders are convinced that the expanding political dialogue they have established represents an increasingly effective means of resolving issues of mutual interest and concern. They do not minimize the real differences of history, tradition and ideology which will continue to characterize the Soviet-U.S. relationship. But they believe that the dialogue will endure, because it is based on realism and focused on the achievement of concrete

results. It can serve as a constructive basis for addressing not only the problems of the present, but of tomorrow and the next century. It is a process which the General Secretary and the President believe serves the best interests of the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union, and can contribute to a more stable, more peaceful and safer world.

I

The General Secretary and the President, having expressed the commitment of their two countries to build on progress to date in arms control, determined objectives and next steps on a wide range of issues in this area. These will guide the efforts of the two governments in the months ahead as they work with each other and with other states toward equitable, verifiable agreements that strengthen international stability and security.

The General Secretary and the President signed the protocol on the exchange of instruments of ratification of the Treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. The two leaders welcomed the entry into force of this historic agreement, which for the first time will eliminate an entire class of Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms, and which sets new standards for arms control. The leaders are determined to achieve the full implementation of all the provisions and understandings of the Treaty, viewing joint and successful work in this respect as an important precedent for future arms control efforts.

The two leaders noted that a Joint Draft Text of a Treaty on Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms has been elaborated. Through this process, the sides have been able to record in the Joint Draft Text extensive and significant areas of agreement and also to detail positions on remaining areas of disagreement. While important additional work is required before this Treaty is ready for signature, many key provisions are recorded in the Joint Draft Text and are considered to be agreed, subject to the completion and ratification of the Treaty.

Taking into account a Treaty on Strategic Offensive Arms, the sides have continued negotiations to achieve a separate agreement concerning the ABM Treaty building on the language of the Washington Summit Joint Statement dated December 10, 1987. Progress was noted in preparing the Joint Draft Text of an associated Protocol. In connection with their obligations under the Protocol, the sides have agreed in particular to use the Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers for transmission of relevant information. The leaders directed their negotiators to prepare the Joint Draft Text of a separate agreement and to continue work on its associated Protocol.

The Joint Draft Treaty on Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms reflects the earlier understanding on establishing ceilings of no more than 1,600 strategic offensive delivery systems and 6,000 warheads as well as agreement on subceilings of 4,900 on the aggregate of ICBM and SLBM warheads and 1,540 warheads on 154 heavy missiles.

The Draft Treaty also records the sides' agreement that as a result of the reductions the aggregate throw-weight of the Soviet Union's ICBMs and SLBMs will be reduced to a level approximately 50 per cent below the existing level and this level will not be exceeded.

During the negotiations the two sides have also achieved understanding that in future work on the Treaty they will act on the understanding that on deployed ICBMs and SLBMs of existing types the counting rule will include the number of warheads referred to in the Joint Statement of December 10, 1987, and the number of warheads which will be attributed to each new type of ballistic missile will be subject to negotiation.

In addition, the sides agreed on a counting rule for heavy

bomber armaments according to which heavy bombers equipped only for nuclear gravity bombs and SRAMs will count as one delivery vehicle against the 1,600 limit and one warhead against the 6,000 limit.

The delegations have also prepared Joint Draft Texts of an Inspection Protocol, a Conversion or Elimination Protocol, and a Memorandum of Understanding on data, which are integral parts of the Treaty. These documents build on the verification provisions of the INF Treaty, extending and elaborating them as necessary to meet the more demanding requirements of START. The START verification measures will, at a minimum, include:

A. Data exchanges, to include declarations and appropriate notifications on the number and location of weapons systems limited by START, including locations and facilities for production, final assembly, storage, testing, repair, training, deployment, conversion, and elimination of such systems. Such declarations will be exchanged between the sides before the Treaty is signed and updated periodically.

B. Baseline inspections to verify the accuracy of these declarations.

C. On-site observation of elimination of strategic systems necessary to meet the agreed limits.

D. Continuous on-site monitoring of the perimeter and portals of critical production facilities to confirm the output of weapons to be limited.

E. Short-notice on-site inspection of:

(i) declared locations during the process of reducing to agreed limits;

(ii) locations where systems covered by this Treaty remain after achieving the agreed limits; and

(iii) locations where such systems have been located (formerly declared facilities).

F. Short-notice inspection, in accordance with agreed upon procedures, of locations where either side considers covert deployment, production, storage or repair of strategic offensive arms could be occurring.

G. Prohibition of the use of concealment or other activities which impeded verification by National Technical Means. Such provisions would include a ban on telemetry encryption and would allow for full access to all telemetric information broadcast during missile flight.

H. Procedures that enable verification of the number of warheads on deployed ballistic missiles of each specific type, including on-site inspection.

I. Enhanced observation of activities related to reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms by National Technical Means. These would include open displays of treaty-limited items at missile bases, bomber bases, and submarine ports at locations and times chosen by the inspecting party.

The two sides have also begun to exchange data on their strategic forces.

During the course of this meeting in Moscow, the exchanges on START resulted in the achievement of substantial additional common ground, particularly in the areas of ALCMs and the attempts to develop and agree, if possible, on a solution to the problem of verification of mobile ICBMs. The details of this additional common ground have been recorded in documents exchanged between the sides. The delegations in Geneva will record these gains in the Joint Draft Text of the START Treaty.

The sides also discussed the question of limiting long-range, nuclear-armed SLCMs.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan expressed their joint confidence that the extensive work done provides the basis for concluding the Treaty on Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms which will promote strategic stability and strengthen security not only of the peoples of the USSR and the USA, but of all humankind.

Guided by this fundamental agreement, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the U.S. President agreed to continue their efforts in this area energetically and

purposefully. The delegations of the two countries have been instructed to return to Geneva on July 12, 1988. It has been agreed as a matter of principle that, once the remaining problems are solved and the Treaty and its associated documents are agreed, they will be signed without delay.

The agreement between the USSR and the U.S. on notifications of launches of Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles and Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missiles, signed during the Moscow summit, is a practical new step, reflecting the desire of the sides to reduce the risk of outbreak of nuclear war, in particular as a result of misinterpretation, miscalculation or accident.

The leaders reaffirmed the commitment of the two sides to conduct in a single forum scale, stage-by-stage negotiations on the issues relating to nuclear testing. In these negotiations the sides as the first step will agree upon effective verification measures which will make it possible to ratify the USSR-U.S. Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974 and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty of 1976, and proceed to negotiating further intermediate limitations on nuclear testing leading to the ultimate objective of the complete cessation of nuclear testing as part of an effective disarmament process. This process, among other things, would pursue, as the first priority, the goal of the reduction of nuclear weapons and, ultimately, their elimination. In implementing the first objective of these negotiations, agreement upon effective verification measures for the USSR-U.S. Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974, the sides agreed to design and conduct a Joint Verification Experiment at each other's test sites.

The leaders therefore noted with satisfaction the signing of the Joint Verification Experiment Agreement, the considerable preparation underway for the Experiment, and the positive cooperation being exhibited in particular by the substantial numbers of personnel now engaged in work at each other's test sites. They also noted the substantial progress on a new Protocol to the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty and urged continuing constructive negotiations on effective verification measures for the Threshold Test Ban Treaty.

Expressing their conviction that the progress achieved so far forms a solid basis for continuing progress on issues relating to nuclear testing, the leaders instructed their negotiators to complete expeditiously the preparation of a Protocol to the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty and to complete the preparation of a Protocol to the Threshold Test Ban Treaty as soon as possible after the Joint Verification Experiment has been conducted and analyzed. They confirmed their understanding that verification measures for the TTBT will, to the extent appropriate, be used in further nuclear test limitation agreements which may subsequently be reached. They also declared their mutual intention to seek ratification of both the 1974 and 1976 Treaties when the corresponding protocols to the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty are completed, and to continue negotiations as agreed in the Washington joint summit statement.

The two leaders noted that this year marks the 20th anniversary of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, one of the most important international arms control agreements with over 130 adherents. They reaffirmed their conviction that universal adherence to the NPT is important to international peace and security. They expressed the hope that each state not a party to the Treaty will join it, or make an equally binding commitment under international law to forego acquisition of nuclear weapons and prevent nuclear weapons proliferation. This will enhance the possibility of progress toward reducing nuclear armaments and reduce the threat of nuclear war.

The two leaders also confirmed their support of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and agreed that they would continue efforts to further strengthen it. They reaffirmed the value of their regular consultations on non-proliferation and agreed that they should continue.

The leaders expressed satisfaction over the activation of the new communications link between the Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers in Moscow and Washington, established in accordance

with the Soviet-U.S. agreement of September 15, 1987. It was agreed that the centers can play an important role in the context of a future Treaty on reducing Soviet and U.S. strategic nuclear arms.

The leaders reviewed the status of on-going multilateral negotiations and bilateral Soviet-U.S. consultations toward a comprehensive, effectively verifiable, and truly global ban on chemical weapons, encompassing all chemical weapons-capable states. They also expressed concern over the growing problem of chemical weapons proliferation and use.

The leaders reaffirmed the importance of efforts to address, as a matter of continuing urgency, the unique challenges of a chemical weapons ban and to achieve an effective convention. While noting the progress already achieved in the talks and the difficult problems with regard to effective monitoring of the global prohibition of chemical weapons and non-use of dual-capable chemicals for chemical weapons purposes, the leaders underlined the need for concrete solutions to the problems of ensuring effective verification and undiminished security for all convention participants. They gave instructions to their respective delegations to this effect.

Both sides agreed on the vital importance of greater openness by all states as a way to build confidence and strengthen the foundation for an effective convention. The leaders also emphasized the necessity of close coordination on a multilateral basis in order to ensure the participation of all CW-possessing and CW-capable states in the convention.

Both sides strongly condemned the dangerous spread and illegal use of chemical weapons in violation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. They stressed the importance of both technical and political solutions to this problem and confirmed their support for international investigations of suspected violations. Noting the initial efforts being made to control the export of chemicals used in manufacturing chemical weapons, the leaders called on all nations with the capability of producing such chemicals to institute stringent export controls to inhibit the proliferation of chemical weapons.

The leaders emphasized the importance of strengthening stability and security in the whole of Europe. They welcomed progress to date on development of a mandate for new negotiations on armed forces and conventional armaments. They expressed their hope for an early and balanced conclusion to the Vienna CSCE Follow-Up Meeting. The President and the General Secretary also noted that full implementation of the provisions of the document of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe can significantly increase openness and mutual confidence.

They also discussed the situation in the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) negotiations in Vienna.

They expressed their commitment to further development of the CSCE process. The USSR and the U.S. will continue to work with the other 33 participants to bring the Vienna CSCE follow-up meeting to a successful conclusion, through significant results in all the principal areas of the Helsinki Final Act and Madrid Concluding Document.

The leaders agreed to bilateral discussions at the level of experts on the problem of proliferation of ballistic missile technology.

II

The General Secretary and the President noted the importance of the ongoing Third Special Session on Disarmament.

The General Secretary and the President engaged in a detailed discussion of human rights and humanitarian concerns. The leaders reviewed the increasingly broad and detailed Soviet-U.S. dialogue in this area and agreed that it should be conducted at all levels in order to achieve sustained, concrete progress. They noted that this dialogue should seek to maximize assurance of the rights, freedoms and human dignity of individuals; promotion of people-to-people communications and contacts; active sharing of spiritual, cultural, historical and other values; and greater mutual under-

standing and respect between the two countries. Toward this end, they discussed the possible establishment of a forum which, meeting regularly, would bring together participants from across the range of their two societies. They noted steps already taken to establish the exchange of information and contacts between legislative bodies of both countries, as well as discussions between legal experts, physicians and representatives of other professions directly involved in matters pertaining to human rights, and between representatives of non-governmental organizations.

III

The General Secretary and the President thoroughly discussed a wide range of regional questions, including the Middle East, the Iran-Iraq war, southern Africa, the Horn of Africa, Central America, Cambodia, the Korean Peninsula, and other issues. They expressed satisfaction with the April 1988 conclusion in Geneva of accords on an Afghanistan settlement. Although the discussions revealed serious differences both in the assessment of the causes of regional tensions and in the means to overcome them, the leaders agreed that these differences need not be an obstacle to constructive interaction between the USSR and the U.S.

They reaffirmed their intention to continue Soviet-U.S. discussions at all levels aimed at helping parties to regional conflicts find peaceful solutions which advance their independence, freedom and security. They emphasized the importance of enhancing the capacity of the United Nations and other international institutions to contribute to the resolution of regional conflicts.

IV

The General Secretary and the President reviewed progress in further expanding bilateral contacts, exchanges and cooperation since their meeting in Washington, D.C. in December 1987. They noted the increasingly important role that mutually beneficial interchange between the two countries can play in improving mutual understanding and providing stability in the Soviet-U.S. relationship. They stated their intention to intensify such ties.

They noted with particular satisfaction that concrete agreements had been reached in most of the areas identified at their meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik and Washington.

The General Secretary and the President welcomed the conclusion of a number of bilateral agreements which open new opportunities for fruitful cooperation in the following fields: cooperation in transportation science and technology; maritime search and rescue; operational coordination between Soviet and U.S. radio navigation systems in the Northern Pacific and Bering Sea; and mutual fisheries relations.

The two leaders welcomed the recent signing of a new Memorandum on Civilian Nuclear Reactor Safety under the bilateral agreement on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. There was an exchange of notes to extend that Agreement.

They expressed satisfaction with the recent signing of a new protocol under the bilateral Housing Agreement for cooperation in construction research relating to extreme geological and unusual climatic conditions.

They reviewed the status of negotiations between the two countries concerning maritime shipping, the USSR-U.S. maritime boundary, basic scientific research, and emergency pollution clean-up in the Bering and Chukchi Seas. They instructed their negotiators to accelerate efforts to achieve mutually acceptable agreements in these areas at the earliest opportunity.

The two leaders welcomed the start of bilateral discussions on combatting narcotics trafficking. They noted with satisfaction ongoing consultations between the two sides concerning law of the sea, air and sea transportation safety, and areas of mutual interest in the field of law.

Noting the expansion of exchanges in the areas of education, science, culture and sports under the General Exchanges Agree-

ment, the two leaders welcomed the signing of a new implementing program for 1989-91 under the Agreement and expressed their intention to continue expansion of such exchanges. During the time in which this program is in force, the two sides, taking into consideration their mutual interest as well as financial and technical conditions, will conduct negotiations on the opening of cultural information centers in the USSR and the U.S. with the aim of signing an appropriate agreement on behalf of the governments of both countries.

They expressed satisfaction that, over the course of their dialogue, people-to-people contacts and exchanges between non-governmental organizations have significantly increased and become one of the most dynamic elements in the bilateral relationship. They reaffirmed their commitment to further growth of such exchanges, which contribute to mutual understanding, and welcomed plans for increased exchanges of young people in the future. In this context, they expressed their readiness to consider in practical terms the idea of further developing exchanges of high school students. They cited recent joint Soviet-U.S. initiatives on culture, theater and the cinema as examples of new opportunities to engage those involved in the creative arts.

Noting the rapidly growing sports ties between the two countries, including their national Olympic committees, the two leaders expressed their support for the International Olympic Movement, which promotes international cooperation and understanding through athletic competition.

The General Secretary and the President noted the successful expansion of scientific cooperation within the framework of bilateral agreements in Environmental Protection, Medical Science and Public Health, Artificial Heart Research and Development, Agriculture, and Studies of the World Ocean, and expressed their intention to continue to expand activities under these Agreements in areas of mutual benefit to the two sides.

The General Secretary and the President noted with pleasure the commencement of work on a conceptual design of an International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER), under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency, between scientists and experts from the Soviet Union, United States, European Atomic Energy Community, and Japan. The two leaders noted the significance of this next step toward the development of fusion power as a cheap, environmentally sound, and essentially inexhaustible energy source for the benefit of all humankind.

The General Secretary and the President welcomed agreement by representatives of the Soviet Union, United States, Canada and France, to institutionalize in the near future the COSPAS/SARSAT space-based, life-saving global search and rescue system.

Both leaders reaffirmed their support for the WHO/UNICEF goal of reducing the scale of preventable childhood death through the most effective methods of saving children. They urged other countries and the international community to intensify efforts to achieve this goal.

The two leaders expressed their satisfaction with activities since the Washington summit in expanding cooperation with respect to global climate and environmental change, including in areas of mutual concern relating to environmental protection, such as protection and conservation of stratospheric ozone and a possible global warming trend. They emphasized their desire to make more active use of the unique opportunities afforded by the space programs of the two countries to conduct global monitoring of the environment and the ecology of the Earth's land, oceans and atmosphere. They underscored the need to continue to promote both bilateral and multilateral cooperation in this important area in the future.

Recognizing the long-standing commitment of both countries to space science and exploration, and noting the progress made

under the 1987 USSR-U.S. Cooperative Agreement in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space for Peaceful Purposes, the two leaders agreed to a new initiative to expand civil space cooperation by exchanging flight opportunities for scientific instruments to fly on each other's spacecraft, and by exchanging results of independent national studies of future unmanned solar system exploration missions as a means of assessing prospects for further Soviet-U.S. cooperation on such missions. They also agreed to expand exchanges of space science data and of scientists, to enhance the scientific benefit that can be derived from the two countries' space research missions. They noted scientific missions to the Moon and Mars as areas of possible bilateral and international cooperation.

Taking into account the unique environmental, demographic and other characteristics of the Arctic, the two leaders reaffirmed their support for expanded bilateral and regional contacts and cooperation in this area. They noted plans and opportunities for increased scientific and environmental cooperation under a number of bilateral agreements as well as within an International Arctic Science Committee of states with interests in the region. They expressed their support for increased people-to-people contacts between the Native peoples of Alaska and the Soviet North.

The General Secretary and the President noted the positive role played by the multilateral Antarctic Treaty and emphasized the importance of Soviet-U.S. scientific and environmental cooperation in that region.

The two sides reconfirmed their strong support for the expansion of mutually beneficial trade and economic relations and noted recent activity in this area. They reiterated their belief that commercially viable joint ventures complying with the laws and regulations of both countries could play a role in the further development of commercial relations. They welcomed the results of the meeting of the Joint USSR-U.S. Commercial Commission in April and noted with satisfaction that working groups had been created under the Commission to further the establishment of better conditions under which mutually advantageous trade can develop. Taking note of the 1974 Joint Statement and Protocol amending the Long-Term Agreement between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America to Facilitate Economic, Industrial and Technical Cooperation issued at the conclusion of the Joint Commercial Commission, they agreed that the Commission should continue to meet to build upon the forward momentum which has been generated.

The two leaders cited expanding relations between Aeroflot and Pan American Airlines under the government-to-government Civil Air Transportation Agreement as a positive example of mutually beneficial cooperation.

The General Secretary and the President reaffirmed their agreement to open Consulates General in Kiev and New York as soon as practicable.

The two leaders discussed questions relating to ensuring adequate and secure conditions for Soviet and U.S. diplomatic and consular establishments and their personnel in each other's territory. They agreed on the need to approach problems relating to such matters constructively and on the basis of reciprocity.

V

The General Secretary and the President, recognizing the importance of their personal involvement in the development of relations in the months ahead, instructed Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and Secretary of State Shultz to meet as necessary and to report to them on ways to ensure continued practical progress across the full range of issues. Expert-level contacts will also continue on an intensified basis.

Pravda, June 2, 1988

Mikhail Gorbachev Gives Press Conference

On June 1 the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev held a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists covering the Soviet-American summit in Moscow.

Statement by Mikhail Gorbachev

Our delegation that took part in the talks is present here, with the exception of Andrei Gromyko. We are at your disposal.

But apparently in accordance with tradition I should say a few words as to how we assess the results of the meeting.

The fourth meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States in three years has ended. This is not just arithmetic. I believe this is a statement full of meaning and big political importance.

Four meetings in three years. This characterizes the intensity of the political dialogue, the level of our relations. And I think that already by itself this is very meaningful.

It is only natural that across the whole world, particularly in the Soviet Union and the United States, and evidently among you journalists there arises the question — what has the Moscow summit produced? Where has it led to? Has it added anything new to the previous meetings?

I will begin by saying that we all, and I am convinced of this, were participants in a major event. The meeting has really demonstrated once more the importance of the dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States, confirmed once again the correctness of the choice of road made in Geneva two and a half years ago. By way of Reykjavik and Washington we came to Moscow. This is a unique process in postwar history. It is important that this is realized by all — both politicians and the public which is displaying a big interest in how relations between our countries are shaping up.

In the three years I have been in the post of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, I have had more than two hundred meetings of an international character. I do not recall virtually a single meeting with friends from socialist countries, with representatives of capitalist and non-aligned countries in which the thought would not have been expressed and emphasized that everybody is interested in seeing Soviet-American relations directed into a normal, healthy channel. Such is the reality that is determined by the weight of our countries.

Yet, why has such an intensive dialogue, a process of immense importance, become possible?

I think it is thanks to realism. I mean realism in the policy both of the Soviet Union and of the United States, for the manifestation of this approach by one side alone would not guarantee the possibility of such a process.

I don't want to engage in guesswork as to where confrontation would lead us if it continued, if the Kremlin and the White House lacked the resolve to turn the steering wheel in good time and in the right direction — from confrontation to the search for areas and spheres of cooperation, to the buildup of a political dialogue.

When the realities became clear, we started a dialogue accompanied by negotiations, and these negotiations, in turn, brought about agreements.

Relations that had harbored a dreadful threat to the entire world, to the very existence of humankind, started to change. The two most powerful nations began reforming their relationship in their own interests and the interests of the international community.

That was a hard thing to do. A few minutes ago I mentioned that as the President and I exchanged the instruments of ratification.

Things are not easy, but on the whole an important, productive and positive process is under way.

Each of the four meetings was both a difficult and fruitful search for a balance of interests, each stepped up the efforts for finding solutions to major problems of universal human importance.

To illustrate the point, I will remind you of Reykjavik, the Reykjavik drama. This is but one example of how hard, sometimes

dramatically so, the political dialogue between the two world powers is evolving.

What are the results of the fourth summit? The principal outcome is that the dialogue has been continued, now encompassing all vital issues of international politics and bilateral relations. The Moscow meeting has shown again that the dialogue has come to deal with real politics.

I will not say that our meetings got rid of propaganda moves, demarches and attempts to score points through propaganda maneuvering. Nevertheless, these meetings are increasingly characterized by a striving, a desire to make real politics. I'm convinced that this is a correct path, it is precisely in this way that we should act.

When in Washington, at the very first meeting, we felt an attempt at coaching us, we declined this approach and said that we had arrived to engage in real politics. We acted in the same way at this, the fourth summit. That is why it is characterized by deep-going, at times keen debate, up to the last minute of negotiations, not at the table, but when we already stood up — "wall against wall", as we say in Russia.

I would like to emphasize once again the idea of continuity that prevailed throughout the atmosphere of the meetings. You will find that in the final document. I regard it as a large-scale document. It embraces the idea that the dialogue, our fourth summit lays bricks into the building of our future relations, and launches movement to continue in the 21st century.

What specifically has been accomplished? Following the political dialogue which I place highest, we have completed the process of agreeing on the elimination of intermediate and shorter-range missiles. Preparations for the fourth meeting pushed on that process, and we were able to exchange the instruments of ratification. This was not merely a formal act. I'll permit myself to use the following solemn phrasing: the completion of the procedures for putting into effect the INF Treaty has made the Moscow meeting a landmark in Soviet-American dialogue, and in world politics as well.

Not only the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States but also their allies, the entire world public, the entire world community can congratulate themselves. This is a joint victory for reason and realism. It has become possible because today on all continents, in all countries irrespective of their social choice and other values which each people chooses and determines itself, there is a common understanding that the world has found itself on a line where one must stop, when it is necessary to open a road in another direction — the direction toward a nuclear-free, non-violent world, toward an improvement of international relations.

Many made a real, substantial contribution to the attainment of this major victory. I must also note the role of the press. When it put difficult questions to politicians and to the participants in the talks, this too was a necessary contribution because the questions put by journalists helped to raise the talks to the level at which they were concrete and convincing, helped to find solutions and arguments, helped to work out the forms of verification. So I consider it my duty to note the press as well.

It is now a matter of honor, first of all for the Soviet Union and the United States, and not only for them but for other states as well, for every letter and comma of the Treaty to be observed and implemented.

Further I must say that the President and I have approved a joint statement. As I have already said, it sums up what has been accomplished after the Washington meeting and what was done here, in Moscow. At the same time the statement confirms a sort

of agenda for the Soviet-American dialogue in future. In short, this is an important political document heralding a whole stage in our relations. The provisions relating to the importance of continuing and building up the political dialogue between countries and intensifying talks are the most substantial.

I would note the advance also in the sphere of disarmament. This is a very difficult process, especially concerning the question of strategic offensive arms. This, it appears, is the most complex task which we have encountered in post-war world politics. But I must firmly state that step by step we are advancing toward the treaty on the reduction of these weapons.

Today one of the correspondents, maybe of those present here, asked whether after the talks held here I would retain my optimism concerning the conclusion of this treaty this year, during the present administration. I can say that if work is conducted effectively, if the present administration and if both sides act effectively, we can achieve the treaty.

I want to draw attention to our initiative, that has gained much ground, concerning talks on the reduction of armaments and armed forces in Europe. It was published and I will not be repetitive. Now if something has to be specified, you are free to ask questions.

A whole package of agreements concerning bilateral relations between our countries has been signed. They too have been published.

There was an indepth discussion of the problem of regional conflicts. It was present at all our conversations with the President and at two plenary meetings. It was discussed with particular detail and thoroughness today. I think that we have come to face a situation when it is possible to state that at the world's "flash points" real chances have emerged for resolving regional problems and untangling these tight "knots" on the basis of political approaches, on a basis of the balance of interests.

As a matter of fact, we today stated the following: Firstly, there is Afghanistan, and I will talk about that later on. Secondly, there is a process concerning the Middle East. It is proceeding, positions are drawing closer and there is growing understanding of the need for its solution along the lines of an international conference. This has already been recognized. But the point at issue is how to regard this conference. All these issues will be specified in the course of future efforts.

There is a Kampuchean problem. Thanks to the initiative recently displayed by Vietnam and Kampuchea, it is being moved into the plane where it can be resolved in the nearest future.

A real process is under way, and there is a possibility of solutions, in Central America, in Southern Africa, and so on.

If some view my considerations as unjustified optimism, as an attempt at wishful thinking, I think they are wrong. Let us compare the situation three-four years ago and today. The situation has substantially changed. There have emerged chances for a political solution of all these conflicts. Formidable forces have been set in motion in these regions and in the world as a whole. I have always stressed in conversations with the President and all American officials the principal idea — we should not lose, nor pass up this chance.

In this connection I directly told the President that the signing of the agreements on Afghanistan creates a precedent that exceeds in its importance the framework of this very problem. This is the first instance when the Soviet Union and the United States, along with parties directly involved in the conflict, have signed an agreement paving the way for a political solution. We will try our utmost to abide by the agreements, and expect the same attitude from all other parties to the accords, including the United States of America. I think that if we fail this time, if this positive precedent does not materialize, this will have far-reaching consequences and tell upon approaches to similar problems in other regions.

There are grounds for concern. Two worrying events occurred recently: firstly, the city of Kabul, the Soviet Embassy and our troops in Kabul are fired upon. Secondly, comrades of ours perished in the Kandahar area yesterday, several people were

reported missing. We promised that Soviet troops would not participate in hostilities from the moment the troop withdrawal began. We did act in this way. But we made a reservation to the effect that such would be their actions if there were no provocations and bandit attacks on our troops. If this happens, we will respond in a proper way. This should be clear, too.

An accord is an accord. We see what Pakistan is doing and in this connection the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a statement. I do not want to go into details. I only want to underscore that there are attempts to torpedo the accords, which would have serious negative consequences. This was stated most candidly to the President and the whole American delegation.

I think that the United States and the Soviet Union can make a constructive contribution to the solution of regional conflicts on the basis of political approaches, taking into account the balance of interests of all the participants in a conflict, on the basis of realism.

I can note a certain advance on humanitarian issues, on human rights. I set the question before the President as follows. Some concrete problems arise in this sphere from time to time. We have always attentively studied and tackled them. And we shall further study and solve them. But the more thought I give to the situation, the more I come to believe that the American administration does not have an understanding of the real situation with human rights, with the processes that are taking place in our country in the sphere of democracy. Probably we too do not have a clear understanding of the American situation in this sphere of life. I proposed: let us organize a seminar within the framework of interparliamentary exchanges at which the representatives of our Parliaments, political and public circles would meet and exchange information and evaluations as to what is taking place in America and in our society in this sphere. We are prepared for this.

There remains very much speculation regarding the issue of human rights. And I must say that propaganda moves, all sorts of shows prevailed in this part of the fourth summit. So when I learned, true with a delay, only today because I was too busy to read the newspapers, that our press reacted to this accordingly, I arrived at the conclusion that it had acted correctly, within the framework of glasnost. This part of the President's visit had to be shown to our people. The people should know everything.

I am not thrilled by this part of the fourth summit. I think that it is necessary to engage in realistic politics. When the President expressed to me his views about human rights in the Soviet Union. I also asked him a lot of questions. And it took him a long time to explain because he wanted me to change my opinion of the human rights situation in the United States. On hearing him out I said, "Mr. President, your explanations are not convincing because I used facts based on data of the American Congress, not to mention the press which prints many materials on this question. In my position it is best to proceed from official data."

I think this is the only way to conduct talks. Let us look at one another with open eyes, let us see each other's history, traditions and values, let us respect each other's choice, respect our peoples. For, after all, it is they who are making the choice. Incidentally, the peoples always come out for rapprochement, for mutual knowledge, for friendship. The Americans are saying this and Soviet people are openly speaking about this. Much was told to the President on this score yesterday. So let us listen to what our people want. Since they are elected by the people, politicians should detect what the people want and implement this in concrete policies. We should help this process if we are intent on improving Soviet-American relations and the situation in the world as a whole.

I must say that the possibility of making contact with Soviet people was a substantial fact of the U.S. President's visit to the Soviet Union. This was the first visit by the President and his wife, a first acquaintance to replenish their impressions of the Soviet Union, of Soviet people. There was much within the framework of the program, while in several instances they acted of their own choice, outside the program. Mrs. Reagan's program,

which enabled her to get acquainted with the Soviet Union, was a substantial element.

Yesterday, when the President conversed with our people, with me present, somebody asked him, and I think this got into the press, whether he still regarded the Soviet Union as an "evil empire".

No, he replied. Moreover, he said this at a press conference near the Czar Cannon, in the Kremlin, in the center of the "evil empire". We take note of this and it means, as the ancient Greeks used to say, "everything flows and everything changes".

This confirms my thought that the President has a sense of realism and that this is a very important quality for a politician. Regardless of what the realities are, one must look them squarely in the eye. It is only a policy based on analysis, on an evaluation of real processes that merits to be termed a policy.

I have got slightly carried away and have begun to speak for the President. I think it is best for the President to tell you himself what he thinks about his meetings. But I mentioned only those remarks which I was witness to.

In short, this is how I would sum up the results: The President's visit and the talks will serve the improvement of Soviet-American relations, their development and strengthening and will raise them to a still higher level.

Could more have been attained? This, naturally, interests both you and us. We have just had a discussion and that is why my colleagues and I were late for the meeting with you. The discussion did not produce any advance, we stopped halfway. I was compelled to say, well, politics is the art of the possible. But I hold that more could have been achieved at this meeting.

For example, I proposed to the President making a big new stride in spelling out the political realities of our time as a platform of intentions and political actions. Here my colleagues in the leadership and I proceeded from the experience that we have accumulated since Geneva. There we stated: Nuclear war is impossible, impermissible, there can be no victors in it and in general no war at all between the Soviet Union and America is permissible.

This did not mean that everything would be solved and nuclear arms would vanish on the second day or in the second week after the meeting. No, the arms remain but this joint statement was invested with tremendous meaning, evoking a great response, throughout the world. Today we increasingly are arriving at the conclusion that problems should be solved by political means, on the basis of a balance of interests, on a basis of respect for the social choice of peoples. Whether we want it or not, we are all obliged to learn to live in our real world.

If you take the latest book containing the President's speeches and the book of selected articles and speeches by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the first and in the second you will see these statements. So proceeding from the understanding that have been drawn from the practice of recent years, we proposed including this political understanding into the present joint statement. Here is the draft that I suggested to the President: Mindful of the existing realities in the modern world, we both believe that no outstanding issues defy solution and that they should not be solved by military means, that we both regard peaceful coexistence as a universal principle of international relations, and that the equality of all states, non-interference in internal affairs and freedom of socio-political choice should be recognized as standards that are inalienable and obligatory for all. I gave the President the Russian and the English texts. I like it, he said on reading the text.

When we came today to reach agreement on the final text of the joint statement, it turned out that not all in the President's milieu liked the idea of such a wording. And this became the subject of a discussion. We felt that there was a dislike for the term "peaceful coexistence" as it had been used in the past in documents which were signed by the Soviet leadership with Nixon and Kissinger. We withdrew this term since it was unacceptable although we really want to coexist, and I think nobody will put this to doubt.

There appeared a new variant and the President himself suggested elements of that formula. Yet it did not appear in such form in the concluding statement although serious common understandings are stated in it. But they could have been more serious and weightier. This does not mean at all that, were we to state jointly today that we should proceed from the premise of using political methods to solve problems and not to bank on their military solution, the troops and armaments would vanish overnight.

No, nuclear arms did not vanish after we noted in Geneva the unacceptability and impermissibility of nuclear war. But that was a very important political point of reference both for the Soviet-American dialogue and for dialogue in the world. We regarded that as a very important statement, especially since this view was expressed separately by the leaders both of the Soviet Union and the United States. I think that at the meeting here a chance was lost to make a big step toward forming civilized international relations.

We failed to agree on the subject of the talks on conventional arms in Europe. We suggested using the summit meeting, but, naturally, without replacing the Vienna forum, to make its work easier. For the point at issue is that we, the Soviet Union and the Americans, come to some accord, to some understanding on such an important issue as the subject of the talks, the issue that now restrains the process of preparing a mandate in Vienna. This position, by the way, was brought forth in Geneva at a meeting between Mr. George Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. Nonetheless, despite the positive attitude to it from both sides, it has not been included in the statement. Even though the excuse was quite plausible — it was not, purportedly, proper to replace the Vienna dialogue.

That we were not going to do. On the contrary, we wanted to make work at it easier by offering a viewpoint of ours that could be used by the participants in the Vienna meeting. What I think is: there is much talking to the effect that one cannot advance the process of nuclear disarmament, 50 per cent reductions, without handling the problem of conventional arms and the reduction of armaments in Europe. But as soon as we come to real proposals in order to advance that process, then incomprehensible maneuvering and departure begin. The West was alarmed by the Warsaw Pact's alleged superiority in strength. When we said: let us exchange data to clarify the entire matter, the other side evaded giving an answer. Now we proposed the following: Let us say that we have reached an understanding on the subject of the negotiations. This will make work easier in Vienna. Nothing has come off. The Americans have not accepted our bold and quite realistic plan consisting of three stages and integral parts directed at eliminating asymmetry and imbalance in Europe and effecting resolute transition to creating in the continent a situation when the structure of arms and armed forces is non-offensive and their level is considerably lower. I believe that a good chance to impart proper dynamics to the talks on diminishing the danger of confrontation between the two most powerful alliances and, thus, contributing to international security has been passed up.

Politics is the art of the possible. Anyway, I wouldn't draw dramatic conclusions because not everything that could have happened came off. Nevertheless, I ought to share my considerations so that you have a fuller understanding of the content of the talks.

Before concluding my statement, I would like to mention one general impression. I wouldn't be quite honest and truthful with you if I failed to say this. I form an impression that the American stance was contradictory. This observation is based not only on the results of this meeting. We have already come across this phenomenon before.

What is contradictory about the American approach, about the American stance? On the one hand, we have a joint statement to the effect that war should be prevented, that it is inadmissible. We conduct a business-like discussion about reducing weapons, about disarmament, talk about the preference of political solutions of problems. On the other hand, we constantly hear, and we heard

it this time in Moscow and many times before the President's departure for here, about relying on force. This means that force — armed force, military might — is proclaimed to be the chief principle of United States policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, and not only the Soviet Union.

How are we to tally the Geneva statements with this approach? On the one hand, the President and I state that both our peoples want to live in peace, in cooperation and even be friends. This also finds its reflection in what ordinary people say. I have read American press reports. Asked about their vision of our relations in the year 2000, the Americans preferred development of friendly relations and cooperation to rivalry.

It would seem that we should proceed from this, guide ourselves in accordance with the will of our peoples. This does not happen in real politics. This is also noticeable in the sphere of economic ties. The clear interest of an influential part of the American business community to cooperate with us runs up against bans, restrictions and downright intimidation. A most unfavored-nation status is applied in the United States with regard to the Soviet Union.

The President and I yesterday had a serious discussion on this subject. I said: why should the dead grip at the coat-tails of the living, referring to the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. One of them is dead, the other is a political corpse. Why should they hold us back? The amendment was adopted in a totally different situation, decades ago.

In today's totally different, changed world, we ought to conceive and shape our policy on the basis of present-day realities. This reminds me of British legislation under which wrongful actions committed today are judged on the basis of laws adopted in the 13th-14th centuries.

Traditions do differ. I have nothing against them. This is up to the British people. I don't mean to offend the British correspondents. But in politics, one should proceed from today's realities and even look to the future. I said to the President: We have already proved that we can live without each other economically, now we should prove that we can cooperate, the more so, for we are simply doomed to cooperation. The alternative to that leads to a totally unpredictable situation. One cannot maintain lasting cooperation without it resting on trade, on economic cooperation.

I would even risk raising the question in the following way: The more we depend on each other economically, the more we will be predictable on the political plane.

Do you agree? You may not reply, just give your answers in your newspaper commentaries.

We see this contradiction in the sphere of propaganda and in the behavior of officials, especially on issues of human rights. We say yes, we are independent, each people has the right to social choice, relies on its values. Yes, we are different, but that is no reason for confrontation, never mind war. It's good that there is diversity. This is a ground for comparison, an impetus to thought, to judgment. We can remain ourselves and live normally, in a civilized world.

We have not yet noticed on the part of the Americans a serious will to orient themselves toward new phenomena, to take into account the changes in our society. As Mayakovsky used to say: if stars light up, does it not mean that somebody needs this? So this must be to somebody's advantage. But I am sure that our peoples have a different view, and this is the decisive factor in shaping policy. This contradictoriness in American policy and the conduct of the U.S. administration is disappointing to our people.

And still, returning to the overall appraisal of the fourth Soviet-American summit, I would like to say that this is a great event, that the dialogue continues. The continuity has been given an added impulse, the Soviet-American relations have advanced. I don't know whether by one or by two stages, but in any case, they were brought to new stages. And this in itself is a remarkable fact in world politics.

This is what I wanted to tell you.

Then Mikhail Gorbachev answered questions from journalists.

Question. (the newspaper Izvestia) Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have held a number of fruitful meetings with President Reagan. He will leave the White House in eight months' time. Do you think that regular contacts with the next President are possible? Do you think that there can be a meeting to get acquainted with the next U.S. President after he is inaugurated?

Answer. I think this is not just possible, but necessary, and vitally so.

Question. (CBS television network, USA) You have mentioned twice the missed opportunities at the talks on strategic offensive arms. You have also said that politics is the art of the possible. Therefore I would like to ask you if there is an opportunity to conclude a treaty on strategic offensive arms with the current U.S. administration if the U.S. side continues insisting on preserving the SDI program?

Answer. I am sure there is still an opportunity to conclude the treaty this year. First, I am encouraged in this optimism by the progress that has been achieved over this period between Washington and Moscow and the exchange of opinions that was conducted here almost round-the-clock. That warrants such an optimistic appraisal.

Question. (Il Messaggero, Italy) I would like to ask you if, after your pronouncements, President Reagan said anything about the United States' obligations under the Geneva accords on Afghanistan.

Answer. It seemed to me that not only the President but also all members of the U.S. delegation realize the importance of a successful solution to the Afghan conflict along the principles that were laid down in Geneva. I think the exchange of opinions on this theme was sincere and useful.

Question. (National Public Radio, USA) Mr. General Secretary, you have been asked several times in the past few days if a fifth summit with the President of the United States is possible. You have answered as a rule that it is possible, but that everything depends on how matters proceed at the Moscow summit. Has it achieved such a degree of progress as would warrant the holding of a fifth summit with President Reagan this fall?

Answer. I think that another summit is only possible on one condition — if we have an opportunity to achieve a treaty on strategic offensive arms reductions which takes into consideration the entire range of questions, including the problems of ABM and sea-based cruise missiles. I won't go into details. All this is the subject of talks and exchange of views. Since I state the possibility of achieving a treaty, I believe that a fifth summit is so far a possibility. This is the only matter with which I link the possibility of a fifth meeting.

Question. (New York Daily News, USA) We are all amazed at the degree of openness which exists in your society. Americans were yesterday also amazed at the tone of the speech of President Reagan at Moscow University. We were surprised at the fact that the Soviet press has not said a word about that speech by the President. What is your reaction to that speech?

Answer. Regrettably, I have not been able so far to familiarize myself either with President Reagan's speech at the meeting with writers or with his speech at Moscow University. Nevertheless, I think that these meetings were useful. At any rate, the comrades who are better informed about these meetings said that they had been useful. As to our press, its representatives are present here and if they have not yet managed to publish some reports, I think they will do so.

Question. (SANA new agency, Syria) Mikhail Sergeyevich, Arab countries highly value the just words you have said recently about the Palestinian people who have been waging these days a courageous struggle against the Israeli occupiers. Please tell us what you have achieved at your meetings with Mr. Reagan on the Palestinian question and on the Middle East settlement in general.

Answer. We noted that there have appeared tangible aspects related to a political settlement of the Middle East situation.

First, there exists in the world community and among the permanent members of the Security Council the awareness of the need for settlement in the framework of an international conference. It is quite a different matter that the question of its content has not yet been clarified. I should also mention the awareness that there exist the interests of Syria, there exist the interests of the Palestinian people, the interests of Israel, the interests of other countries of the region which are affected by this conflict.

We stand for a political settlement of all issues, with due account for the interests of all sides concerned and, of course, for the fundamental provisions of relevant UN resolutions. This implies that all Israeli-occupied territories are to be returned and the Palestinian people's right restored. We told President Reagan how we view the role of the United States, but we cannot decide for the Arabs in what form the Palestinians will take part in the international conference. Let the Arabs themselves decide, while the Americans and we should respect their choice.

Furthermore, we must recognize the right of Israel to security and the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. In what form — let the Palestinians together with their Arab friends decide that. This opens up prospects for active exchanges, for a real process. At least I think that such an opportunity is emerging.

I will disclose one more thing: we said that following the start of a conference — a normal, effective conference, rather than a front for separate talks — a forum which would be interrelated with bilateral, tripartite and other forms of activity, we should be ready to handle the issue of settling diplomatic relations with Israel.

We are thus introducing one more new element. This shows that we stand firmly on the ground of reality, on the ground of recognizing the balance of interests. Naturally, there are the principal issues — the return of the lands, the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. I must reiterate: we proceed from the premise that the Israeli people and the state of Israel have a right to their security, because there can be no security of one at the expense of the other. A solution that would untie this very tight knot should be found.

Question. (Trybuna Ludu, Poland) Comrade General Secretary, you said this morning that issues of conventional arms in Europe would be considered today. Now you have said that the West rejects the Soviet proposal in this area. We know that your initiative also comprises proposals put forward by other socialist countries, Poland included. What, in your view, is the future solution to this issue? What can be expected after Vienna? For your program contains even some replies to the wishes of Western countries, of social democratic and other parties.

Answer. To be fully objective, I ought to say the following: the American side does not refuse to consider the subject of the talks on the basis of the accords reached in Geneva at our Foreign Ministers' meeting. It evaded making a statement and jointly recording an attitude to this question at the Moscow meeting.

That is why I should be absolutely objective so as not to cast any aspersions on the American side when such important matters are dealt with. They argue that they have to consult the other participants. But we say that what we have proposed does not contradict the necessity to consult. It appears that something is being withheld. Nevertheless I believe that the prospects for defining the mandate of the Vienna conference are real.

I must say that the question of this conference's mandate was being linked to a certain extent by the American side with other CSCE issues, especially with the humanitarian sphere. There too a live, vigorous process is going on, views are clashing and being compared. I think that solutions are possible.

We hold that in its foreign policy the Soviet Union should always take into account the opinions of both Eastern and Western Europe. That is exactly the way we are trying to work with our allies. Now this is being done better, and we have a regular exchange of views. With the West European countries, too, we are trying to conduct matters in such a way that there would be

full clarity and understanding. We want to build our common European home together.

Question. (by a British journalist) There is a widespread view that the differences between the American approach to the SDI program and your position are the main obstacle to the conclusion of the START treaty. Have you succeeded in achieving any progress in removing the differences in respect of SDI in the course of this summit? If you have, what concrete progress has been achieved? Do you continue to think as before that this is the biggest obstacle to concluding a treaty on strategic offensive arms?

Answer. I will first answer the last question. Yes, that is what I think because SDI means destabilization. It defies normal logic — to scale down strategic offensive arms on Earth and at the same time to build bridgeheads for an arms race in outer space. The American side is trying to persuade us that these are only defensive weapons.

We do not think so. And we are competent to pass such a judgment. If the arms race is moved to outer space, this is fraught with a most serious destabilization of the entire world situation. I reminded the President: in Geneva we stated that we will not strive for military superiority. You have the impression, I told him, that you can surpass us by way of outer space, that you can achieve an advantage. Thereby you are going back on the Geneva statement. We had a pointed discussion on the philosophical aspect of this "defensive" system.

Then there was yet another moment. In order to persuade us to support SDI, the American side stated its readiness to share the secrets with us when it achieves real results in this matter. I told the President: Mr. President, permit me to disagree with you and put this assurance in doubt. The two sides at present are trying in vain to reach agreement on verifying the presence of sea-launched cruise missiles on two or three classes of ships. You are not prepared for this and refuse to give your consent. How can we believe that you will suddenly declassify secrets related to SDI? This is not serious, this is beyond the framework of real politics.

Yet, while conducting such a philosophical discussion involving military strategy, we nevertheless agreed to act on the basis of the Washington statement, especially since it contains several concrete matters.

I will illustrate this: coming out for strict observance of the ABM Treaty and a commitment not to withdraw from it in the course of an agreed-upon period of time and considering the position taken by the American side, the Soviet side tabled a compromise proposal on this contradictory question. In particular we proposed to carry out the following:

First, to exchange data related to work in the ABM field, to hold meetings of experts, to have reciprocal visits of testing sites where work in this field is in progress.

Second, to exchange information with the aim of eliminating doubts about the observance of the commitments adopted by the sides.

Third, to verify compliance with the commitments, up to and including inspections at sites giving rise to concern from either side.

Fourth, to hold consultations to consider situations which, in the opinion of either side, place its highest interests in jeopardy.

In the course of the consultations the sides would use all possible means to settle the situations on a mutually acceptable basis.

Thereby the definitive drafting of the treaty on a 50 per cent reduction of strategic offensive arms in 1988, as you can see, will require considerable effort but we remain confident that this is possible.

That's the first time I have given such a detailed answer to this question.

Question. (The Guardian, Great Britain) There are 5000 journalists in Moscow covering the summit. The Soviet Union's internal policy took an unexpected turn for them when in his television interview Mr. Yeltsin suddenly called for the resignation of Mr. Ligachev. Mr. Burlatsky, Mrs. Zaslavskaya as well as

Mr. Yuri Afanasyev have suddenly started speaking about difficulties which arise in the elections of delegates to the forthcoming party conference. You call for the proponents of perestroika to be participants and delegates of the conference, but at present only some manifestations of perestroika are evident. What is your personal view of the process of political perestroika in the Soviet Union as the party conference approaches and what do you think of Mr. Yeltsin's call for Mr. Ligachev's resignation?

Answer. The course of perestroika and its prospects are fully outlined in the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee on this question. Sitting before you is one of those who drafted these Theses. Also taking part in this were all members of the Political Bureau, the entire leadership. The Theses express our collective opinion concerning the platform for the forthcoming party conference and the prospects of perestroika. I think that the conference will give a powerful new impetus to the entire process of perestroika along all its main directions. We will act resolutely but with prudence. It's a vast country and a huge responsibility. We should not put either ourselves, our friends or the world community in a difficult situation. In the course of their personal experience of perestroika our people are changing, just as we ourselves are. We have emerged from one stage, analyzed it, drawn lessons, drawn up our plans and are searching for ways to fulfil them.

In the main we have found them, but there remain many tactical and practical problems. It is not always, perhaps, that everything is running smoothly, it is not always that we find the right solution to some matters. Setbacks do occur. But the really important thing is that perestroika is picking up speed and the people are for perestroika. Society is in motion, the party is undergoing renewal, all spheres of society are in the process of renewal.

Of course, in our society you can find facts to illustrate any theme and thereby fulfil any assignment that the publishers of your newspapers will give you. Whatever view is set before you, you will confirm it by concrete facts. At this summit there were some attempts to use facts out of context. After all, facts can be selected to fit any view. The thing is to see the tendency of phenomena in overall terms, to see their thrust and their perspective.

As to comrade Yeltsin's interview with the BBC, I am in total ignorance about it. (A voice in the hall, "and ABC".) I was compelled yesterday to say that I know nothing about this. Of course, this does not do me credit. But you too did not do much for me to learn about this in time (animation). I have asked for the full text of what comrade Yeltsin said. I'd like to read it. If the correspondents who interviewed him could provide me with a full recording, without any tape editing, I would be grateful. Yeltsin is a member of the Central Committee. The things he is speaking about were discussed at last year's October plenary meeting. There were 27 speakers, they spoke absolutely spontaneously, like here at the press conference. His speech, too, came as an absolute surprise. The plenary meeting was held to exchange views about the report to be made on the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. But Yeltsin took the floor and a debate began immediately. All the 27 comrades were unanimous that comrade Yeltsin's generalizations and conclusions concerning various aspects of the Central Committee's activities, the situation in the Political Bureau and the work of the Secretariat were wrong. His speech was qualified as politically erroneous. So a discussion took place and a decision was taken. In this particular case it might be that comrade Yeltsin disagrees with the decision of the party's Central Committee. Then we in the Central Committee should ask comrade Yeltsin what this is about and what he is pressing for.

As to comrade Ligachev resigning, no such problem exists in the party's Central Committee, in the Political Bureau. I advise you to proceed from this.

Question. (Soviet journal USA: Economics, Politics, Ideology) Not only journalists but also political scientists who consider themselves experts on U.S. affairs have come to Moscow. Many of them say that the conservative forces in the United States,

which tried to prevent the ratification of the Treaty, are now closing ranks, believing that the development of Soviet-American relations is proceeding too rapidly and that they should do all they can to stop this advancement or to reverse it regardless of what position is taken by the future administration. Did you speak about this with President Reagan and what do you think about these forces?

Answer. I think that if you put this question to the President, and he is to appear before you soon, he will give you a better answer. In any case, the views of American conservatives will have little influence on us.

Question. (NBC Television, USA) About your conservatives, Mr. General Secretary. An analysis was conducted in America and also in your country, and according to it you have only three or five years left in which to ensure the success of perestroika. If you fail, you will be outstripped by conservatives and critics inside the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. What is your personal assessment of what has been achieved to ensure the success of perestroika that is necessary for the survival of your great society?

Answer. Here is what I'll say. The most important thing in our perestroika is that through democracy and openness we have already drawn the people into it, while by way of perfecting our political system we will substantially strengthen this tendency. It may be that there are places and processes that perestroika has not yet influenced, but it is present everywhere today.

The other day, for instance, there was a debate on Sakhalin Island. As a result, a plenary meeting of the regional party committee was convened and the opinions of working people, of communists were discussed. Their remarks and demands were found to be just. The meeting decided it was necessary to strengthen the party's leadership in the region and adopted decisions for democratization on Sakhalin to gain momentum. So perestroika has reached Sakhalin. But it is also spreading in depth, penetrating all spheres.

In the course of three years nobody has proposed a convincing alternative to the policy of perestroika, and I am confident that no such alternative exists. We must restructure, renew the country on the basis of our principles, our ideals, using the tremendous material, spiritual and intellectual potential of society. The party and the people have the strength to carry out perestroika and accomplish a breakthrough. There is no alternative to perestroika, and perestroika will be victorious. It may know occasional retreats, maneuvers, even setbacks, but this will not change the main direction of our society's development. We have embarked on a path of irreversible change.

Question. (Diario de Noticias, Portugal) I would like to hear views on Angola. Secondly, when speaking of the results of the meeting, you repeated several times the words "missed", "let slip a chance".

Answer. Better "let slip" than "missed". "Missed" is forever, while "let slip" applies only to this meeting and we still can go again after this chance in the future.

As to Angola, I must say that we had an interesting, substantive and realistic exchange of views. Both the Americans and we stated the possibility of advancement toward settling that regional conflict, providing, as both sides stressed, strict observance of relevant UN Security Council resolutions, no South African interference in Angolan affairs, and the granting of independence to Namibia. We are not involved in that process directly, but we supported the talks conducted by the Angolans, Cubans and South Africans through U.S. mediation. If all the parties believe that the Soviet Union should join this process more tangibly in addition to expressing its considerations, we are prepared for that, too. Anyway, such was the discussion: it was based on the understanding that this process can bring about a positive result.

Question. (Izvestia) First of all, I'd like to say that our newspaper published today a rather detailed account of President Reagan's remarks at the House of Writers and at Moscow State University. This is in reply to the question asked by my American

colleagues. In following the Soviet-American dialogue, we have always felt that initially the difficulties related to verification and inspection originated from our side. Now we think that the accent has moved to the American side. Has the summit confirmed this reorientation?

Answer. Your observations are correct. And we discussed that, on the basis of facts. It has turned out that previous statements were largely bluff. Now that we are beginning to deal with actual processes, we are in a very resolute mood. Verification should be real, effective. In the field of verification, thanks to the experience gained in elaborating the treaty on intermediate and shorter range missiles, we now cooperate constructively. We think that solutions will be found in these matters as well.

Question. (l'Unita, Italy) President Reagan cited a saying, "It was born, it wasn't rushed." Still, what we are witnessing is a resolute turn for the better in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. What is Europe's role in that process, and don't you think that Europe should join it more actively?

Answer. In all the processes so far, Europe has not only been present, but also participated vigorously in defining problems that became subjects of discussion at summit meetings between the U.S. President and the General Secretary. This also applies to our East European allies. So Europe, both East and West, is always there, acting and making its dynamic contribution. We will proceed precisely in this manner. I know that President Reagan has stated this too. Moreover, today, when the world is looking for answers to tough, burning questions, I see no way for a successful solution to international problems without Europe with its unique historical, intellectual, diplomatic and political experience, the European contribution.

Question. (Literaturnaya Gazeta) The previous edition of our weekly published a dispatch by our U.S.-based correspondent Iona Andronov regarding 300 Soviet servicemen in Afghanistan who had been forcibly taken across the border into Pakistan. The article was immediately followed by letters to the Editorial Board with inquiries about their fate. In discussing regional conflicts, has this question been raised during your conversation with President Reagan?

Answer. I have also received letters from the mothers of some of these soldiers. We approached the American side in order to consider this question practically. Discussions have been held. We did not discuss this matter specifically with President Reagan. But it began to be elaborated at working level, at the level of experts. I will add that this problem has also been raised before Pakistan. We will do everything so that our people could return home.

Question. (Los Angeles Times, United States) Presidential elections are held in the United States every four years, whether they are needed or not. But the President is limited to eight years in office. Your term as General Secretary has not been strictly defined. Many Americans would like to know how long you intend to remain in your post.

Answer. This does not depend on my intentions, although your notions of our democracy are such as if the people were not involved. This is another fact showing that we have false notions of each other. Nevertheless, I shall answer your question. This problem, related to party and other elective bodies, will be referred to the party conference, taking into account what has already been stated briefly in the Theses. It will be reflected in the new election law. So all this will be put on a basis of law.

Question. (Rizospastis, Greece) Mikhail Sergeevich, in your opening speech you mentioned a number of regional conflicts. But you did not touch upon the Southern part of Europe, the Mediterranean, the Cyprus problem. Does this mean that these questions did not come up for discussion at the talks, or that the differences were so great that there has been no progress? Do you intend to visit Greece this year?

Answer. As to the first question, we did raise these problems during intensive exchanges of views in working groups, but they have not been developed because of the lack of interest on the

U.S. part. As to my visits, we plan them, and when there is clarity, we shall surely avail ourselves of the invitation and pay the visit.

Question. (NHK TV, Japan) What other regional Asian problems, apart from Kampuchea and Afghanistan, did you discuss with President Reagan? Did you discuss the situation on the Korean Peninsula in connection with the coming Olympic Games?

Answer. We spoke of Afghanistan, Kampuchea, and the situation on the Korean Peninsula. I gathered the impression — to tell the truth, we did not have enough time to exchange detailed opinions on the latter question — that the American side is aware of the need for some headway in this respect. Our negotiating partners negatively described the stand of North Korea. On the contrary, we presented the stand of the DPRK government to the President as constructive and inviting a dialogue and said that the DPRK government is prepared, both on a bilateral basis and with the participation of the Americans, to conduct an exchange of views on the present-day state of affairs and on prospects for reunification, on the principles along which the nation could reunite. We said that this was one of the opportunities which had not been used so far.

Question. (Al Hawadis magazine, Lebanon) You said that during the summit, the positions on the Middle East problem drew closer together. Could you specify in what exactly the stands of the United States and the Soviet Union on this matter coincide? Will Mr. Shultz take with him some joint position for his trip to the region? And, secondly, yesterday Mr. Reagan did not say anything about the Middle East when addressing students at Moscow State University. Today you did not say anything about the situation in the Persian Gulf area. But today you said that Afghanistan could be used as an example for a settlement of a similar situation in Kampuchea and elsewhere. Could you elaborate?

Answer. About the Middle East. I want to repeat once again that, first, there are elements which make it possible to state the positions were brought closer together — above all, the recognition that an international conference is needed. Second, there is awareness that within the framework of such a conference, it would be possible to involve other forums. There is awareness that the provisions of relevant UN resolutions should be implemented. I think there are aspects which will have to be worked out. These are the essence and content of such a conference, the question of Palestine, and of the PLO's participation in the negotiating process. And, finally, the United States is aware that the Soviet Union should participate in such a settlement.

We gave the Americans an opportunity to go it alone for several years. They did and saw that nothing came out of it. After they saw that, we resumed the dialogue.

For our part, we are ready for constructive cooperation.

As to the Persian Gulf, this question was discussed rather thoroughly. We hold that the conflict there is very serious and everything should be done to prevent it from escalating in a dangerous direction. This is why we say that it is essential to use to the full the potential inherent in the first resolution of the UN Security Council and to enable the UN Secretary General or his envoy to utilize the potential and to secure cessation of hostilities.

I think we are justified in calling for restraint and for a display of composure. We want this conflict to be settled. The threat of its spread with dangerous consequences is real. We are calling on the Americans to relieve the Persian Gulf of the U.S. military presence. Let us rather introduce a United Nations force so that the process would not be spurred on in a wrong, dangerous direction.

Question. (Washington Post, USA) Could you elaborate on the Soviet stand on SDI? Did the U.S. side make it clear that there was an opportunity to resolve the question of a mandate for the Vienna meeting on conventional arms?

Answer. The joint statement has a point which confirms the Washington statement and the recognition of the need for intensive work in this sphere on the basis of both American proposals, specifically on gauges and sensors, and our proposals. So, it does

contain specifics which the negotiators should thoroughly discuss.

Second, I am always for accuracy in wording but in this case, perhaps, I am inaccurate: I am not a professional diplomat, you know. At Geneva, there was an exchange of views on the questions of the Vienna meeting and on a mandate for the conference and, specifically, the negotiators tackled the subject matter for the talks. Now a few words as to whether understanding between the two sides, American and Soviet, was achieved. There was a formula which comrade Eduard Shevardnadze read out at this meeting. Mr. Shultz confirmed that the formula had been in fact conveyed to the negotiators in Vienna but that the process of discussion was not carried through over there. Over here, in Moscow, it was again the subject of a very thorough study, but the work was not completed for reasons which I already mentioned.

Question. (New York Times, USA) Mr. General Secretary, when you were in Washington, you told Mr. Reagan, that the Soviet Union was prepared to discontinue the supply of arms to Nicaragua if the United States stops funding the contras. Then, later on, Mr. Shevardnadze and George Shultz discussed the question and we were told that the Soviet stand did not change, i.e., if the U.S. stops deliveries to Central America, the Soviet Union will discontinue deliveries to Nicaragua. Could you confirm whether this is really so and whether you discussed this question within the Central American context?

Answer. Today we discussed this problem in a very detailed manner, and made an excursion into history. When we make such an excursion, we reveal different points of view and different explanations. I suggested, nevertheless, that one should proceed from today's realities. There is the Contadora process, there are the Guatemala agreements, there is the truce, and there is movement in the search for a political settlement. And it is essential to rely on and support this process, giving an opportunity to the opposing forces in Nicaragua to decide this question themselves with the participation of other Latin Americans and representatives of Central America.

I told President Reagan that I was sticking to what had been said during our strolls in the White House: Let us limit ourselves to deliveries of police weapons.

In general, this subject will be examined in future as well. We urged the Americans to take it into consideration that the process had reached such a stage when it could be completed positively. Over there a certain colonel of the Somoza Army appeared. He served Somoza well and is now serving the United States. He is making every effort to frustrate the entire process. I don't know, maybe the colonel should be replaced by a sergeant who will be closer to the people and matters would be settled more speedily. (Animation in the hall.)

Question. (Soviet television) Speaking of foreign policy aspects of perestroika, it has spread far to the East beyond Sakhalin and far to the West beyond Brest. I mean the immense attention of the public, of ordinary people, to the developments, and the desire to get an insight into the holy of holies of the process. Hundreds of people from anti-war organizations all over the world arrived in Moscow and followed the talks. I know that tomorrow you will have a meeting with civic and anti-war organizations. Considering all that, what is your opinion about the role of the public

and of people's diplomacy in the entire process taking place over the past three years?

Answer. I have expressed my opinions on that score more than once but, summing up, I can say today: We would have made a great error in politics if we did not pay attention to the very deep changes occurring in the sentiments of the world public, of ordinary people. They have got sick and tired of wars, tensions, conflicts, and of vast amounts of information which mars the present day and promises a still worse future. People have come to feel that actual politics does not always reflect what they want, what they say, their aspirations and interests. They have begun to act, uniting into appropriate organizations and bringing into use everything they have available. We see among numbers of the movements both ordinary people and intellectuals — physicians, scientists, former military officers, veterans, young people, and children. I think all this is very serious and if someone thinks that there is anyone's "hand" in it, I would like to shake that hand because it is a powerful hand which stirred to action vigorous forces.

The world feels that change is needed. Life itself has raised such questions that people have come to feel the need to directly intervene in politics. Only a policy made fertile by the experience of the masses, their sentiments, their will, and using the competence of scientists and enriched by ethics and by the contribution which intellectuals and the artistic community can make — only such a policy has a future. Only such a policy is adequate to the actual processes under way and has a right to exist nowadays.

Question. (Associated Press, USA) Mr. General Secretary, do you agree with an evaluation of U.S.-Soviet relations of the past period of detente when attention was focused on economic cooperation and political tolerance? To what extent, in your view, both superpowers can and must be interdependent economically?

Answer. I think that both today's and tomorrow's realities, if analyzed in earnest, bring us to the view that we must cooperate and this would be in the interests of both our two peoples and of the whole world. I can see a future world in which the American and Soviet peoples would cooperate in the economic sphere, too, and would exchange the fruits of their labors, complementing each other's contribution. This is why I came up with the idea of a joint space flight to Mars so as to compete not in who gets ahead in the amount of weapons but rather in pooling scientific, economic and intellectual resources, and setting an example of cooperation in this direction. This would promote progress very much, let alone afford greater scope to our cooperation and work for greater confidence between our two peoples. Yesterday I was pressuring the President on these matters in public, using forbidden tricks, and he said: "Yes, we'll think it over." And to my mind, his words convey the idea that it is time to begin to study these problems.

Now, I would like to say goodbye. You should save your energy for a meeting with President Reagan. Thank you for your active participation, and please forgive me if perhaps I have not been able to answer all the questions. There are so many of you signalling. I welcome your immense interest in the fourth Soviet-American summit and I thank you for your cooperation. Till we meet again.

Pravda, June 2, 1988

Hungary: On the Course of Renewal

From the Resolution of the Hungarian Party Conference

A national conference of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party took place in Budapest on May 20-22, 1988. It was attended by about 900 delegates (elected by secret ballot), members of the HSWP CC and Central Control Commission and over 150 guests.

Janos Kadar, HSWP General Secretary, addressed the conference.

The delegates focused on the demand for higher party efficiency, swifter, comprehensive and radical reforms of the political institutions, consolidated socialist gains and an adequate cadre environment for the changes planned.

A conference resolution, with four votes against and nine abstentions, was passed. (Its abridged text is given below.)

A closed session, by secret ballot, elected the party's leading bodies — the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the HSWP.

A plenary meeting of the Central Committee was held. It elected a new Political Bureau and Secretariat of the HSWP CC. Janos Kadar was elected Chairman of the HSWP, and Karoly Grosz General Secretary of the HSWP.

The 13th congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, held in March 1986, resolved to create, on the basis of the ever fuller use of socialism's potential, by building up economic efficiency, the conditions necessary for further improving the overall balance of the Hungarian economy and ensuring a tangible rise in living standards; to assist, by developing science, culture and education, the growth of the creative potential of society; and to strengthen national unity by perfecting the system of democratic institutions.

However the congress's analysis of the situation, as well as the aims charted on its basis in the field of economic policy and the enhancement of living standards, were not well substantiated. More tasks of equal priority were put forward under the seventh five-year plan than we could possibly fulfil. The economy's condition did not improve, the convertible-currency debt continued to grow, the inflationary processes intensified, the burden of hardships on the people increased, and their living standards declined.

This state of affairs, though partly accounted for by reasons beyond our control, is mostly due to internal causes and the shortcomings of our work.

The Central Committee and government had incorrectly assessed the influence which world economic changes exerted (and still exert) on Hungary's economy, and therefore our economic policy failed to respond to these processes adequately.

We also failed to take into account the gravity of conflicts which necessarily arise when unprofitable production is curtailed and state subsidies are withdrawn; we had assumed that these conflicts could be avoided. Distribution was not in line with the really generated income. All of this led to a further worsening of our internal and external financial balance and to higher indebtedness.

It became clear that the Hungarian economy could achieve stable results only if the reform was continued, if we learned to run the socialist market economy in a way that matches our level of development and our conditions. What further compounded these problems was that the economic reform failed to be extended to other fields of social life in time. The aggravated economic contradictions partly caused and partly resulted from the problems in social relations and in the functioning of our system of political institutions.

Public opinion reflects these contradictions, the people increasingly express dissatisfaction over the stagnation in socio-economic development and the growing difficulties; the morale of society has deteriorated, and trust in the party and our leaders has decreased.

The blame for this situation lies with the Central Committee and its effective bodies, and also with the government and its agencies. A part of decisions have proved ill-substantiated, and on a number of important issues they could not be implemented. The changes in the practice and style of the work of party and

state bodies, and of public organizations, did not live up to required standards.

The Central Committee, in the decisions of its November 1986 plenary meeting, pointed out the need for fundamental changes. It followed this up, in July 1987, with a program for social and economic development which has incorporated inputs from party activists, scientific institutions and public organizations.

The government prepared on its basis a working program of stabilization, which was approved by the National Assembly. Renewal of the government's work began accordingly. There are visible signs of an improvement in the economy, but the necessary turn has not yet arrived. Conditions for this can be created only in the long run.

The most important guarantee of our objectives is the socialist social system, the foundation of which comprises people's power, created under the leadership of the working class by the efforts of the workers' and peasants' alliance, with support from the intelligentsia, as well as public ownership of the determinant part of the means of production, the leadership role of the Marxist-Leninist party, and the strengthening and further development of the main institutions of our society.

The party conference deems it necessary for the Central Committee to set up a working commission which will subject the existing situation to more profound analysis, identify the causes of the phenomena and, using the experience of recently-held discussions, map out a long-term program of socialist construction. We need to consider working out a new policy statement in this context.

The party conference deems it necessary to continue and speed up the process of social and economic reforms. Since the HSWP plays the leadership role under the long-established one-party system, the point of departure for an all-embracing reform is a renewal of the activity of our party.

The party must strengthen the political character of its activity. In the course of policy elaboration there should be greater reliance on scientific achievements and on practical experience. It is necessary to improve the drafting of party decisions on a political plane, and after the decisions are adopted — explanatory work, organization of their implementation, and control over their fulfillment. The party should not assume the functions of state or public organizations, it must exercise its leadership role within the framework of constitutionality, fulfilling it through the activity of its members, organizations and bodies, winning the broad support of the masses and defining a principled, political line.

The party is built and functions on the principle of democratic centralism. At present the main task is to strengthen and promote party democracy on a larger scale. In between congresses the Central Committee adopts decisions on issues relating to the party as a whole and takes a definite stand with respect to the issues relating to society and the economy. It must adopt decisions on particularly important issues on the basis of preliminary party discussions in which all party members would participate.

Along with streamlining the central leadership's work, it is necessary to ensure the participation in policy shaping of territorial and local party bodies, of primary party organizations and indeed of all members of the party, and to enhance their independence and responsibility in the matter of representation of party policy, in the organization of political activity and in control over it.

The rights and duties of primary party organizations include submission to higher party bodies of proposals on the discussion of questions which, in their opinion, require consideration or debate. The higher party bodies must consider these proposals.

An important element of the renewal of party work is improving the decision-making process and accelerating it. In drafting political decisions leading bodies need to consider the opinions and proposals of public organizations, of bodies representing interests and of public forums.

The principle of collective leadership is exercised in the party. Participants in the adoption and implementation of decisions bear personal political responsibility. Fulfillment verification must become regular at all levels of party work.

Extending party democracy calls for changes in the inner-party electoral system. It is necessary to ensure that primary party organizations or local party bodies could directly elect a certain percentage of leading-body members and recall them if they are remiss. At all levels, election must be by secret ballot. Where members of the party so demand, it is necessary to nominate several candidates. There should be no statistical approach in the election of delegates to party conferences or of members of party bodies.

Members of the party have a duty to publicly defend the position of party bodies. Nowhere, except the appropriate party forums, may they express opinions different from the decisions adopted or create any factions for the support of their special opinion. Those in the minority can state their position at meetings of party bodies or theoretical forums of the party, and also have the right to ask their primary organizations, the elected bodies or higher party authorities to reconsider the contentious issue. However, so long as a decision remains in force, they are obliged to fulfil it.

Work with cadre is determinant in the exercise of the party's leadership role. It is necessary to more widely promote capable young people to leading positions in every area of political and public life. Concurrent holding of posts in the leading bodies of the party, the state and public organizations should be reduced.

Members of the Political Bureau and Secretariat, the chair and secretary of the Central Auditing Commission, and secretaries of the Budapest and of regional, city and Budapest borough party committees may be elected to this post for no more than two terms. This principle also applies to the appointment of heads of Central Committee departments. It is necessary to take care of the job placement of leaders who leave their posts.

Consistent implementation and renewal of the policy of establishing alliances is an indispensable condition of socialist construction.

As a result of the changes that have occurred in the position of the classes and sections of society, the enrichment of party policy and the unfolding of socialist construction, the HSWP is becoming a party of the people. It will continue to regard the attainment of the historical aims of the working class, which also represent the interests of the whole people, as its principal task. Carrying on the well-acquitted traditions of the workers' and peasants' alliance in today's context, the party also counts on the support and active cooperation of the intelligentsia and young people.

We proclaim our conviction in the correctness of the position of the party, but we also take into consideration views different from this stand. We regard criticism and constructive proposals as an essential motive force of further progress.

The majority of our people see the nation's future in the construction of socialist society and are eager to take an active part in this work. At the same time one can observe manifestations of bourgeois, anti-socialist views in social thinking; a political and world-outlook apathy is also widespread. The solution of the

tasks facing us calls for a consistent renewal of ideological work and the invigorating of creative Marxist thinking.

Socialist pluralism based on the leadership role of the party is a condition for and the means of the exercise of people's power. This will create a possibility for the organized expression and coordination of the various interests and the political will.

It is necessary to improve the separation of functions between party and government and to refine the principles, methods and tools of party influence on state life. The party must realize its political position and influence the work of state agencies primarily through its members working in the state apparatus.

As bearers of historical traditions, the trade unions, which incorporate the overwhelming majority of the working people, will have to assume still higher responsibility.

The Patriotic People's Front is an important institution of socialist pluralism. It must continue to help in ensuring social accord, a firm alliance of all the forces of our society.

The Communist Youth Union of Hungary is called upon to publicly uphold young people's interests and to play a role in the preparation of social and political decisions.

An important condition of the extension of socialist democracy is public openness, which creates favorable opportunities for awareness of the life of society, the identification of a coincidence or divergence of interests, the establishment of social harmony and the exercise of public control. Political openness must be extended to party, state and public life, to the sphere of civil rights and the methods of their practical realization.

The main task of the party in the economic field is to implement the program of development, adopted by the Central Committee on July 2, 1987, and the working program of stabilization approved by the Council of Ministers.

Economic stabilization will basically depend on our slowing down and then checking the growth of foreign indebtedness, and restoring financial balance. This imperative can only be met through an all-out buildup of economic efficiency. Reinforcing order and discipline, speeding up technological progress and modernizing the structure of production and output will also be instrumental.

In Hungary's multisectoral economy the determinant role will continue to belong to state and collective ownership. An important task is to make the functioning of state and cooperative ownership more effective. It is necessary to diversify the forms of collective ownership. We support any initiatives, including mixed enterprises and the invigoration of private activity, that serve to raise the national income and the people's standard of living. We must create such conditions of economic management as would permit earnings based on performance and investment and open up the way for the development of socially useful and productive forms of enterprise.

It is necessary to carry on the economic reform, which sets the stage of the functioning of a socialist market economy.

Economic planning will be our vehicle for coordinating major economic-policy goals, determining the proportions, forecasting the main economic trends and influencing them. A reform of economic planning and a budget reform must serve this aim.

In line with other elements of the economic reform, it is necessary to effect a radical change of the wage policy and system so as to strike a balance between pay and the social utility and effectiveness of work.

We have to accept the social costs that will attend the creation of economic conditions for implementing the program of development, and primarily the reorganization of production structure and gradual liquidation of subsidies.

Repatteming the economy makes inevitable the large-scale movement of labor and its transfer to dynamic industries and enterprises. Temporary employment problems should be cushioned by retraining and through state assistance. The fate of those left without work requires the organization of regulated aid.

It is expedient to study what prerequisites are necessary for the state to guarantee a minimum level of financial support.

A uniform system of social policy and public health, dovetailed with modernized social insurance and pension reform, also needs to be developed.

Housing construction and the management of the housing stock should be brought into conformity with its real value and the actual costs. The housing situation is to be improved with regard for the pattern of territorial development, structural changes and the migration of labor.

Scientific research plays a determinant role in the accomplishment of the tasks facing society and in the technical renovation of our economy. It is necessary to encourage both essential basic research and promising, high level applied R & D of economic and social value, and to facilitate the introduction of scientific achievements in practice.

A more refined education system and better training are indispensable if we are to achieve our social and political aims. Special attention should be paid to improving the quality of teaching in general primary and secondary schools where the foundations of education are laid.

Our art and literature are distinguished by openness and diversity, but a healthy critical spirit is lacking here. Few discussions are being held to clarify the issues, and this impedes the identification of genuine values. The malfunctioning of our institutions of culture are due partly to a blind box-office preoccupation, partly to the delay of a sweeping cultural reform.

Molding the requirements, fostering taste, ensuring the cultural and enlightening influence of our education system, and providing a wide choice of valuable works of art are all indispensable for the dissemination of genuine cultural values.

The favorable assessment of our country by the international community is primarily a result of our successful socialist creative work and the policy of reforms, and also of the international activity of Hungary. We want to retain this reputation in future as well.

The preservation of peace and cooperation between states with different social systems are central to our constructive effort. This is the basis of the vigorous international activity of our party and of the Hungarian People's Republic. Our foreign policy, which enjoys the support of the most diverse sections of society, has become a major factor of national unity.

Restructuring now undertaken in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries creates favorable conditions for the implementation of our program of social and economic renewal. With peaceful competition between the social systems the processes of renewal strengthen the positions of socialism and promote the

relaxation of international tension. Our country is an acknowledged participant of this process, one of the initiators and participants of international dialogue.

One factor has particularly contributed to improving international conditions and to broadening the foreign-policy field of activity of our country. Under the influence of the flexible foreign policy of the Soviet Union and its new approach and initiatives, favorable tendencies have strengthened in the world since the middle of the 1980s, including the resumption of Soviet-American dialogue, a livening-up of East-West contacts, improvement of the international atmosphere, and reinforcement of peace and security.

A major international factor of our activity is the expansion, in accordance with common interests, of friendly, internationalist ties with the Soviet Union, with the member states of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and the CMEA and with all socialist countries, and the uplifting of equal cooperation to a new, higher quality level. We want to streamline and renew the content and organizational forms, and to mobilize the reserves of bilateral and multilateral cooperation with these countries.

For CMEA cooperation to be urgently improved we attach special importance to further developing its commodity and financial relations and the system of economic levers.

One of the basic interests of the Hungarian People's Republic is the maintenance of normal and friendly relations and close cooperation with our next-door neighbors, with the countries of Europe and with all states.

About a third of Hungarians live outside our country, mainly in neighboring socialist countries. Under socialism we consider natural the safeguarding of individual and collective rights of national minorities. National minorities in any country have a right to count on support in preserving their language, fostering their national culture and maintaining links with the country where the bulk of the nation lives. The problems arising in connection with their status can be settled only on the principles of humanism, guaranteed human rights and democracy. This calls for past prejudices to be sunk. We seek understanding, trust and cooperation with all neighboring peoples.

Hungary will continue to play an active role in the furtherance of world security, peace and progress. We shall multiply our efforts seeking a detente in East-West relations, equilibrium of forces at an ever lower level of armaments, wider dialogue and cooperation, and a solution to the global problems of our disunited and yet interdependent world.

Abridged

statements & speeches

Chile: Freedom Has Never Been Won Anywhere Through a Compact with the Oppressors

Declaration by the Communist Party of Chile

The common and inescapable task of all the democrats is to frustrate the dictator's intention to prolong his evil regime and to perpetuate his power. Democracy can score a victory over the dictatorship. To do so, we must steadily advance along the way of unity and struggle by all the strata of the people for their rights, for the satisfaction of their wants, with a firm resolve to frustrate the fraud of the plebiscite.

It is a fraud not only because the electoral system is under the total control of the servitors of the tyranny. Things are much worse. This fraudulent plebiscite is designed to perpetuate the terrorism, repression, torture, crimes, disappearance of individuals, endless emergencies, the proscription of the truly popular and consistently democratic parties, and the keeping of citizens in exile. The tyranny has denied the right of civic expression to hundreds of thousands of Chileans who have to emigrate to other

countries for political or economic reasons. The fraudulent plebiscite means that millions of Chileans will be denied the right to vote because they cannot register at their polling stations, that all the resources of the state will be used to back the candidacy of the dictator, and that there is to be the most gigantic bribery operation in the country's history. The very staging of the plebiscite under the 1980 constitution, which was imposed on the people, is nothing but a fraud, because it says that Pinochet is to remain in power even if the people refuse to say "yes" in the plebiscite despite all the pressures. In order to perpetrate the fraud, great efforts are being made to recruit supporters for Pinochet, pressure is being put on the soldiers, sergeants and officers of the army and other arms of the forces, and television and other mass media have been monopolized. For the sake of this fraud, the dictatorship has engaged in demagogy and speculated on the economic

hardships and distress of the neediest families. By means of propaganda campaigns, the regime has simultaneously tried to create the impression that the economy is flourishing, although hunger and misery have become even more acute, ever larger numbers of Chileans now live in dire poverty, the shortage of housing is ever greater, unemployment has spread, wages are even lower than they were 14 years ago, and the education and health systems are in crisis. These are the problems we have brought and will continue to bring to the fore in our concrete struggle.

The communists are fully resolved to expose the fraud and to combat it, concentrating on the people, its problems, its wants, and its struggle in every form. The tyranny has designed the plebiscite to win it, not to lose it. If the entire opposition rejected it and decided not to take part, it would be a crushing blow for the dictator that would precipitate his downfall. However, the center-right opposition and other, including, regrettably, left-wing parties, eventually accepted the plebiscite, so making it more probable and narrowing down the possibilities of the democratic forces, diverting attention from the main problems, and raising dangerous illusions about the false electoral scenario. Some parties have made their participation in the plebiscite conditional on certain guarantees, but Pinochet has no intention at all of giving guarantees. If he gets his way, which is most likely, these parties will be forced to capitulate to the dictator, or to take part in the voting. On the other hand, one cannot ignore the statements by Christian Democrat leaders that their party's decision to say "no" during the plebiscite could be replaced by a "yes" if the armed forces command puts forward a man the party could support.

The communists denounce before the people the center-right opposition, which has retreated step by step in the face of the dictator's preponderance. It has given up the demand for Pinochet's resignation; it has refused to support the campaign of public protest and social mobilization; it has ceased to take part in the civil disobedience movement; it has given up efforts to create a state of ungovernability; it has also forgotten the calls for non-violent action, that is, everything that it preached but yesterday. This opposition now, accepting the plebiscite, is prepared to put aside or postpone the campaign for free elections. That is the succession of capitulations which meets the plans of U.S. imperialism in its continued interference in Chilean affairs. It first installed Pinochet's dictatorship. It is now trying to impose a solution that would ensure its interests, above all the preservation of the economic model suiting the transnational corporations. In trying to put through this project, imperialism has sought to bring about social demobilization, a division of the opponents of the regime and chiefly isolation of the communists, as Robert Gelbart so cynically declared in July 1986.

Attempts are now being made to reach an accord on saying "no" in the plebiscite, but it is a purely electoral accord and does not imply any frontal fight against the dictatorship. It is aimed to negotiate with the dictatorship, a deal that could be made even before the plebiscite. Such a capitulationist and conciliatory policy will not lead to a victory by democracy over the dictatorship. What is more, under these conditions participation in the plebiscite signifies approval of the fascist state system, gives it a semblance of legitimacy and helps to legalize any fraudulent results Pinochet may proclaim tomorrow.

We have acted and will continue to act resolutely to change this political situation, to prevent capitulationism and to pave the way for struggle for true democracy. We have confidence in the masses and we shall develop their combat potential. Nowhere has victory ever been won by conniving at the oppressors and without mobilizing the people for vigorous action. The dictatorship can and will be defeated only through powerful mass action. There is no other way. If the plebiscite proceeds in an atmosphere of resolute struggle against the regime along every front and in the most diverse forms, it could create a favorable outlook for the people.

The Communist Party calls for efforts without delay to organize this struggle, to support the social movements, and to create the

conditions in which the plebiscite, whatever its outcome, would become a detonator for a mighty popular explosion to sweep away the tyranny.

If the opposition forces mobilize themselves concertedly and decisively to lead our people into offensive action in the struggle for democracy, the plans of the dictatorship will not work.

We urge the working people, students, women and the entire people of Chile to mount a vigorous and united struggle in support of the economic demands of the masses, for the right to work, to housing, to education, to health care, for university autonomy, for the freedom of Clodomiro Almeyda, Karin Eitel, Leopoldo Melo, Roberto Weibel, Alfredo Malbrich, Victor Diaz, Vasili Carrillo and other political prisoners, for the acquittal of the Chairman of the National Governing Council of Working People, Manuel Bustos, and trade union leaders Arturo Martinez and Moises Labarana, for a repeal of the death sentences, for a return home of all the exiles, against the proscription of the parties, against the fascist constitution, and especially against its Article 8, for an end to the torture, for the trial of the torturers and assassins, in defense of the patrimonial rights of the Mapuche Indians, for the satisfaction of the demands of those who have no permanent jobs or jobs under the Minimum Employment Plan or the Breadwinners' Employment Plan, and for the rights of tenants.

The dictatorship will cede nothing without a fight. It will, at best, agree to make small handouts that do not jeopardize the regime, and that only for those who fit into its system, especially the bourgeois opposition.

The people demand that all the parties and all the organizations should have the full right to assembly, and access to radio, the press and television.

We fully agree with the declaration issued by the United Left coalition on November 19, 1987, which says: "We proclaim a way of organization, unity and struggle by the people leading to a state of mobilization, greater social activity and protest, and to a powerful upswing in action for democracy, to break up the existing state system, put an end to the dictatorial regime and effectively go on to democracy. In other words, we want the people to revolt against the tyranny, instead of submitting to it. The end of the dictatorship necessarily runs through a break-up of its institutional system, both because of the obstinacy of the dictator, and of the fact that his constitution and laws admit of no possibility at all of advancing toward democracy.

There are many voices and attitudes indicating the people's dramatic situation. Among others, there are the 150 priests and nuns who said that Pinochet was the chief culprit; there are the members of the Women for Life movement who have criticized the indolence of certain members of the political hierarchy; there are the inhabitants of Valparaiso who staged a 20-day hunger strike, demanding opposition unity, and the series of strikes to back up the demand to save the lives of the five youths who were kidnapped by the secret police in September 1987.

Accord is being reached between left-wing political parties, Christian Democrats and other organizations in many communes and towns in the course of concrete action. The people insist that such concerted action in defense of their interests should involve all the democratic forces throughout the country for resolute struggle against the dictatorship.

In order to promote mutual understanding, the masses, especially the working class, should play a more prominent and decisive role, with a greater weight in political life. That requires persevering efforts to develop the movement for meeting the working people's demands, strikes, protest action, and street demonstrations, and the use of every possible form of struggle.

When raising the people's demands connected to the struggle for democracy, we can and must create a new political situation. The struggle is and must be the main factor in bringing about the necessary change. That is the communists' approach to developments, and we shall go on striving, unsparing of effort, to have these developments lead to confrontation with the tyranny. In each concrete political situation, including the plebiscite, the com-

munists have taken and will continue to take decisions in the light of the people's interests.

The opposition can and must reach accord on the basis of common action, in the course of active struggle for democracy—before the plebiscite, during it, and after it. Our point of departure should be the need to put an end to the dictatorship, to guarantee a process of democratic reconstruction, so as to assure the people of the exercise of legislative power, something that is not possible with Pinochet.

The parties of the United Left bear the immense responsibility of carrying high the banner of Salvador Allende, steadfastly fighting for the people's rights, against imperialism and the oligarchy, and for consistent democracy. It is our duty to consolidate

and develop the United Left coalition as the best alternative power in the interests of the people. As an independent force, we must present our own program for profound economic, social and political transformations, setting up local committees of struggle for the people's demands and for free elections. In this way, we can and must promote the achievement of mutual understanding and common action with other opposition forces, without favoring the hegemonistic pretensions of the bourgeois sections. Broad, resolute and vigorous mobilization of society for struggle is the pledge of the democratic victory.

*Political Commission
Communist Party of Chile
Santiago, February 1988*

China: The Next Five Years Will Be A Key Stage

From the report delivered by Li Peng, member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Premier of the State Council of the PRC, at the first session of the seventh National People's Congress.

During the past five years our economy, fuelled by the reform and wider foreign relations, has kept developing steadily, with quite good overall results.

Its potential rose appreciably. In 1987 we had a gross national product of 1,092 billion yuan. This spelled, in comparable prices, an average yearly increase of 11.1 per cent. The economy's rate of growth was fairly high. Our national income in 1987 reached 915.3 billion yuan, a climb averaging 10.7 per cent a year in comparable prices. Grain production went up considerably, and so did the output of cotton, steel, coal, electricity, oil, chemical fertilizers, cement, chemical fibers, yarn, cotton fabrics and other major items. Likewise the volume of transportation. The fixed assets of public enterprises rose by 585.4 billion yuan. This has laid the material-technical basis for further economic growth.

The economy's main ratios have become more harmonious. Macroeconomic efficiency improved. The yearly labor productivity gains in industry averaged 6.5 per cent. As compared with the past, the return on capital invested, working capital turnover and the percentage of newly-in-place fixed assets all rose. The range of manufactured goods widened, their major types improved in quality. Along with a saving of 160 mln tons of energy resources (in conventional fuel terms), industry cut its material costs. Greater macroeconomic efficiency has set the stage for gradual transfer to a normally-cycling economy.

The life of urban and rural populations continued to improve. In 1987 net per-capita incomes of the peasantry climbed to 463 yuan from 270 in 1982, at an average yearly rate of 8.6 per cent, allowing for higher prices. Per-head incomes of the urban population, which go to meet vital requirements, grew from 484.5 yuan in 1982 to 916 in 1987. Allowing for higher prices, this works out at a yearly increase of 6.3 per cent. The supply of consumer goods has markedly risen. We saw 850 million square meters of housing built for workers and employees in the cities; plus another 3.9 billion square meters by peasants for themselves. The housing conditions of urban and rural populations have improved. With jobs found for over 37 million people in our cities, the long-standing problem of urban youth employment is now basically removed. Significant shifts have occurred in changing the face of the poorest areas.

Economic reform over the past five years has also spurred a gradually mounting reconstruction in science, technology, education, culture, politics and other fields.

Science and technology were further stimulated by the introduction of a mechanism of competition as their administrative system underwent reform. This raised the activeness of most research and engineering personnel. A fresh boost was given to amalgamating research centers, colleges and industrial plants. We now have a steadily growing number of factories of the scientific-technical type and public research centers which operate on a self-financing basis, through combining scientific-technical knowledge, indus-

trial production and commercial activity. Over 50,000 important scientific and technical achievements, a part of them on an advanced world level, were registered in our country during the past five years.

Restructuring the education system gave it an overall boost. Local authorities, departments and factories became more active in this field. The enforcement of the Compulsory Education Act helped improve the conditions in primary and secondary schools, and raise the level of their teachers. Vocational technical training expanded at a rapid pace. The constantly introduced changes in higher education helped improve instruction and develop scientific research. A large group of people was sent to study abroad. The professional training of workers and employees in non-working hours increased. There were positive shifts in preschool education, the training of the disabled and literacy drive. Art and literature, journalism and publishing, broadcasting, the cinema, television and other fields of culture, public health, physical culture and sports all developed rapidly.

Socialist democracy and the rule of law were gradually promoted. Government bodies at all levels now better fulfil decisions, whether by the National People's Congress or by local people's congresses, and more seriously heed in their activity the will and demands of the people. Democratic management gradually increased at many enterprises and in self-supporting institutions, adding to the vigor and creative initiative of their workers and employees. A separation of government agencies from economic bodies was carried out in the countryside; government bodies for small rural districts have been set up, and many self-governing organizations of villages assume an increasing role in the self-education and self-governing of the masses. A vast amount of energy was put by government agencies and the appropriate departments into the strengthening of the rule of law. As a result of the legal education campaign, legal and civic awareness of the popular masses has gradually increased.

Restructuring has brought an immense success in the army. There was a strategic turn in the field of guiding ideas of defense construction. The process accelerated revolutionizing and modernizing of the People's Liberation Army of China and augmenting of its characteristics as a regular force. The task of reducing the troop contingent by 1,000,000 was accomplished. State defense, R & D and industrial organizations effectively implemented the policy for combining military and civilian production, with tangible results.

Thanks to steadily expanding foreign relations, intensive technological and economic exchanges and cooperation with other countries new shifts have occurred in the overcoming of full or partial isolation during the past five years.

An export-oriented economy developed rapidly. Something like our window on the external world, open coastal and special economic zones played a significant role in attracting foreign

capital, borrowing advanced technology and scientific management expertise, studying the international market and ensuring economic information transfer and the training of personnel.

Overall foreign trade in 1987 reached 82.7 billion dollars. It had annually grown by an average 14.7 per cent. Trade increased both with developed and developing countries. And so did the export of finished manufactured goods.

Important progress has been made in the use of foreign equipment and technology. Over the past five years we imported 10,000 pieces of advanced technology and equipment to the tune of 10 billion dollars, to retool our industry. This enabled many plants to do away with technical backwardness, and strengthened their ability to master new equipment and technology. Simultaneously we started to export our own equipment and technology to the world market. Gone are the times when we had only to import equipment and technology from abroad.

The use of foreign capital has produced tangible results. During the past five years, we received via different channels up to 15.38 billion dollars in foreign credits, and 8.78 billion dollars in direct foreign investments. We raised the share of export-industrial enterprises and enterprises equipped with advanced plant and technology among the 10,000-plus enterprises and facilities built or being built with joint Sino-foreign capital, through Sino-foreign cooperation or with foreign-only capital. There has appeared a whole group of such enterprises and facilities, which by their good work exert great influence on economic construction.

Contract construction abroad, cooperation with other countries in the services sector and international tourism developed rapidly. In 1987 we welcomed a total of 26.9 million tourists. The international community also had a closer look at China, and the friendship of the Chinese people with the peoples of other countries became deeper.

The practice of reform and construction during the past five years has given a powerful impetus to the renewal of our views and perceptions, and intensified the process of the formation of our socialist spiritual culture.

This struck at feudal views, the force of habit of the small producer and all the outdated notions and ideas. There spread and became stronger new views and new ideas which meet the requirements of the ongoing development of modern science and of socialist commodity economy.

In the course of the firm observance of the four main principles, the acceleration of the reform and the expansion of foreign relations the process of the formation of our socialist spiritual culture was speeded up. Gratifying results came from theoretical investigations in the field of the social sciences, which gave us very useful ideas on many important problems of the construction and reform.

I would like to stress once more that in 1987 the national economy continued to develop at a good pace. And although our economic situation remains tense, the influence of the factors of instability that existed for many years is weakening.

In the economic and social life of the country, the excessive growth of prices attracts particular attention. This circumstance has to a certain extent affected the life of the people, leading to an actual reduction in living standards for a part of the urban population. Here one should take into consideration the fact that our prices for output from agriculture and small holdings and for primary industrial products have long been too low and that the system of prices is more than irrational.

However the too high growth of prices in recent years, especially last year, also involves certain anomalies. These include the excessively large issue of money, the too large scale of capital construction, too fast growth of the consumption fund and the excess of aggregate demand over aggregate supply. All of this occurred because of the unauthorized (overt and covert) increase of prices by some state industrial and commercial enterprises which use their monopoly position, because of inadequate control over market prices and because of the machinations of speculators who wreak havoc with the market at each convenient opportunity.

Though we have made enormous progress in all fields over the

past five years, we still face quite a few difficulties and problems. There are many shortcomings in our work too. In the economic sphere there still lingers the tendency for the achievement of "quick" results and disregard for economic efficiency. The economy's structure is still irrational, in particular we continue to feel a great strain in energy and materials supply and in transport and communications. The factors of instability, while weakening, have not yet fully disappeared so far. As both the new and old systems exist simultaneously, the reform runs up against a great deal of new contradictions.

Over the past five years of construction and reform we have accumulated much useful experience in practical activity. But what counts most for further work is as follows:

1. *We must irrevocably accept that construction needs to be based on reform while reform is to promote construction; and invariably give reform the dominant role.* Swift socialist modernization and a focussing of efforts on the development of the social productive forces is the central task of socialism, especially at its initial stage. To accomplish this task without an overhaul of the old system, which has developed over many years and does not correspond to the development of the productive forces, is simply impossible. That is why construction needs to be based on reform while reform is to promote construction.

2. *In the process of both construction and reform we must firmly adhere to a realistic approach, unfetter consciousness and respect practice.* In the course of construction and reform one cannot mechanically follow what is written in the books or copy the practice of other countries. Nor can one be guided by one's own subjective wishes, get detached from reality or act as one pleases. Here it is necessary to take into account the specific conditions of our country, invariably to see in practice the criterion of verification of the truth and to look intensively for our own ways. All the correct guidelines, all the projects of reform worked out since the third plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the CPC (11th Convocation) are the result of this unfettering of consciousness. In the future too we must primarily seek an ever greater unfettering of consciousness if the cause of construction and reform is to be successfully promoted. The unfettering of consciousness is a daring breakup of the traditional notions and stereotypes which hinder the development of the productive forces; it's a deliverance from the shackles of ossified ideas. We ought to firmly support everything that promotes the development of the productive forces and firmly remove everything that holds it back.

3. *In the process of construction and reform we must assign the most important role to increasing economic efficiency, tirelessly encourage scientific and technological progress and work to improve the system of management based on modern methods.*

The deepening of the reform and gradual harmonization of different aspects of economic relationships have brought about a rise in the economic efficiency of production and construction. Nevertheless, the low economic efficiency, our lag in this field is far from done with as yet. In order to improve economic efficiency considerably and go over from the extensive economy to an intensive one, it is necessary to give every encouragement to scientific and technological progress and constantly to improve the management system based on scientific methods. We must do everything to achieve positive results in this field. Otherwise, the gap in the economic and technological respect between us and the developed countries will widen still further and there will be no fitting place for us in the international arena.

4. *We must correctly regulate the coordination between our goal and the practical steps of construction and reform, assuring their successful development.* The 13th CPC congress has worked out a strategy of economic development until the middle of the next century, defined the aim of the reform of the economic system and given a general outline of other structural reforms, in particular, an overhaul of the political mechanism. Practice has already borne out and continues to bear out the correctness of the

objectives set. But one also has to see that these aims are so far only most generally outlined and that they need to be continually supplemented and adjusted on the basis of practice.

5. *We must properly regulate the various interests, fully mobilizing the activeness of our cadre and the masses.* A successful continuation of our reform greatly depends on the degree of understanding and support from the cadre and the people and on the full mobilization of their activeness. Essentially, the reform is called upon to free the productive forces as much as possible, to bring the people new benefits and to secure a higher standard of living for them. Therefore the people approve it.

However, the reform is a long and complex process. It requires painstaking work, and here it would be unrealistic to hope for easy success. In the end the reform will benefit our people enormously, but some of the concrete measures relating to its implementation may also impinge on the interests of a part of the people at certain points of time. We must take a sober view of things, keep a watchful eye on the frictions and shortcomings that arise in the course of the implementation of reform, study them seriously and eliminate them.

We resolutely protect the interests of those whose earnings are work-based, who live a prosperous life through honest work and legal activity, but we tax excessive incomes for the purpose of regulation, in accordance with the law. Persons who violate the law and discipline and who derive illegal fabulous profits must be punished according to the law. Simultaneously we are to markedly intensify the explanation of the reform so that the broad sections of the people be fully aware of the content, meaning and need of the concrete measures required for its implementation, understand the reform more deeply, consciously support it and take a part in it. Our cadre, especially leading personnel, should march in the front ranks and lead the masses. Both in construction and reform we must wisely regulate the interests of the state, the collective and individuals, of the center and the localities, of town and country, or particular industries and coastal, hinterland and outlying districts of our country, reflecting such interests as correctly as possible through the single system of planning.

THE AIMS, POLICY AND TASKS OF CONSTRUCTION AND REFORM FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

The 13th congress of the Communist Party of China has mapped out a grand plan for the socialist modernization of our country. The next five years will be a key stage in implementing the decisions of the congress, replacing the old system with a new one and carrying out the second phase of the strategy of economic development. Over these five years we shall have to speed up and deepen the restructuring, intensify the development of the productive forces, fulfil the seventh five-year plan and work out and start implementing the eighth five-year plan. We are to bring up, by 1992, the gross national product to about 1,550 billion yuan, and its average yearly growth to about 7.5 per cent, on the basis of continually improved efficiency. Such growth rates largely match the targets of the seventh five-year plan. Judging by the current state of and trends in our economy, this goal is quite feasible. With its accomplishment our gross national product will have risen 170 per cent as against 1980. And this will enable us to lay a firm ground for quadrupling it and thereby ensuring a middle level of prosperity for our people by the end of this century.

A consistent pursuit of the basic line of the party at the initial stage of socialism, retaining for economic construction its priority role, and the firm observance of the four main principles, along with restructuring and the expansion of foreign relations — such are the chief guarantees of realization of the aims of our economic and social development. In the next five-year period the government should fully apply in its work this main guiding idea and firmly seek, while assigning reform its dominant role, to tie it to development even more strongly and ensure much better coordination and the mutual inducement of reform and development; with a full sense of responsibility implement the strategy of long-

term and stable development of the economy, advance science, technology, education and the process of restructuring in these fields, and accelerate the development of an export-oriented coastal economy; encourage the flourishing of the Chinese economy and raise its level of modernization; and along with a speedier and deeper reform of the economic system conduct an overhaul of the political system and the building of socialist democracy and legality in a vigorous yet reasonable manner and consolidate and develop the atmosphere of political stability and cohesion; intensify the construction of socialist spiritual culture, thereby reinforcing the ideological guarantees and intellectual support for economic construction which will continue to be the focus of attention; and gradually shape a healthy social ethic which meets the requirements of socialism.

THE FOREIGN POLICY SPHERE OF ACTIVITY

In the past five-year period we have consistently pursued an independent and sovereign peaceful foreign policy and at the same time, in accordance with international changes and the needs of the socialist modernization of China, worked out in the right direction certain concrete political guidelines.

Over these five years our top national leaders visited 46 countries. In turn, China received heads of state and government from 89 nations. The exchange of top-level visits helped deepen understanding, strengthen relations of cooperation between the PRC and other countries and promote friendship between the Chinese and other peoples. Cooperation and exchange steadily expanded with countries of the world in the fields of the economy, science, technology, culture, education, public health, physical culture and sport. Beginning in 1983, we established diplomatic relations with 10 states: Antigua and Barbuda, Angola, Ivory Coast, Lesotho, the United Arab Emirates, Bolivia, Grenada, Nicaragua, Belize and Uruguay. At present we have diplomatic relations with 135 states, and about 178 states and territories maintain trade and economic ties with us. The development of such ties creates more favorable international conditions for the implementation of restructuring, the expansion of foreign relations and the modernization of China.

We see gratifying tendencies in the current international situation, though it is not free from some disturbing aspects. But its general thrust is in a direction favorable for the peoples of the world.

East-West relations have somewhat improved over the recent period, and to a certain degree world tensions have been lessened. After years of talks, the USA and the USSR finally signed in December 1987 a treaty eliminating medium and shorter-range missiles. Along with many other countries we pay tribute to this first step along the road of nuclear arms reduction and hope for the most serious approach to its implementation.

China has never been involved in the arms race and has always stood for general disarmament. The world knows that we on our own initiative trimmed the contingent of our troops by one million without any hesitation when international conditions permitted us to do so. China is a developing country, it has few nuclear weapons and they are intended exclusively for the purposes of self-defense. The Chinese government has repeatedly told the world that it will never be the first to use nuclear weapons under any circumstances and announced a discontinuation of its nuclear tests in the atmosphere back in the spring of 1986.

Together with all peace-loving countries China will go on working tirelessly for an end to the arms race, for the total prohibition and complete elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons and of all the other types of weapons of mass destruction, and for a substantial reduction in conventional arms.

As to the situation in the Persian Gulf area, Resolution 598, adopted in 1987 by a meeting of the UN Security Council, has laid a good basis for a peaceful resolution of the Iran-Iraq conflict. We support the mediatory efforts of the UN Secretary General, just as all the measures helping to implement UN Security Council Resolution 598 and to bring the Iran-Iraq conflict to an early end.

Iran and Iraq are countries friendly to China. And we would like to see them halt their hostilities and conclude a peace agreement. We have invariably been coming out for the settlement of international disputes by peaceful talks. Mutual conflicts bring the developing countries nothing but harm. Only a friendly coexistence benefits all sides.

We support the just struggle of the Arab countries and the Palestinian people against Israeli aggression and expansion, and condemn the brutal repression by the Israeli authorities of the Palestinian people in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. We support the idea of calling an international Mideast conference under the UN aegis, and stand for a full and just solution of the Middle East problem.

We support the just struggle of the people of South Africa against racial discrimination, the just struggle of the Namibian people for national independence, and the struggle of the peoples of the countries of Southern Africa in defense of their security, against South African aggression.

We support the efforts of the Central American countries, aimed at establishing peace and stability in that region. We express concern over the tensions that have now arisen in that area and are coming out against the interference of superpowers in the affairs of other countries.

The recent aggravation of the instability of the world economic situation causes general concern and anxiety. Because of the low rates of economic growth in the developed countries frictions keep increasing between them, and the specter of a new economic recession is haunting once again. Many developing countries, on the other hand, face lower export earnings and a growing burden of foreign indebtedness, and their economies are beset by many difficulties. All of this induces the developed countries to both stabilize their finances and coordinate their economic policies on a still greater scale. For their part, many developing countries are looking for ways of development that meet their specific conditions and are taking measures in favor of broader South-South cooperation.

With steadily growing world economic ties a way out of the current situation will only be found if South and North will only do their best together, on the basis of the principle of mutual advantage, to overcome the existing difficulties. The sharp contrast between the poor South and the rich North arose historically. However, the developed countries today find it ever more difficult to maintain their prosperity and stability by keeping the developing countries in abject poverty and backwardness. The South-North dialogue should be continued, while abolishing the irrational world economic order. We support the just demands and sensible proposals of the Third World countries, which speak against trade protectionism, for the raising of the prices of primary goods and a lowering of the burden of foreign indebtedness. We hope that the developed countries will pursue a far-sighted policy and that they will take effective measures in finance, trade and the transfer of technology, but first and foremost, measures to free the Third World countries from the heavy foreign debt and thus create favorable international conditions for their development. Only in this way will the developed countries be able to deal more successfully with the problems of the commodity market, raw materials supply and so forth, and to give an impetus to the prosperity of all countries of the world.

Preoccupied with the problems of its own development, China is interested in maintaining friendly cooperation with all foreign countries on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence.

Sino-American and Sino-Soviet relations evoke universal interest. As is known, firmly adhering to our policy of independence and sovereignty, we do not place ourselves in dependence on any major powers, do not enter into a bloc with them and do not establish strategic relations. That China as a developing socialist country with a vast territory and population implements such a policy not only meets the interests of the Chinese people, but also favors peace and stability in the world.

In the last five years relations between China and the USA

have been basically stable. Both sides maintained contacts at a high level. Trade and economic relations, technological and scientific exchanges and the exchange of visits were further developed. But there are people in the USA who, using various pretexts, constantly try to interfere in the internal affairs of China and, in particular, on the Taiwan issue, do not adhere to the recognition of only one China, a policy once openly proclaimed by the U.S. government. Their pronouncements and actions, contradicting the principles enunciated in the establishment of diplomatic relations between China and the USA, do harm to the Sino-American relationship. We hope that the U.S. politicians will be able to see that a normal relationship between China and the USA meets not only the Chinese, but also the American interests.

The last few years have seen a broadening of trade, scientific and technological ties and exchange between China and the USSR. Consultations are in progress on normalizing Sino-Soviet state relations, as well as talks on the frontier issue. A normalization of relations between China and the USSR meets the aspirations and vital interests of the peoples of the two countries. We take into consideration the statement also made by the Soviet side about the need of strict observance of the principles of peaceful coexistence in relations between socialist countries. However the existence of the three well-known obstacles is at variance with these principles.

China has invariably attached high importance to the maintenance and development of good-neighborly relations with all neighbor countries and is showing special concern for the safeguarding of peace and stability in Asia. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a next-door neighbor of our country. We approve the reasonable stand held by the government of the DPRK on the issue of an independent and peaceful reunification of the motherland and its efforts directed at the easing of tensions on the Korean Peninsula. We maintain good relations with the ASEAN countries, with Burma and with the countries of South Asia. Relations between China and Mongolia have developed. Our relations with Laos have improved of late. In recent years our relations with India have also begun to gradually improve. We hope that, guided by the spirit of understanding and mutual concessions, China and India will succeed, through friendly consultations, in resolving the border issue and assuring the further development of Sino-Indian relations.

Japan is a next-door neighbor of China. Between our countries there exist close economic and trade relations, and mutual visits are frequent. Friendship between China and Japan meets the basic interests of the Chinese and Japanese peoples.

Over the last few years great shifts have occurred in China's relations with the socialist European countries. We maintain all-round friendly cooperation with Romania and Yugoslavia. Relations have been normalized with Poland, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria. We intend to exchange with them the experience of socialist construction and transformations in the spirit of mutual respect, equality and reciprocal advantage, to ensure the further development of friendly relations in all fields.

Fortifying solidarity and cooperation with the Third World countries is a cornerstone of the foreign policy of China. We approve the efforts of the Third World organizations for regional cooperation that seek to assure their security and to stimulate their development. Being a Third World country, China treats with understanding and compassion the difficulties being experienced by the developing countries and, to the extent of its capacity, is rendering assistance to a number of them. However our country's base is weak, and the population huge, which limits our possibilities for the granting of aid. Continuing to follow the principle of "equality and mutual benefit, the emphasis on efficiency, a diversity of forms and joint development", we will intensively develop economic and trade ties and scientific-technical collaboration with the developing countries. This, in our opinion, is an effective way of promoting South-South cooperation.

We approve and support the aims of the non-aligned movement, and highly value its important role in international affairs.

The whole of our foreign policy work serves two important aims — peace and development. Our foreign policy, as practice shows, is correct, and we will consistently pursue it in the future as well.

The billion-strong Chinese people, including our compatriots in Taiwan, look forward with impatience to an early reunification of the country and want to see it rich, mighty and prosperous. Such is the general tendency of development and such are the people's aspirations.

We hope that the broad sections of our Taiwanese, Xianggang and Aomen compatriots, and also the compatriots living abroad,

will rally more closely with the peoples of mainland China and begin to work together, with redoubled efforts to promote the cause of a reunited motherland.

The current domestic and international situation is very favorable for our construction and the process of restructuring. Without missing such a favorable opportunity, we must under the leadership of the Communist Party of China direct all our thoughts toward the business of construction, work selflessly and together, rally in the struggle and boldly march along the road of socialism with Chinese characteristics.

Abridged from *Renmin ribao*,
April 15, 1988

Israel: Our Foremost Duty is to Help Both Peoples

Interview given by Tawfiq Toubi,
Deputy General Secretary, Communist Party of Israel

Tawfiq Toubi has been a member of the Israeli Knesset since 1949. Toubi, deputy general secretary of the Communist Party of Israel, was elected on the party's ticket until 1977. Since then he has been elected on the ticket of the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality, a coalition that includes the Communist Party, the Black Panthers (an organization of Sephardic Jews) and other progressive forces.

Question. What is the character of the Democratic Front?

Answer. It combines Jewish and Arab citizens of Israel under a platform of peace, democracy and equality.

The main point is to work for peace between Israel and the Arab countries, and between the Israeli and Palestinian people. The program calls upon Israel to withdraw from all territories occupied since June 1967 and recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination, including support for the formation of an independent Palestinian state alongside Israel. This is the principle of "two states for two peoples", with a peace treaty to ensure coexistence and cooperation.

We believe the achievement of a peace treaty on this basis can be reached through an international conference convened by the United Nations, including all concerned parties, with the Palestinians represented by the PLO.

Another point on the program is full equality for the Arab citizens of Israel. The Arab population have, since the formation of Israel, been treated practically as second class citizens.

Question. When referring to Arab workers in Israel, you have used the term "Black labor". What does that mean?

Answer. We use this phrase because, in the United States, Blacks are often confined to unskilled and lower paying jobs. This is also the fate of the Arab workers in Israel. So we use the term "Black labor". The defense of the rights of all working people, which are continuously threatened and attacked, and equality for women are important parts of our activity and work.

The discrimination against the Arab population has been in various fields. The main issue the Arab population faces is the right to live in their country — to prevent the execution of plans to expel the Arabs from Israel. After 40 years, we don't consider this danger to be over.

Question. Isn't Meier Kahane an exponent of this?

Answer. Yes. But Kahane draws his philosophy of extreme racism from the policy of discrimination exercised by the government.

Equality also means equality for Sephardic Jews and all sections of the Israel population. It's democracy that we uphold. This is one of the basic points of the program of the Democratic Front.

Democratic practices in Israel have been eroding since the June '67 war. The occupation itself is damaging Israeli society — undermining the standard of living, free elections and free speech. Moreover, the right-wing, nationalist and racist forces in the country have increased their strength during the period of the occupation. The Likud grew from a small party before the June 1967

war to its current sharing of power with the Labor Party. This is merely an indication of the anti-democratic process that has engulfed Israel.

Question. Israel has a reputation for having a militarized economy. Does the program of the Democratic Front address this?

Answer. Of course. When we point out the ills of Israeli society, particularly the continued attacks on the working class and on social services, we connect those ills to the allocation of over 70 per cent of the budget to the military. The military budget is the main source of all social ills and evils of Israeli society. The struggle for peace means the struggle for better conditions for the working people, for better social services and lessening the tax burden on the population. We combine the struggle for peace with the struggle for a better Israel in all areas of life.

This position is particularly appreciated in the development towns and townships, where people are living at a very low standard and unemployment is very high. The people themselves are raising the demand, "Stop allocations to the settlement in the occupied territories and divert the resources to the poor quarters." This is a fighting slogan against the occupation and for improving the standard of living.

Question. What is your assessment of the current uprising in the occupied territories?

Answer. The uprising is an expression of the determination of the Palestinian people, after 20 years of occupation, to achieve the establishment of an independent Palestinian state. It has disproved the notion, fostered by the Israeli government, that with the passing of time the Palestinian people would get accustomed to and eventually accept occupation.

It is confirmation that no force, no occupation, no suppressive measures adopted by Israel will prevent the Palestinian people from asserting their rights. It's a failure of force — a failure of the policy of settlements and annexations.

The uprising has brought a message to the whole world focusing the attention of international public opinion on the necessity to end the occupation and bring about a just settlement. Continued occupation means explosions and new dangers to the area.

Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir and Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin tried to give the impression that this was just the actions of a few boys throwing stones and would end soon. But this is the resistance of a whole people, young, old, women, children — it's one people standing up and resisting occupation and the strongest army in the Middle East cannot suppress them.

With their determination and unity, no force is able to suppress their uprising.

Question. Has there been an evolution in the development of the uprising? Has it become more mature and organized?

Answer. The uprising is the product of the maturity and political consciousness of the Palestinian people. One shouldn't make the mistake of saying the Palestinian people have no leadership. All sections of the Palestinian people are taking part in the uprising and asserting that the PLO is their legitimate, sole representative. At the same time, the people taking part in the uprising are creating local instruments to lead and organize the struggle. This leadership is becoming more experienced and effective and is a product of the maturity of the uprising.

It's engulfing more walks of the Palestinian population. A large number of Palestinian policemen have recently resigned. This is one aspect of the participation of newer sections of the population in the mass activity of the Palestinian people against the occupation.

The uprisings will continue and will bring the reality to the entire world that, without solving the Palestinian problem, you cannot bring about a settlement in the Middle East.

Question. How is the uprising affecting public opinion in Israel?

Answer. It's changing world public opinion and influencing Israeli public opinion. There is a polarization of forces. There are the forces of the racists — those who call for a bigger force to crush the uprising.

But, on the other hand, the popular character of the uprising is influencing certain sections in Israeli society. They are asking, "Where is this confrontation heading?"

It is not a question of a few so-called "terrorists" that we are dealing with. We are dealing with the whole people. We are confronting the whole people and how long can we continue in this manner? How long can Israel continue to be an occupying power? How long can we continue without peace with the Palestinian people? So new forces are joining the fight for ending the occupation. The main slogan now appearing in Israeli society is, "Let's talk with the Palestinians."

Question. How do you assess the difference between the Likud and the Labor Party?

Answer. We do not disregard the discussion that is taking place,

but there shouldn't be any misunderstanding — the main struggle in Israel is not between the Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres "peace forces" and Shamir, the war monger. They both stand on a common national position that prevents a peaceful settlement with the Palestinians. They both refuse to withdraw from all the occupied territories. They refuse to recognize the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and an independent state. They stubbornly refuse to recognize the PLO as the representative of the Palestinian people and they both oppose an international conference where the Palestinian side takes part on an equal basis, represented by the PLO. The forces of peace oppose Shamir and Peres. There are tactical differences between them, but both are united in blocking the road to a peaceful settlement.

Question. What is the role of the United States and the Soviet Union in bringing about a peaceful settlement?

Answer. Without international cooperation, especially between the Soviet Union and the United States, there can be no convening of an international conference. The Middle East conflict has outgrown its regional boundaries and become an international problem. It has repercussions on world peace. Every explosion in the Middle East has sent tremors all over the world and endangered world peace.

Question. You are a Palestinian who has lived his entire life in Israel. Do you consider yourself a patriot of Israel?

Answer. I am a Palestinian. I was born in the country. My forefathers were born in the country. It's my home — my country. The development of events 40 years ago brought about the formation of the state of Israel in accordance with the United Nations resolution. We supported the resolution, of which the basis is the formation of two independent states, and we will fight for the implementation of these principles.

I am a citizen of the state of Israel. My foremost duty is to help both people — Israelis and Palestinians — live in peace. It will be the greatest event in my life when there is a Palestinian state alongside the state of Israel. With that will come a new vista of cooperation — of peaceful, democratic development for the peoples of the region. This is what we are dedicating ourselves to. This is in the interest of the Israeli people, because without peace there will be no security or future for Israel.

People's Daily World, April 7, 1988

Sudan: Lessons of the Uprising

Interview given by Muhammed Ibrahim Nugud,
General Secretary of the Sudanese Communist Party CC

In this interview, timed for the third anniversary of the popular uprising, SCP General Secretary Nugud reflects on the causes that prevented it from achieving its aims.

Question. In previous interviews you described the outcome of the discussion of this issue at the SCP CC's April 1985 plenary meeting. Were the assessments given three years ago by the SCP CC correct?

Answer. Opposition parties and trade unions did not have a unified leadership before the start of the uprising, though there were contacts among them, coordination of action and numerous joint meetings. Several drafts of the Uprising Charter were advanced: by the London and Kuwait groups, the trade union association, the Ummah party, the SCP, and also the draft of Democratic Unionist Party leaders, such as A. Madwi, H. Hamad and Zayn al-Abidin al-Hindi.

Question. Did these contacts ease the preparation of the uprising?

Answer. Yes, preparing the mass march was specifically discussed during these meetings. The initiative for holding it on April 6, 1985, came from the trade unions.

Despite the signing of the April 6 Charter by political parties and trade unions, the forces involved did not have a unified

leadership. This was the first weak spot of the uprising, and it was felt for quite a while. The decision at signing was that the Charter would be promulgated during the march. The march was to start on the morning of April 6 at the law-court building.

Question. How do you assess the armed forces' attitude to the uprising? What did their loyal attitude to it give?

Answer. Officers, NCOs and men openly backed up the uprising. But this attitude of theirs did not go any further. It didn't reach its logical conclusion. Their support was limited to bringing pressure to bear on the official army leadership to make an overthrow of the authoritarian regime possible. The situation in the army resulted in that after the military coup, which under the circumstances was limited in scope, real power landed in the hands of the Transitional Military Council (TMC).

As events showed, most of the officers and men did not call for a Military Council but strongly opposed the use of the army to suppress the uprising. They demanded that the formally dissolved state security forces stop shooting at the uprising participants. The police had identified themselves with the risen people and

were coming out for Nimeri's overthrow, for the disbandment of his power institutions and in support of the slogans of the uprising.

Question. If most of the officers and men held such a position, how come the Military Council members seized power?

Answer. At the official army leadership's meetings, which Umar Mohammed al-Tayeb also attended, it became evident that the army would not act in support of the regime. They concluded so on the basis of secret-service reports, the outcome of the meetings between the four army generals in charge of the units positioned in the capital, and the information that came in from units stationed in the provinces. Based on these data, the official leadership of the army decided to take power and declare the beginning of a transitional period. It is appropriate to recall here that the first months after the uprising saw the dismissal of 11 army officers on charges of preparing a military coup. Actually, they had insisted that the army stand aside from politics and that, after eliminating the aftermath of the May regime a Supreme Council and government be formed.

Question. But just the wish of a handful of generals is not enough for the usurpation of power by the military?

Answer. This is true. Political parties and the mass movement bear a part of the responsibility for the development of events at that time. After the declaration of TMC Chairman Siwar al-Zahab, the National Alliance for Salvation's political parties and trade unions did not get together to jointly assess the situation, work out a common position on the role of the Military Council and outline a plan of action under the new conditions. It turned out that they had varying attitudes. At noon on April 6, though a political strike and the mass actions of the people still continued across the country. Mr. Sadiq al-Mahdi* sent the Military Council a message of support. Ironically, the participants of the large-scale actions in the town of Kosti did not even hear of Siwar al-Zahab's declaration and were continuing their activities.

On the evening of the same day, an attempt was made to hold a meeting of the NAS. But NAS leaders asked for a postponement of the meeting from 6 to 9 p.m., referring to their 6 p.m. appointment with members of the Transitional Military Council.

All these facts show that on April 6 the masses were in confusion. At a time when the uprising badly needed leadership from the NAS, all its constituent parties and trade unions did was to engage in a discussion on whether to cease or carry on the political strike.

The TMC effectively captured power in those so valuable hours and days for any popular uprising. It may not have concentrated such broad powers had the NAS leadership from the outset taken the initiative in its hands.

Question. But the NAS succeeded in forming a cabinet. What, then, prevented it from seizing the initiative?

Answer. Many factors explain the weakness of the transitional civilian government. Above all, the delay in forming this cabinet enabled the Military Council not only to concentrate power in its hands and increase its influence, but also to intervene in the process of the formation of the government itself.

The non-participation in the cabinet of representatives of the

political parties which signed the Charter predetermined its weakness and led to its pre-eminently technocratic composition. And this at a time when the country acutely needed a vigorous, experienced and capable leadership from among those who participated in the struggle against Nimeri's regime.

The influence of the external factors should not be underestimated either. I shall cite an example. During the investigation of the illegal transfer of Falashas, Brigadier General Osman al-Sayid, deputy chief of the state security service and head of its intelligence department, testified that on the night of April 5, 1985, he visited the house of a staff member of the U.S. embassy in Khartoum, Jerry Weaver, and gave him a letter from Umar Mohammed al-Tayeb. The letter spoke of a possibility of intervention by the Rapid Deployment Force in the Sudanese events. According to Osman al-Sayid, the U.S. diplomat told him that a meeting of Sudanese generals was at that very moment discussing ways to save the May regime from the crisis.

Let me also add that Umar Mohammed al-Tayeb had contacts with the capitals of a number of certain states over the situation in Sudan. Even on April 6 he remained in his office and was still inviting representatives of different ministries to come to him. Under these conditions, it was precisely the pressure of the lower army ranks on the military leadership that helped neutralize Umar Mohammed al-Tayeb. He was first held under house arrest, then taken to one of the premises of the security service, and from there delivered to Kobar Prison.

Question. What determined the weak points of the uprising?

Answer. Most of the weak links of the uprising stemmed from the then correlation of forces, which did not permit advancing a slogan of the dissolution of the Military Council and the formation of a Supreme Council and a civilian government. All these factors together enabled the Military Council to gain strength and power, restrain the urge of the rebellious people and establish its control over a weak cabinet, the negative consequences of whose activity still reflect on the political realities. Such examples are many. In particular, the law on elections adopted at some point in the past by the Military Council to placate the National Islamic Front; first of all, this concerns the election districts set up for graduates of institutions of higher learning.

In conclusion, comrade Muhammed Ibrahim Nugud stressed: "We do not speak of the weak points of the uprising from the vantage point of an onlooker, of a haughty or an experience-widened person, because he is the worst politician who refrains from active involvement in a struggle, devises armchair projects and sends down directives for the political movement and its various contingents.

"As one of the forces which participated in the popular uprising, we share with them the responsibility for its shortcomings and weaknesses. We are trying to draw lessons that would benefit our current and future struggles to uphold democracy, and for the unity of all those who took part in the uprising, who fearlessly confront the enemies of the uprising and of democracy. The struggle goes on."

Al-Maydan, March 25, 1988

*The leader of the Ummah Party. On May 6, 1986, the Constituent Assembly elected him Prime Minister of the Republic of Sudan. — Ed.

Dublin Must Repudiate the Accord

Article by James Stewart, General Secretary,
Communist Party of Ireland

The British Establishment's contempt for the mere Irish — from government level to the entire population of this island — is being clearly demonstrated in the first quarter of 1988 by their arrogant governmental and judicial decisions.

It is now obvious that the Anglo-Irish Agreement is a one-way bargain: the Dublin Government and the constitutional nationalist parties are collaborating with British repression and are getting nothing in return.

Thatcher's imperious leadership is clearly stamped on the decisions and events which led to no prosecutions despite the findings of the Stalker-Sampson reports of a conspiracy "to pervert the course of justice", the dismissal of the Birmingham Six Appeal; the decision to make the Prevention of Terrorism Act permanent; the British Attorney General's curt notes demanding extraditions from the Republic; Thatcher's hysterical reaction to the Dublin Government's decision to set up a Garda enquiry into the Aughnacloy killing and the release of Private Robert Thain convicted of the murder of Thomas Reilly after serving only two years of his life sentence.

It has been said that Margaret Thatcher and her Cabinet are insensitive to Irish feelings and the problems created for the Irish Government and the SDLP by the recent actions of the British Establishment.

The truth is that way they don't give a damn. After all in the Anglo-Irish Agreement, signed on 15 November 1985, they achieved what appeared previously to be impossible — the recognition by a sovereign Irish Government of Britain's sovereignty over Northern Ireland, in an international treaty.

And ever since they have used the Hillsborough Accord to embroil the Dublin Government in costly "cross border security operations".

Thatcher and her cronies feel confident that they have the Irish Government and the constitutional nationalists over a barrel — that they may rant and rave and make the usual protests to allay the fears of their supporters — but in the end will come to heel and continue the implementation of the Anglo-Irish Agreement to Britain's advantage.

Indeed they must have taken comfort from Taoiseach Charlie Haughey's presidential address to the Fianna Fail Ard Fheis last weekend.

Charlie's statement on Northern Ireland was described by the Irish newspapers as "statesmanlike" — a masterpiece in firmness.

But when all was said and done — Charlie may have admitted that Fianna Fail formerly opposed the Anglo-Irish Agreement, but he made it clear that his Government is working it and intends to continue doing just that. To placate Fianna Fail grassroots who are beginning to see that the Irish bourgeoisie nationalism was conned by Britain on November 15, he gave a list of actions his Government is taking to show the British Establishment that they can't have it all their own way.

In particular he emphasized that the conditions outlined by the Dail in December 1987 for extradition proceedings would be

adhered to and that the British Attorney General's curt notes stating that a prosecution would take place were unacceptable.

Following this the Fianna Fail Government has set up a Garda enquiry into the killing of Aiden McAneaspie by a British soldier in the border village of Aughnacloy on Sunday.

But, Ireland's Taoiseach made it clear in his speech that his Government, despite imperial Britain's undemocratic and repressive actions intended to continue collaboration with Thatcher's Government on security matters which means when all is said and done, collaboration with Britain's repressive rule in Northern Ireland.

Haughey's stance on extradition and the Garda inquiry are thus, in reality only sops to enable the Fianna Fail leadership to ride out the storm of outrage felt by the Irish people at British imperialism's bloody actions in Ireland.

In this first quarter of 1988 Thatcher's Tory Government has demonstrated again and again that they have complete contempt for the law.

The law is there to be used against their opponents with full vigor and no mercy, but to be bent, broken and overruled to suit their imperialist political purposes.

The latest example is the release of Private Robert Thain sentenced to life imprisonment for the murder of an unarmed civilian in 1983.

Now released after serving only two years of that sentence on the representation of the British Ministry of Defense, Thain is once again serving with his regiment.

This despite the fact that the British Army will not accept a person into its ranks who has criminal convictions. The only conclusion possible is — if you murder an Irish person they do!

Dublin's Government must stop collaborating with British imperialism. The Anglo-Irish Agreement is a Treaty devised by British imperialism to increase its influence in the whole of Ireland at the expense of the entire Irish people.

It is a device to ensnare Irish bourgeois nationalism into collaborating and paying for the cost of maintaining British military rule in Northern Ireland.

Haughey should repudiate the Anglo-Irish Agreement now. His Government should make it clear that there will be no extradition to a system where there is no justice for the Irish people, never mind the so-called safeguards passed by the Dail in December 1987. The Extradition Act should be repealed forthwith.

All security collaboration with Britain should be stopped now. No Irish Government should do British imperialism's dirty work in Ireland.

Instead, the Fianna Fail Government should take the step of gaining the support of the Dail for the demand for a declaration of intent from the British Parliament of its intention to withdraw from all interference in Irish affairs and to leave the Irish people — North and South — free to determine the conditions which will unite our country, safeguard democracy, guarantee national independence and bring peace to our island.

Unity, February 27, 1988

In Support of the Uprising

Appeal by the Organ of the Central Committee of the Jordanian Communist Party

The people of Jordan have been intently watching the course of the heroic struggle of the Palestinians in the occupied territories. The uprising is on everybody's lips: people exchange news about the valiant actions and the legendary steadfastness of their Palestinian brothers and sisters giving rebuff to the occupation forces and the gangs of fascist-like settlers. The campaign of solidarity with the uprising is expanding, in spite of all the barriers, prohibitive measures and the subversive activity of hooligan elements who dislike the national struggle of the Palestinians. Patriotic and progressive forces, including our Communist Party have once again appealed for solidarity with the uprising and the rendering of every support to it. At the same time, they have drawn public attention to the attempts to prevent actions of solidarity or divert them from the support of the national aspirations and expectations of the Arab people of Palestine, to the conspiracies and maneuvers to which imperialist and Zionist circles resort in their bid to put down the uprising and extricate Israel from the crisis which has sharply aggravated as a result of the racist and fascist nature of this state and told on the state of affairs within the country and on its international standing.

Despite everything, the actions in support of the uprising are assuming ever greater proportions. Along with the various undertakings held in the cities of Amman, Al-Zarqa, Al-Salt and Al-Qaraq, mass demonstrations took place at Jordan University. Thousands of students participated. As well as acclaiming the steadfastness of their brothers and sisters in the occupied territories, they carried posters and chanted slogans castigating the occupation, Zionism, U.S. imperialism and the capitulationist decisions. Mass marches in the Al-Wahdat camp lasted several days. A major action took place in the Al-Bukaa camp. School students in the quarters Al-Taj, Nizal, Al-Nuzha, Al-Hussein and Al-Nadif and those of some colleges organized marches and demonstrations joined by many citizens. They shouted slogans in support of the uprising and branded the United States and the fascist Israeli rulers with shame.

In the town of Irbid the group of Abu Zaim tried to wreck the action organized by the trade union center as part of the week of solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian people. Having occupied seats in the hall, members of the group again resorted to the method tested in Amman of provoking clashes which could be used as an excuse for the suppression of the campaign of solidarity in any form whatsoever. However, patriotic and progressive forces, public figures and trade union leaders gave them no opportunity to realize their base design.

Hundreds of students came out for a demonstration at Yarmuk University. Chanting slogans, they marched around the university

yard. There was also a demonstration in the Irbid camp. A mass procession was organized in the town of Maan. A one-day general strike in solidarity with the uprising took place in Al-Tafil. Appeals, calls and slogans in support of the Palestinians' action could be heard and seen in cities, towns, villages and camps across the land in all major centers of human activity such as universities, schools, factories and plants, offices, etc.

A national committee has been set up to collect donations to aid the hero brothers who, having no weapons other than stones, confront the armed-to-the-teeth occupiers and fascist-like settlers full of malice and hatred toward them.

When this issue was being discussed, a report came in about a sit-down strike of solidarity on the Red Cross premises in Amman. It had been organized by women's organizations of Jordan. The hundreds of women taking part raised Jordanian and Palestinian flags, slogans to the glory of the uprising and the struggle of Palestinian women, and posters with the words of condemnation of U.S. attempts to "ignore" the uprising. At the end of the action, its participants adopted a message to the UN Secretary General, international bodies and women's associations urging them to support the demands of the Palestinians for an end to the occupation and to the brutal crimes.

The popular masses and their patriotic and progressive forces have angrily condemned the position of the Jordanian authorities and the actions of the repressive machinery with regard to the participants of solidarity actions. Such positions and actions show not only a fear of the influence which this uprising exerts on our people, but also a panic terror before the uprising itself, before the possibility of its further escalation and development. The policy of repression, terror, and insensitivity to the patriotic feelings of the population, which find reflection in solidarity with the uprising, brings out the class nature of the ruling alliance in Jordan and its incompatibility with the hopes and aspirations of the masses.

We appeal to the people and all true patriots to expand the campaign of support and solidarity with the heroic uprising. It must become an expression of national determination to uphold the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. So let this solidarity campaign, assuming countrywide dimensions, block the way for any attempts of conspiracy against the uprising. May all the criminal intentions to draw Jordan into the mainstream of capitulationist policy fail.

Glory to those who fell in the struggle for the national cause of the Palestinian people and may their memory live for ever! Shame and disgrace on the Zionists, imperialists and their puppets!

Al-Djamaahir, No. 3, 1988

Ecuador: Immediate Measures to Overcome the Crisis

Proposals by the United Left Front of Ecuador

Before the second round of Ecuador's presidential election (held on May 8, 1988), the National Committee of the United Left Front comprising the Communist Party of Ecuador, Popular Democratic Movement, Popular Socialist Party, Broad Left Front and a number of other parties, sent an open letter to the candidate for presidency, Rodrigo Borja (the Democratic Left), and the candidate for vice presidency, Abdala Bucaram (the Roldosist Party). They also suggested a program of measures for the future government to overcome the crisis in Ecuador.

We give below the text of the letter and the proposals put forth by the United Left.

Open Letter of the United Left Front

Most of the electorate have spoken out against the economic and social policy of Febres Cordero's government, which leads to a concentration of wealth, the impoverishment of the popular

masses, and subjection to the diktat of the monopolies and international financial capital.

The United Left Front, defending the people's and national

interests, has put forth a clear-cut and specific government program to overcome the general crisis in the country, to solve the vital problems of our people and to build a free, sovereign and prosperous Ecuador.

The outcome of the January 31, 1988, vote imposes on you, in the event of your election, high responsibility for the adoption of urgent measures that meet the demand of the Ecuadoran people and the interests of the entire state. In particular, the results of the first round of elections were accounted for by your declared intention of pursuing a policy diametrically opposed to the neoliberal anti-people course of the government of Leon Febres Cordero.

The United Left Front believes that one cannot confine oneself to verbal assurances and that it is necessary to take a certain minimum of immediate measures to overcome the crisis which has such a ruinous effect on the position of the people and the

country. The paper attached deals precisely with such measures. Stating publicly your point of view on these issues, as well as your readiness to solve them at government level, would be of great importance for determining the positions of our organizations during the run-off.

Meetings of the leading bodies of our parties to decide on this highly important question will be held on February 27, and we would be grateful to you if we received your answers before this date.

We are convinced that in such a responsible and serious matter the people themselves will be the judge of your decisions — present and future.

Yours respectfully,
National Committee of the United Left Front.

Urgent Measures to Overcome the Crisis

1. *Defense of the People's Position*

Assure the right to work and worthy conditions of life for all Ecuadoran families. Establish minimum monthly wage of 30,000 sucres, in accordance with the demand of the trade union centers and the National Association of School Teachers. Struggle against speculation; real control over the prices of consumer goods and services. Impose the income tax solely on those whose monthly income exceeds 100,000 sucres. A two-year freeze on rent. Combating of urban land speculation. Elimination of the Agricultural Products Exchange, support to the small producers and merchants. Provide investment capital for the National Enterprise for Procurement and Sales and the National Enterprise for the Production of Basic Products.

2. *Defense of Human Rights*

Freedom to all the political prisoners, including the commandos from the Taura airforce base. Dissolve the police units specializing in torture and repression. Disbanding of the bands and paramilitary armed groups. Judicial investigation and punishment of the persons shown to be involved in crimes, misuse of public funds or embezzlement of state property.

3. *Reinforcing the State Sector of the Economy*

Independent national development. Annulment of the economic measures decreed on August 11, 1986. State control over currency transactions and bank rates. A moratorium on foreign debt repayments during the four years of the government. Reimbursement of the private foreign debt by the debtor employers and not by the people. Abolition of the system which enables the private sector to repay its foreign debts in sucres.

4. *Strengthening the State Sector of the Economy*

Strengthen the Ecuador State Oil Corporation (CEPE), the Ecuador Institute of Electrification (INECEL), the enterprises of marine transport (TRANSNAVE), of the oil fleet (FLOPEC) and of military air transport (TAME), the airline Ecuatoriana de Aviacion and others.

Impart to the Ecuador Oil Corporation (CEPE), in accordance with its rights, the status of an operational unit of the consortium CEPE-TEXACO; place the trans-Ecuador oil pipeline in its direct and immediate charge. Revise the contracts for the provision of hydrocarbon services signed with foreign companies, end the agreement on granting privileges to them. Assign the filling of domestic gas cylinders to the plants of CEPE provided that it transfers them directly for sale to the existing transport agencies and small distributors.

Recover from the EMELEC company the sum which it owes to the state and place its activities under the control of the Institute of Electrification.

5. *Strengthening the Local Self-Government Bodies*

Abolish the presidential executive commissions and finance the activity of the municipal and provincial councils. With the funds to be released by the imposition of a foreign debt repayment moratorium solve such important questions for the people as the creation of new jobs, the supply of drinking water and electricity to the population and sewerage construction. Expand the building of roads and irrigation systems and carry out reforestation, using unemployed labor for this purpose.

6. *Improving the Life of the Peasantry and Respect for the Interests of the Indigenous Communities*

Take measures with respect to the latifundias that do not perform the social function. A four-year moratorium on peasant debt repayments to the Development Bank and annulment of the related interest payments. Incentives to farm production for internal consumption. Organization of agro-industrial enterprises, especially on uncultivated lands, with the participation of the peasantry. Easy-term credit and technical assistance to the peasants and the promotion of agricultural cooperatives.

7. *Education and Culture for the People*

Compliance with Article 71 of the Constitution of the Republic, which lays down that 30 per cent of the national budget should go for the needs of public education. Special attention to literacy furtherance and upgrading. Vigorous support for the development of the state education system in accordance with constitutional provisions. Invigorate the work of secondary technical educational establishments.

Provision of sufficient funds to the universities and polytechnical institutes. Development of science, technology, research and of all the aspects of national culture.

8. *Independent International Policy*

Pursue an independent policy of peace and cooperation with all countries and peoples. Immediately re-establish diplomatic relations with Nicaragua. Contribute to the political solution of the Central American problem on the basis of respect for the principle of self-determination of the peoples. Contribution in the international bodies to disarmament and the establishment of a new international economic order that would represent and guarantee the genuine interests of the peoples.

El Pueblo, February 19-March 3, 1988

Morocco: A Big Step to Reconciliation

Statement by the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party of Progress and Socialism of Morocco

On May 16, 1988, Morocco and Algeria officially announced their decision to resume diplomatic relations at ambassador level.

By this act the two sister nations put an end to a rupture that had lasted for over 12 years and which had greatly prejudiced the wish of the Moroccans and Algerians to build, jointly with other peoples of the region, the edifice of a united, democratic and peace-loving Arab Maghreb.

The Political Bureau of the Party of Progress and Socialism has received, with deep and sincere satisfaction, this remarkable advance toward an upsurge of ties of solidarity and good-neighborliness.

It notes that the re-establishment of diplomatic relations specifically attests to the desire of Morocco and Algeria "to ease the success of international community efforts to enhance the good offices process for a just and definitive solution of the West Saharan conflict through a referendum on free self-determination by the people of this territory".

The Political Bureau of the PPS also points out that the communique published simultaneously in Morocco and Algeria reaffirms that the "treaties, agreements and protocols" concluded between the two governments "remain fully in force".

Proceeding from this, the Political Bureau considers that the resumption of Moroccan-Algerian relations demonstrates the will for the removal of artificial cleavages, which persist to this day. Effective handling of regional tension and the implementation of earlier bilateral accords guaranteeing respect for the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the two parties will enable Morocco and Algeria to advance along the path of retrieved brotherhood, in the most fruitful and profound manner.

As a sincere protagonist of the Maghreb scheme, which corresponds to the best interests of our country and people, the PPS pledges to continue to work with selfless diligence for the reconciliation and inclusion in it of other countries and peoples of Maghreb: Mauritania, Libya and Tunisia.

At this hour, the Political Bureau considers it particularly important to implement the noble aims of this reconciliation. In this sense, the two countries and peoples ought to make wide use of the opportunities provided by reopening of borders for free movement of people and goods and the reinvigoration of exchanges and contacts, humanitarian as well as cultural, economic and others. It is necessary to make up for the lost years, to the mutual benefit of our two countries and peoples.

Deeply conscious of the urgent imperatives of the consolidation of the Arab ranks, and the unity which is absolutely necessary for the support of the heroic uprising of the Palestinian people, the Political Bureau is convinced that the improvement of relations between Morocco and Algeria will serve to increase the contribution of Arab Maghreb to the anti-Zionist and anti-imperialist struggle.

On May 16, 1988, the governments and peoples of Morocco and Algeria took a great step along the path of regained concord and unity. It is necessary to pursue this course, favorable for peace and friendship. This course will lead to success, especially if the healthy forces of the country will act in concert and through national unity.

Casablanca, May 19, 1988
Al-Bayane, May 20, 1988

Strike Tactics — New and Old Theories

John Case

The wave of concessions, unionbusting and now strikebreaking that has dominated the Reagan years for the labor movement shows no sign of letup. The aggressive tactics of corporations seeking to advance the rates of profit at all costs have been accompanied by the rapid erosion of the legal rights of workers.

Many heroic battles are being fought by workers against cruel assaults by corporations. Greater and larger mobilizations of workers are taking place under the banner of Jobs with Justice rallies and workers are forging new alliances in struggle.

Despite these advances in tactics and thinking, most workers on strike still find themselves at a gross disadvantage against the concentrated power of capital. Most of these strikes are being defeated.

In these circumstances there certainly is a need for a review of labor tactics and strategies. Some forces — but a shrinking number — use the setbacks as argument against strikes altogether. But these are silenced by the outrageous actions of the bosses, which arouse even weak hearts.

In discussing strike tactics and strategy it is worth examining the fundamental propositions developed by William Z. Foster and others in the 1920s and 1930s. A foremost organizer, theoretician, publicist and historian in the labor and communist movements, Foster's tactics greatly contributed to the tremendous successes of the CIO, a movement that transformed the labor movement and society as a whole.

"All organizing is preparation for a strike," Foster wrote in outlining the key tactics of industrial organizing in 1935. However, he did not mean a strike at just any time or any place. He meant

a strike whose preparation involved the thorough education of the workers as to all factors; the development of class conscious leadership, an estimate of the positions of all social forces — allies, enemies and wavering elements — relative to the workers' demands; the careful consideration of demands that fully correspond to the objective situation and needs of the workers as a whole and isolate the enemy to the maximum extent.

To be effective, all workers within an industry must be united with due attention to the requirements of equality. To be effective, the timing of the strike is all important. This must be chosen by the workers, in such a way as to create maximum division among the corporations, and the greatest strength of the strike must be aimed at the enemy's weakest point.

Foster's theses on organization and the conduct of strikes do not mention the National Labor Relations Act or the National Labor Relations Board, since they did not exist at the time. Much is made of this by some trade unionists who reject Foster's principles as irrelevant for today's problems. Current labor law demands that the goal of organizing activity be NLRB elections that pit pro and anti-union workers against each other; it demands that the scope of "bargainable issues" be narrowed to exclude what the company produces, how it is produced, where and by what methods.

It demands that the workers be disarmed from using the strike when they choose — only at the expiration of contracts — with specific notice periods. Current labor law encourages fragmented bargaining, gives the employers weapons to prohibit secondary boycotts and mass picketing. It permits employers to sue unions

and discharge employees for violations of NRLA restrictions or injunctions. It is arguable that strikes are now less legal than in 1935, though there were certainly formidable restraints then as well.

The maintenance of substantial strike funds, PAC funds and general funds makes union organizations more vulnerable to lawsuits than they were in Foster's day. The legal structure makes a number of the tactics advocated by Foster illegal. But does this invalidate them at a time when the labor movement's very existence is under attack?

I don't think so. No amount of "corporate campaigns," public relations gimmicks, labor consultant "networks" can substitute for the united action of workers at the point of production. Equally unlikely is the success of individual shops staying on strike up to three years, waiting for the next one to go on strike as its contract expires, and the next, etc. This simply exhausts the workers' strength. And the corporations have many weapons to counter these tactics.

National bargaining can only be achieved by national, coordi-

nated action by all workers in a given corporation, with the support of all workers in a given industry, at once, regardless of other considerations. If the time is picked correctly, if it is well prepared, if the basic issues are sound and clearly in the public interest, then these obstacles can be overcome.

The same is true for injunctions. They can be defied. They can be defeated. This was proved many times in the labor movement. And it was no more brilliantly proved than in the tactics of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. No strike can win if the company is permitted to replace the entire workforce with impunity. To accept the "legality" of such injunctions is to abandon the strike altogether. But they cannot be defeated by words or PR campaigns alone. They must be defeated by the united action of the workers and their allies, making the injunctions unenforceable.

No major gain was ever made by workers in the U.S. or any other capitalist country without defying and then repealing unjust laws that held them in chains. The same is true today.

People's Daily World, January 27, 1988

USSR, Cyprus: Developing Fraternal Relations

Joint CPSU-AKEL Communiqué

On May 20, 1988, Anatoly Dobrynin, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Yuri Zuyev, Deputy Head of the International Department of the CPSU CC, had a meeting at the CPSU headquarters with a delegation of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus (AKEL) comprising Dimitris Christofias, General Secretary of the AKEL CC, and Donis Christofinis, Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the AKEL CC. The sides adopted the following communiqué on the results of the talks that proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and identity of views.

The representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus discussed international issues and relations between the two parties.

Much attention was devoted to problems related to disarmament, the elimination of nuclear weapons and efforts to ensure international security. The representatives of both parties stressed that the signing of the INF Treaty in December 1987 was a major accomplishment for the peace forces of all humankind and an achievement for new political thinking and the Soviet Union's peace initiatives. This agreement showed that it was possible to work out arms reduction measures, and opened up the road to new agreements in this field.

The CPSU representatives informed the AKEL representatives about preparations for the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting. They emphasized that the Soviet Union would work toward further measures in the sphere of disarmament, especially toward 50 per cent reductions of the strategic offensive arms given the strict observance of the ABM Treaty, the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons, and the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments.

The signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan that would make it possible to achieve early solutions on the external aspects of the Afghan problem has made an important contribution to the political settlement of the existing regional conflicts.

The sides expressed concern at the explosive situation persisting in the Middle East. In that context they emphasized the importance of an international conference on the Middle East — an idea that was winning increasing recognition.

The transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of security and cooperation would promote the general cause of peace and international detente. The new Soviet initiatives set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev in Belgrade in March 1988 came in line with the interests of all Mediterranean people without exception, including the people of Cyprus.

The comrades from Cyprus informed the CPSU representatives

about the activities of their party at the current phase of the campaign for an end to the incessant intervention of NATO countries in the internal affairs of Cyprus and to the continuing occupation of the northern part of the island by Turkish troops. They expressed heartfelt gratitude to the CPSU for its steadfast support for that campaign.

The CPSU delegation reaffirmed the consistency of the Soviet Union's position in favor of defending the rights and interests of the Republic of Cyprus and its population, as well as intensifying the search for the settlement of the Cyprus problem. A representative international conference within the UN framework could become an important factor for such a settlement.

The AKEL delegation was informed about the efforts of the CPSU to effect revolutionary perestroika embracing all aspects of Soviet society: the economy, politics, social relations, the intellectual and moral sphere. It was emphasized that the road to a qualitatively new level of Soviet society's development and to the tapping of the humanitarian potential of socialism passed through perestroika. The comrades from Cyprus were informed about preparations for the 19th party conference, about its aims and tasks.

The AKEL representatives praised the perestroika policy in the USSR and stated that the destiny of peace and human civilization, national liberation and social emancipation depended on the success of the current changes in the Soviet Union, as well as on the introduction of new political thinking into the practice of international relations.

The CPSU and AKEL reaffirmed the striving of their parties to continue working toward further development of all-round cooperation between the USSR and the Republic of Cyprus, toward stronger friendship between the Soviet and Cypriot peoples.

With the aim of promoting the fraternal relations between the CPSU and AKEL, the delegations endorsed a plan for exchanges and cooperation between the two parties in 1988-1989.

Pravda, Charavgi, May 22, 1988

New from International Publishers

Super Profits and Crises: Modern U.S. Capitalism

Victor Perlo

Paper, appendix, index, 548 pp. \$14.95 USA: \$9.95

History of the Labour Movement in the United States Volume 8 Postwar Struggles 1918-1920

Philip S. Foner

Paper, index, 305 pp. \$13.50 USA: \$8.95

Thoughts on Women and Society

Eleanor Marx and Edward Aveling

New translation of the renowned essay, "The Woman Question."

Hardcover, richly illustrated, sel. bibliography, notes, 64 pp. \$7.50 USA: \$4.95

Charles Dickens: The Progress of a Radical

T.A. Jackman

New edition of the 1930s' classic analysis of Dickens' work and development.

Paper, 181 pp. \$8.75 USA: \$5.75

Anti-Semitism and Zionism: Selected Marxist Writings

Daniel Rubin, Editor

Writings by U.S. Marxists Gus Hall, Herbert Aptheker, Henry Winston, Hyman Lumer, Lewis Moroze.

Paper, appendix, index, 340 pp. \$9.25 USA: \$5.95

U.S. customers: order from International Publishers, 381 Park Ave. S., New York, NY 10016

ABC of Social and Political Knowledge

A Reader on Social Sciences

Selections from Marx, Engels, Lenin and documents from the CPSU and international working class movement.

Glossary, name index, cloth, 463 pp. \$7.95

Also available in this 24-volume series, in paperback, all with glossary:

What is Political Economy? 350 pp \$4.95

What is Philosophy? 239 pp \$2.95

What is Scientific Communism? 173 pp \$2.50

What is Dialectical Materialism? 326 pp \$3.95

What is Historical Materialism? 294 pp \$2.95

What is Capitalism? 278 pp \$3.95

What is Socialism? 192 pp \$2.95

What is Communism? 296 pp \$3.95

What is Surplus Value? 301 pp \$3.95

What is Property? 189 pp \$2.50

What are Classes and the Class Struggle? 263 pp \$3.50

What is the State? 156 pp \$2.50

What is Revolution? 191 pp \$2.95

What is the Working People's Power? 228 pp \$2.95

What is Marxism-Leninism? 310 pp \$3.85

What is Labor? 296 pp \$3.50

What is the Party? 286 pp \$3.95

What is the Transition Period? 173 pp \$2.50

What is the World Socialist System? 159 pp \$2.50

PROGRESS BOOKS, 71 Bathurst Street, Toronto M5V 2P6

Mail Orders from Progress Books

Minimum Order: \$5.00

Postage Charges: \$1.00 for first book; 75 cents each additional

U.S. Postage: \$2.50 for first book; \$1.00 each additional

U.S. Customers: Please pay in Canadian funds through International Money Order, or in U.S. funds *at par*.