

# DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

## 28TH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

- Report and Speeches by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee
- Policy Statement of the 28th CPSU Congress
- Resolutions

Moscow  
Kremlin  
July 2-13, 1990

---

---

# **DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS**

---

## **28TH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION**

**Report and  
Speeches by  
Mikhail  
Gorbachev,  
General Secretary  
of the CPSU  
Central  
Committee**

**Policy Statement  
of the 28th CPSU  
Congress**

**Resolutions**

**Moscow  
Kremlin  
July 2-13, 1990**

**Novosti**

Moscow 1990

ДОКУМЕНТЫ И МАТЕРИАЛЫ.  
XXVIII съезд КПСС  
*на английском языке*  
Цена 35 к.

**0902010000**

Copyright © Novosti Publishers (APN), 1990

## **CONTENTS**

CONTINUING ALONG THE ROAD OF PERESTROIKA "Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 28th CPSU Congress and the Party's Tasks". Speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee July 2, 1990	5
SPEECH BY MIKHAIL GORBACHEV Concerning the Results of the Discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 28th Party Congress July 10, 1990	54
FOR THOROUGHGOING RENEWAL OF THE PARTY AND A BROAD COALITION IN THE NAME OF PERESTROIKA Concluding Speech by Mikhail Gorbachev July 13, 1990	72
TOWARDS A HUMANE, DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM (Policy Statement of the 28th Congress of the CPSU)	76
RESOLUTIONS OF THE 28TH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU	96

## **CONTINUING ALONG THE ROAD OF PERESTROIKA**

### **"POLITICAL REPORT OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE TO THE 28TH CPSU CONGRESS AND THE PARTY'S TASKS". SPEECH BY MIKHAIL GORBACHEV, GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE**

Comrades, in five years we have made revolutionary strides in all spheres of life, and this has enabled us to reach a crucial watershed. The issue today is this: either Soviet society will go forward along the path of the profound changes that have begun—and then, I am convinced, a worthy future is in store for our great multinational state; or else forces opposed to perestroika will gain the upper hand—and then, let us be perfectly honest, dismal times are in store for the country and the people.

This will, therefore, be a time of blunt speaking. Assessments and conclusions cannot be put off. We have to, as they say, "dot our i's" on all the fundamental issues of the present stage of perestroika, which were also at the core of the pre-Congress discussion.

Was the change of policy begun in April 1985 warranted? What do we imply today by the term "socialism", and what are the principles we intend to be guided by in our domestic and foreign policy? How are the crisis phenomena which are affecting people's lives and causing justified dissatisfaction to be overcome? What is the destiny of our Homeland, and how are we going to build up a union of sovereign states? What is the role of the Party in the new conditions? What must it be like politically, ideologically and organisationally? What do we have to do to revive the CPSU as a revolutionary organisation of working people enjoying the nation's trust?

#### **I. ON THE CURRENT SITUATION**

The situation in which our society finds itself today is a topic of heated debate, disquiet and even mutually excluding evaluations. It is in the current situation, if you

like, that all our apprehensions and concerns are rooted. It is here that the answer lies to the question of what we have to do and how we must shape our further lives. The distinctive features of the current situation can be understood correctly only by making an analysis of the scale and diversity of the changes that have taken place in society in five years. Revolutionary changes have indeed occurred in the country, and we must see the full picture of the transformations.

The Stalinist model of socialism is being replaced by a civil society of free men and women. The political system is being radically transformed; genuine democracy is being established, with free elections, a multiparty system and human rights, and real government by the people is being revived. Production relations that caused the alienation of the working people from property and from the results of their work are being dismantled, and conditions are being created for the free competition of socialist producers. A process has been initiated to convert our overcentralised state into a genuine union based on self-determination and the voluntary association of peoples. The atmosphere of ideological domineering has been replaced by freedom of thought and glasnost, and by the openness of society to information.

New political thinking has helped us to see anew and realistically assess the world around us and has rid us of a confrontational approach in foreign policy. The USSR has become a country open to the world and to cooperation, generating not fear, but respect and solidarity. After April 1985 we told people the truth, swept aside false arrogance, and admitted that we had been unable to assure them a worthy life in practical terms. We resolutely condemned the crimes of the authoritarian bureaucratic system. We restored the good names of many thousands of people who had been the victims of illegal repressive measures.

All this has produced a real revolution in people's thinking. Life has become fuller, richer in content and more interesting. But it has become neither simpler nor easier. Diverse political trends have appeared which interact with and oppose one another. The interests of the most diverse groups and sections of the population have been set in motion and come into conflict. Perestroika has enabled people to regain a sense of dignity, but it has also

made them more demanding as regards living standards, and has given rise to great expectations of swift change for the better. The Soviet citizen of today no longer accepts what he meekly tolerated in the past. He reacts with understandable alarm and indignation to the negative phenomena that, like foam on the surface, accompany the turbulent and basically healthy process of perestroika. Hence the confusion in people's minds, the nervousness, the spontaneous heated forms of discussion, and the flood of accusations and claims. There have been plenty of them lately, including those at the Congress of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation.

We, comrades, will not move forward in our analysis of the situation if we ignore a substantial contradiction inherent in it. On the one hand, what we are doing is fundamentally changing society, and will determine its shape in the coming years and decades. On the other hand, we are facing a mass of unsolved problems, which are imposing a burden on the everyday life of the people.

It is important to understand the dialectics behind this. We cannot evade the question: why has the process of perestroika, which began successfully and which—in historical terms—has already given society so much, failed to cure many of its diseases? In some respects, the situation has even worsened. First and foremost, this applies to the consumer market, but also to the economy as a whole, public order and interethnic relations.

A clear and well-founded answer to the question of why this has happened is important for formulating conclusions as to what should be done next and how. It is also essential in order to reinforce people's faith in perestroika. After all, voices can now be heard, and even a stand of a kind has taken shape that perestroika is to blame for all our present troubles. Excuse me for my bluntness, but that is simply nonsense. And it is prompted by an unwillingness or inability to face up to the facts, which are there for all to see. Or maybe they say so pursuing certain goals.

It was an extremely grim legacy that we inherited. Let us recall it together and consider the facts. Take the neglect in the countryside, in farming and in the processing industry. Did this arise recently, after 1985? Yet it affects the food situation today, the condition of peasants and their present life. Or take the sorry state of our for-

ests and rivers, the millions of hectares of fertile land flooded as a result of the former power-generation policy. Are these things that were done in the past few years? The grim ecological situation—over 100 cities in a disaster zone, with over 1,000 industrial establishments brought to a standstill as a result; the drama of Lake Baikal, the Aral Sea, Lake Ladoga and the Sea of Azov; Chernobyl and other accidents and the disasters in railways and gas pipelines. Are not all these the consequences of a policy pursued for decades?!

Did not the structure of the economy, in which a mere seventh of our industry is geared towards producing consumer goods, arise back in the 1930s, and has it not survived ever since? Or take the problems of the Kuznetsk Basin, the Donets Basin, Tyumen and Vorkuta. The plight of the social sphere there has taken shape over a number of decades!

Or consider today's explosions of interethnic strife. Is this not rooted in the past? I don't say anything of the militarisation of the economy, which has swallowed up huge material and intellectual resources and the best of them at that. Or the irreplaceable human losses due to the war in Afghanistan.

Let us be impartial and stick to principles. In matters of big-time politics it is wrong to succumb to petty passions. That is why it is impossible to agree when it is said that the past has been censured enough and when perestroika is blamed for all difficulties. Yes, it is our job to set things right, to change everything for the better, and to improve people's life, but it is wrong to assert that all these are consequences of perestroika. By making blunders in our assessments, we may also blunder in our actions and in our practical work.

In speaking of all this, comrades, I certainly have no desire to mitigate assessments or conclusions concerning the activities of the Central Committee, the Politburo or Communists working in Party, government and economic organs in the republics or locally. There are many things we could have foreseen and there are processes, above all in the economic and social spheres, in interethnic relations and in the spheres of culture and ideology, whose development we could have prevented. The Politburo does not deny its responsibility for these errors. In the course of this report, I intend to speak of this in greater

detail when dealing with specific matters. In the agenda we have provided for reports by members of the Politburo, alternate members of the Politburo, and Central Committee secretaries. Delegates will thus have a chance to obtain requisite information about the work of the governing bodies of the Party.

But, as I see it, the Congress has not assembled to pass hasty judgement. We need to continue to analyse the reasons, and correctly evaluate the situation in which the country found itself when the need for revolutionary changes arose before us. Moreover, the changes were urgent because the country was gathering speed in its lapse into a second-rate state. Already by the early 1980s it had become clear that our apparent well-being rested on a savage, wasteful use of natural and human resources. Indeed, it may be said candidly that we would have very soon been in dire straits with unpredictable consequences.

We must also look thoroughly into the work we have done in the five years after the 27th Party Congress. For a correct understanding of the current situation it is above all essential to bear in mind the incompleteness of perestroika itself. We are in a transitional period, in which the dismantling of the old system—and still less the building of the new one—has not yet been completed. We must therefore act more resolutely, because any delay is sure to aggravate the situation in the country.

One of the serious reasons for the difficulties we are encountering in many fields is the resistance to change put up by the bureaucratic stratum in managerial structures and by the social forces associated with it. We of course realised that it would inevitably affect the interests of those who held actual power and who administered society's wealth in the name of the people.

The present position of some of the leading cadres who prefer the old methods and are in substance quite incapable of integrating themselves into the perestroika processes, and who, moreover, refuse to accept them either politically or psychologically, is clear to us. And at this point we must agree that unless the stance of these people is not changed—and they exist, as I have already said, in the administrative structures at all levels—the perestroika processes are sure to run into difficulties.

The attitude of the CPSU is of fundamental signif-

icance. It stands to reason that we must not simplify our assessments or conclusions, much less persecute any of the cadres. There always have been and are today skilled specialists who have done plenty of useful things for the country. They are also now devoting their intellect and talent to the cause of perestroika, and many of them have achieved outstanding results—I am speaking here not of dozens, nor of hundreds, but of thousands of people. But now I am referring to those who are stubbornly clinging to the past, who are obstructing the changes taking place in society. Moreover, they try to justify their conservative stance under the pretext that they are promoting the people's interests and the purity of ideological principles.

Accomplishment of the tasks of perestroika is being seriously impeded by the increased activity of nationalist and all sorts of destructive forces which are trying to use the energy of the people for their own selfish ends and which are not even shrinking from destabilising the situation for this purpose. That is why conflicts break out here and there.

Not should we close our eyes to the fact that forces have emerged in society which are pushing us towards the bourgeois system and which link coping with the present difficult situation to putting the country on the capitalist footing.

At present, when we are entering the decisive phase of change in all spheres of society, we should call attention to yet another phenomenon—the interaction of the most extreme of currents, of various destructive, extremist forces. They even unite to confuse people, to push us aside from the main direction of perestroika.

But that, too, should be understood by us because, as we reach a stage of decisive transformation, the Party is thereby assuming the strategic initiative of perestroika and again acting as society's consolidating force, offering far-reaching solutions in the interests of the people.

In general, comrades, as we assess the current situation and try to understand the reasons for these crisis phenomena, we should be aware of the fact that there is a junction, as it were, between the past and the present, of the contradictions of the transitional period and the intricate interrelation of interests, political designs, and of objective and subjective factors.

I should just like to stress that there is an appreciation both within the Party and within society of the need to unite all sound forces and emerge as quickly as possible from this difficult period of our development. I think that even if perestroika is defeated, it will be only in case when someone succeeds in splitting the democratic forces that firmly support it. What we need is an interconnected complex of practical and effective measures in the context of the economic reform which is taking place. We need to take urgent measures to stabilise the political and social situation in this country, to strengthen the law and ensure law and order. We must now, without a single day's delay, draft a new treaty of the union that will become the basis for the profound transformations of our multinational state. We must give top priority to resolving the food problem and improving supplies of manufactured goods for the people. It is on these vital tasks that all Party branches must concentrate their efforts.

We must do everything we can to enable perestroika to develop as a peaceful revolution, imparting a new quality to the country along the socialist lines without upheavals whose chief victims are always the people. We have to create all the democratic conditions necessary for government to be exercised by genuinely talented people committed to perestroika, reflecting the spirit of the time and the mood of the people, and capable of getting the job done.

What we need more than ever before is the highest possible degree of harmony in society. This is no time for ultimatums and conflicts, or for ill-considered actions that divide people and only aggravate the situation. There is now a growing mood in society in favour of combined efforts. In this context I would like to appeal from this rostrum to the miners' collectives to support this mood on the understanding that the work of solving the questions they have rightly raised will be seen through to the end.

This, comrades, is a brief exposition of the current state of affairs in the country.

## **II. THE POLICY OF PERESTROIKA: EXPERIENCE AND PROSPECTS**

Comrades, one of the fundamental principles of the strategy formulated by the 27th Party Congress was the

need for a social reorientation of the economy, for it to face the human being.

What has been accomplished in this respect? First of all, the structural policy has been amended. This has had the effect of making growth rates in the current five-year period in industries producing consumer goods much higher than in those turning out means of production. To use our commonly accepted terminology, Group B is for the first time ever developing more dynamically than Group A. Investments have begun to be rechannelled into the sphere that directly concerns human beings, into industries which work for human beings. This trend is extremely important for our enormous economy, and we must do everything not just to consolidate it but to give it a further impetus.

In the work to carry out the five-year plan additional steps have already been taken to overcome the principle of using residual funds for the social sphere. In four years 34 billion roubles were allocated in excess of the five-year plan targets for investments in non-productive construction. All in all, over 246 billion roubles were used for this purpose, and the average annual growth rate of non-productive investment nearly doubled: from 4.7 per cent in the 11th five-year period to 8.8 per cent in the current five-year period.

This is quite a substantial shift. It will make it possible, over a five-year period, to complete 100 million square metres of housing more than in the previous five years. It is the first time we have attained such a scale of house building. The completion of building of other social and cultural amenities has likewise increased. The completion of building of schools in terms of enrolment every year has on the average been 38 per cent higher than in the previous five-year period; pre-school facilities, 10 per cent; hospitals, 15 per cent; polyclinics, 38 per cent; clubs and community centres, 51 per cent; and shops, 7 per cent.

Let me single out the problem of providing the population with goods. The situation here is extremely difficult. I would subscribe here to everything that is said on this subject and express my agreement with the most scathing criticism. But just fanning emotions won't increase the amount of goods. What we need are sober assessments, well-considered conclusions and practical steps.

That is what Soviet men and women expect of us.

What is happening here in reality? If we take the statistics—moreover, if we make comparisons in physical rather than financial indices—we will see a definite favourable trend in many foodstuffs and other consumer goods. For example, the mean annual grain production was 26.6 million tons greater than in the previous five-year period. This is a substantial increment. Similarly, the production of meat increased by 2.5 million tons in slaughter weight as did the production of milk, sugarbeet and sunflower, but the figures here are considerably lower. So did the production of fabrics, knitwear, colour TV sets, tape recorders, refrigerators, washing machines and other household appliances. The conversion of the defence industries to civilian production is already beginning to yield its first results: from January to May this year an increase of 22 per cent was registered in the production of consumer goods in these industries.

While in the past the average annual trade turnover increase stood at 10-12 billion roubles, in the current five-year period it was 20 billion roubles, and in the last year the increase was 38 billion roubles. Per capita consumption has increased.

All this is true. Yet at the same time the situation on the consumer market, far from becoming less strained, has in many cases grown more acute and become intolerable. In fact, I'd say that the socio-economic situation in the country has reached a critical point.

This is mainly because cash incomes have been growing much faster than the production of goods. What are the reasons for this?

In the first place, when enterprises were granted more managerial rights and autonomy, rigid control over the relationship between the growth of labour productivity and earnings was removed. At many enterprises earnings substantially surpassed the growth of production.

Secondly, far from sufficient thought was given to all aspects of the expansion of the cooperative movement. Parallel with the useful things the cooperatives have been doing, there has appeared a channel for converting funds into cash. Moreover, we are also talking here of billions of roubles.

Thirdly, the decisions on changing the situation and restoring order in capital construction have not been ful-

filled. The practice of dragging out construction continues, which pins down material resources instead of transferring them to the market.

Add to this the wages paid to construction workers employed on the unfinished projects. All this, too, totals billions of roubles.

The growth of cash incomes was naturally affected by the implementation of decisions to raise the salaries of school teachers, medical doctors and other categories of workers, and also pensions and grants.

As a result of all these measures, the cash incomes of the population rose by 64 billion roubles just last year as against the usual increase of 12-15 billion roubles. The same situation is prevailing this year.

People naturally ask: could the mistakes have been avoided, and the negative economic tendencies prevented?

In any case—and this should be admitted—the consequences could have been far less painful if the government had approached the economic reform comprehensively, and had managed to stand up to the pressure of various industries and the old managerial structures that sought to keep their positions and maintain the command methods of administration.

That was where the government should have had the help of the Politburo, where higher demands should have been made of it, and where it should have received support in its work—in fact, there had been such suggestions from members of the public and economic agencies, including the Economic Department of the Central Committee—but, unfortunately, this was not done. Although the issue had been debated on many occasions, not everything that should have been done, was done. Therefore, we are directly responsible for the worsening on the consumer market which has complicated the general situation in the country.

This is a serious lesson for our work. This is what dictates the imperative need to accelerate and radicalise the economic reform. We can no longer tolerate the managerial system that rejects scientific and technological progress and new technologies, that is committed to cost-ineffectiveness, and generates squandering and waste.

As before, the country is expending 100-150 per cent more material resources and 50 per cent more fuel and

energy than the developed countries. A tremendous number of enterprises are in the red, and government subsidies amount to 23 billion roubles.

To say nothing of the enormous losses of grain, cement, metal, oil, mineral fertiliser, lumber and many other resources. There is no way the country can be rich and the people prosper with a system of management such as this.

All this has to be resolutely changed, so as to achieve a considerable improvement in the people's living standards, not in the distant but in the immediate future.

Thus, the very logic of perestroika and the dramatic social and economic situation in the country bring us face to face with the need for fundamental changes in the economic system.

What we are talking about is establishing a basically new model of economy: a multi-sectoral model, with diverse forms of ownership and management, and with a modern market infrastructure.

This will clear the path for people's business activity and initiative, and create powerful new incentives for fruitful work and greater economic efficiency.

We set this objective at the opening stage of perestroika. But it is only now that we can tackle the transition to a market economy, for we now have certain experience in working with new forms of management, we have taken major steps as concerns political reform, and have enacted a number of crucial laws, notably on property, land, lease holdings and the like.

Certainly, much has yet to be done to begin the transition to a market economy. And work is now under way to that effect.

It involves urgent measures to normalise the consumer market, freeze the surpluses of money, improve the state budget, and much else besides.

We are now facing the practical task of successfully completing the current economic year. Displaying initiative and enterprise, all work collectives must do everything in their power for this year's economic results to exercise a positive influence on the country's social and economic situation.

What worries people when they discuss the problem of how to achieve the transition to a market economy is whether this might not lower the living standards and

lead to social differentiation, and whether social justice and people's security will be assured.

These questions are asked by Communists, they agitate everyone: those who work and those who are retired, men and women, veterans and young people.

All these are very serious matters. It was because they had not been properly dealt with when the government programme was being elaborated that the programme evoked a very critical attitude in society. There has to be complete clarity in this.

First of all, concerning the market itself. It has gone through a thousand-year-long evolution from spontaneous barter trade to a highly organised mechanism. We have to reject voluntaristic approaches, learn to regulate economic processes on the basis of the law of value, and thereby create powerful new incentives for business activity.

Market conditions open up the possibility of realistically assessing needs and finding ways to satisfy them effectively, balancing supply and demand, and creating a normal environment for the development of production.

In general, we regard the market not as a goal in itself, but as a means of making the economy more effective and improving the standard of living. The market must facilitate a speedy solution to the problem of giving our economy a greater social orientation and gearing it to the people's interests.

The market, in its contemporary interpretation, rejects the monopoly of one form of ownership and requires a diversity of such forms, vested with equal economic and political rights.

State-owned enterprises, the collective ownership of a cooperative or joint-stock association, the work-earned property of the farmer, craftsman, or family all serve to strengthen the democratic pillars of society, since the working people become the genuine masters of the means of production and the results of their labour, and have a personal stake in efficient performance and high final results. Here there is no basis for exploitation.

This means that by moving towards a market we are not swerving from the road to socialism, but advancing towards a fuller realisation of society's potential. It is this that underlies the concept of perestroika.

Needless to say, we cannot leave it to the market to

implement major long-term scientific and technical projects, advance basic science, culture or national social and ecological programmes.

Nor should they be driven by crude administrative pressure: they should be regulated by taxation, interest rates, discounts and sanctions, and customs tariffs. If the economic policy of the state is to be effective it must master the whole range of instruments of economic management.

The problems of introducing market relations have to be solved with maximum circumspection. What we need are legal acts protecting people's right to work and to a real choice of employment. The state must support those who want to work but are temporarily unable to find a suitable job.

Another important question is the differentiation of society by property. The socialist principle allows for property distinctions if they stem from the nature and amount of work performed, from the talent, initiative and creativity of the individual. But we are firmly opposed to any stratification that is derived from unearned incomes or unlawful privileges.

Prices are a special issue. After discussion at the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the government is now revising its proposals in the light of the critical remarks addressed in the first place to the price-setting reform. Hopefully, an optimum solution will be found as a result.

I would like to stress, however, that the revision of retail prices cannot begin without well thought-out mechanisms of social protection. Needless to say, the transition to a market economy cannot start with a price increase, for that would be absurd.

Indeed, I think that the criticism voiced both in society and the Supreme Soviet—and I want to make a point of it here since it was raised by society in a pointed way—goes to show that insufficient thought was given to the logic, tactics, priorities and sequence of steps to be taken on the way towards a market. As a result, the issue of prices was presented as all but the pivotal and only measure with which to start the transition to a market.

Admittedly, among the set of measures involved in this transition, prices are a central point. Therefore, we must do everything to make the people feel certain that at this difficult stage of the transition to new forms of management and economic life, they will be socially protected and their interests ensured.

When going over to a market economy we must single out the measures that come first. Even today nothing prevents us from beginning to turn state enterprises into joint stock companies, from granting real freedom of enterprise, from leasing small enterprises and shops, and putting housing, stocks, shares and other securities, as well as part of the means of production, up for purchase and sale.

We must accelerate the formation of commodity and stock exchanges, and the banking reform, launch an interest rate policy, provide conditions for the emergence of competing enterprises and associations, and small- and medium-sized enterprises, especially those that produce consumer goods.

As for the structures of management, they must be reshaped to suit the requirements of a market economy. Strategically, we must set out to eliminate industrial ministries, and reduce their number in the immediate future. The economic activity of enterprises must be separated as far as possible from administrative control and departmental diktat.

Filling the sovereignty of republics and local self-administration with a tangible economic content is of special importance for shaping society's new economic model.

Of late, tendencies towards economic segregation have made headway against a background of mounting critical phenomena. Existing inter-regional economic ties are being severed and naturalised. These negative processes feed upon separatist ideas and are exploited by nationalist elements.

We would like to see in the new Treaty of the Union a clear definition of the economic rights of the republics, and the principles governing their mutual relations within a single economic complex. The economic freedom of enterprises, however, must not be restricted.

The diktat of Union ministries and departments must not give place to republican diktat, as is already happening in some cases. The economy must be based on direct ties between independent enterprises, and on those associations which the enterprises themselves and work collectives may deem it fit to form.

The integrity of our economy is an imperative condition for the formation of a full-blooded Union-wide market. Its

strengthening and release from monopolism is a task of paramount importance. The economic stake that the republics and regions have in integration is a promising factor that is constantly in operation. Those who deny it are greatly mistaken.

I want to dwell on the ecological problem. The situation here is dramatic, and simply critical in a number of regions. Regrettably, the measures taken so far have not been very effective and have failed to halt the deterioration of the ecological situation in the country.

We should adopt a new approach to the problem. To begin with, the responsibility of the enterprises themselves should be heightened, the rights and powers of the Union republics and local self-administration should be fully set in motion, and there should be the strictest governmental and public control over the observance of environmental protection legislation.

At the same time, coordinated action is required to protect nature. This, too, must be reflected in the Treaty of the Union.

The other objective is to marshal intellectual and material resources (also at the international level), in a drive to save the Earth ecologically. All this should become part and parcel of the nationwide ecological problem which is being drafted.

The improvement of the Soviet economy depends to no small extent on how it becomes integrated in the system of the international division of labour. I should say, there has been a great deal of activity here. The more freedom is given to enterprises, regions and republics—which we think is the right thing to do—the greater this activity becomes and the more new ideas are generated. But let us be careful, since this is no simple problem and improvisations have led to great losses.

A lot must be done to modernise our economy, to develop new technologies, to heighten the productivity of labour, and to produce competitive goods.

But the main thing, I should say, is to work for the convertibility of the rouble. Until lately, we referred this to the distant future. However, the matter should not be put off. We must have powerful export incentives, and barriers against ineffective imports and the growth of foreign debt. There must be mutually beneficial conditions for attracting foreign capital.

The transition to a market system and the establishment of ties with the world economy set high demands on our economic activity abroad.

We have dealt extensively with these issues of late. We have defined the right political principles and made substantial changes in this sphere with the help of the government. But there are many serious deficiencies in the work of our external economic agencies, enterprises and associations, although they have been granted new rights.

Certainly, the overall situation has been affected by the sharp decline of world prices for raw materials, notably oil. This has almost halved our foreign exchange revenue.

The situation called for a large-scale manoeuvre as concerned exports and imports, but this, as we all can feel, has not been without its consequences. As regards modernising our engineering industry, we have had to cancel an agreement on purchasing many different kinds of equipment. Furthermore, the manoeuvre has affected the consumer market as well, since previously we used to spend much of our hard currency to replenish it with goods.

At present, the government is drawing up proposals for the entire set of problems related to external economic activity. This applies to expanding ties with capitalist countries, and going over to world prices and settlements in hard currency within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. This also suggests a revision of our cooperation with Third World countries, and the introduction of certain corrective measures.

All this is so, and the situation is bound to change. But joining the world market and transferring the Soviet Union to the world economy calls for radical change in the mentality and approaches of our executives, for much knowledge and vision and the ability to conduct business in a new way.

For the time being, however, everybody wants one and the same thing: give us three, five or ten per cent of our foreign exchange reserves so that we could sell them on the market and buy whatever we want.

At first glance, everything looks simple and natural. But if we really see this as the gist of the reform of our external economic activity, then we don't understand any-

thing. What we need is to retrain our executives, to help them develop a new mentality, and to learn to work in a new way.

So far, we are obviously not devoting enough attention to this aspect, which is holding up the reform of our country's economic activity abroad, and, as I have already said, often leads to direct losses.

And one more thing: if our enterprises continue to misuse everything we import in order to modernise our economy, if everything we acquire for hard currency with so much difficulty lies around for years, spoils and grows old instead of working for the market, we can hardly expect a turn for the better or any of the advantages that international cooperation can yield in the economic field.

In other words, what is needed here are swift, immediate and resolute measures, a sound, well-thought-out approach and a sense of responsibility.

Comrades,

The 27th Congress Report and the Central Committee's Plenary Meeting of March 1989 posed the agrarian problem in a more pointed way than ever before. It was dealt with in the context of the destiny of the countryside and the farmers. These, indeed, are the keys to solving the food problem.

Specific technical and technological measures have proved incapable of solving it. This is now quite obvious.

The fact that the Party has adopted fundamentally new positions is the result of an uncompromising analysis of the history of the farmers' question and agrarian relations, from the collectivisation up to the present day.

This has led to the conclusion that changes must be made not only in the agrarian sphere as such, but also in the approach to the farmer, to the countryside as a whole, and in the mutual relations between the working class and farmers, between town and country.

In essence, we have gone back to the basic Leninist understanding of the agrarian question, which enabled us to work out new approaches to the social development of the village, to appreciate the need for equivalent exchange between the main sectors of the economy, and for radical change in property relations in the countryside.

Today, comrades, as we objectively assess the situation, we must admit that these fundamental decisions

were not followed up with appropriate practical actions either at the governmental level or at the republican and local ones.

I am aware of why the mood of the agricultural workers today is so critical, so sharp and categorical. The countryside really needs far-reaching improvements, both as concerns social well-being and material and technical facilities.

It is essential for the Congress to work out its stand on this score. We must acknowledge the need for powerful financial and material backing for the countryside, for the entire agrarian sector, as declared by the farmers at various public forums.

How can this be done? Our usual approach would be to redistribute and allocate resources from the budget. This distributive method of administration is no longer acceptable.

The problem of reviving the countryside must be tackled by economic means—by establishing equivalent exchange between town and country, giving economic and social priorities to the countryside and the agro-industrial complex as a whole, demonopolising the industries that make agricultural machinery, and producing a system of machines that would meet the needs of the various types of farming.

The necessary legislation and governmental decisions must be enacted to secure a substantial transfer of capital to the development of the countryside.

I suggest putting this issue before the Supreme Soviet of the USSR as a legislative initiative. Society must come to the aid of the village. I think that we should spell out our position on behalf of the Party for the whole nation to hear.

I would also like to stress that no other branch probably needs economic freedom and a true market environment as desperately as our countryside, our agrarian sector. And we should provide this freedom.

The Central Committee's Plenary Meeting of March 1989 has stated that the radical remodelling of production relations in the countryside is a key task, without which there can be no economic freedom.

Today, we must keep declaring that no investments will help unless economic relations change, unless new incentives for agricultural labour are introduced, unless the

farmer's situation is altered and he becomes the true master of the land. At this Congress we must reaffirm our commitment to the course mapped out at the March Plenary Meeting.

A few words here about a question that is the focus not simply of discussion, but, I would say, of real speculation. I am referring to the collective and state farms. People go as far as saying that the new agrarian policy puts their very existence in doubt. But its actual purpose is to give equal opportunities to all forms of farming. Let each of them prove its viability and effectiveness. That is our position of principle. And we certainly reject the demand for "overall de-collectivisation".

I am convinced that the collective and state farms which go about their business skilfully, which are advancing on the social plane and providing farmers with decent living conditions, turning out much produce needed by society, deserve every support. They will naturally remain an organic part of the renovated Soviet countryside. Those collective and state farms, however, that have not put their hearts into their work for decades, that operate at a loss and live off subsidies, and whose management is nevertheless obstructing the reform of property relations and the introduction of new forms of farming—those must undergo cardinal transformations.

And one more topical issue—that of the land reform. Let's be frank: the Law on Land has not been working so far. And not only due to the prevailing administrative structure and the position of the managerial apparatus, but also to the old psychology, the petrified stereotypes which resulted from the farmer's depersonalisation, the working man's detachment from the land and the means of production, while remuneration was guaranteed regardless of the end results.

This is all very serious, comrades, and resolute measures are highly necessary. Certainly, no one is suggesting "overall leaseholding" on the model of "overall collectivisation". I hope, no one has yet decided to create leaseholding collectives. This would be a repetition of the great folly that brought about vast misfortunes the effects of which are still being felt. The main thing is to create a mechanism that would make the Law on Land work. People in agriculture, particularly the leaseholders, including prospective leaseholders, and many of the man-

agers and specialists, have raised this question most emphatically.

All obstacles should be put out of the way for those who wish to take up free farming. The Law on Land must be abided by most strictly, and I think the new powers of the Soviets should be used here above all. That is their immediate duty.

I want to announce that the progress of the land reform is to be examined at one of the next sittings of the Presidential Council.

Comrades, interethnic relations have deteriorated in the period under review, and especially lately. We did not grasp the significance of this promptly enough, and failed to see its dangers in good time. You may recall that the 27th Congress of the CPSU, whose decisions are now being reviewed, examined the matter as though it had long since been settled and things were generally normal.

But, as they say, we were taught a harsh lesson. We were not prepared for what happened when the serious problems that had long been accumulating behind a screen of apparent well-being burst to the surface.

There are a lot of interwoven factors, and I would certainly avoid simplifying things. Perestroika and glasnost have provided favourable conditions for the rebirth of national identity. This is a positive process that can only be welcomed. At the same time, however, it has disclosed problems and contradictions that stem from past mistakes in locating productive forces, in elaborating national cultural policy, in developing national languages and resolving social issues in some of the regions of the country, in their uneven development, and their demographic and ecological changes. There are also historical and religious reasons. And, of course, we are now having to pay for past crimes committed against entire nations.

Let's admit that initially the central and local authorities did not pay enough attention to these problems. All kinds of destructive forces—separatists, ranting nationalists and corrupt elements—have made the most of this. The nationalities question and interethnic relations reached extreme forms in a number of cases. There has been bloodshed and considerable loss of life on ethnic grounds. Refugees have appeared, with thousands of people being compelled to abandon their homes and wander about the country, suffering privation. All this is intolerable.

erable and gives rise to immense concern among people all over the country.

Justified demands are being addressed to the authorities, calling for action to restore peace and accord in our multinational state. I am sorry to say that not everyone has stood the test of internationalism in these conditions. Quite a few Communists succumbed to pressure and failed to present arguments that would have convinced their people, the working people, of the danger of following the call of separatists and instigators of national strife. Yet there are more than enough such arguments. And I believe that Party bodies have been legitimately criticised for faults in their political work and for not being able to conduct it against the background of deteriorating interethnic relations. We have lost much ground there.

The necessary conclusions were drawn, and a platform for the Party's nationalities policy was worked out, publicly discussed, and then approved by the September 1989 Plenary Meeting. The main thing is that it recognises the need for directing the processes of national revival along constructive lines in the interests of every nation and the country as a whole. The nationalities question cannot be settled without continuing and expanding perestroika, which, in turn, cannot count on success unless relations between the nations of our country are harmonised.

It seems to me that now, more than ever before, we appreciate the essence of Lenin's views concerning the character and make-up of the Union as a voluntary association of peoples with the same economic and political interests, united by history. What we have lived through and reflected upon in recent times, has caused us to realise that the updating of the Union cannot be confined to the mere, even if highly considerable, extension of the rights of the republics and autonomies. What we need is a real union of sovereign states.

What I am referring to, in essence, is a national-state arrangement in our country that would enable us to untie the knots of conflict, to raise the cooperation between our peoples to a new level, and multiply the aggregate political power of the Union and its economic and spiritual potential in the interests of all those who have joined hands in our great union of states. This will reliably ensure the country's security and enhance its international prestige.

For all this, human rights must retain priority over the interests of national sovereignty and autonomy. This must be engrained in the constitutional fabric of the Union and each of the republics. Nor must we depart even an inch from this principle, which guides us on the international plane as well.

Work on a new Treaty of the Union, which will embrace the entire set of questions related to the fundamental transformation of our multinational state, is already under way within the framework of a special commission set up by the Soviet of the Federation. But if this is so and we are, in effect, moving in the right direction, if we hope to secure a radical change for the better very soon, then it is probably right to appeal to all the peoples of the country now on behalf of our Congress to realise the folly of any further exacerbation of feelings in interethnic relations, to halt the hand and repulse the instigators, whatever cloak of honour and dignity they may have donned. I believe, this is the attitude on that question that people expect from us.

At present, as we embark on a succession of deep-going changes in our multinational state, we need tranquility, peace and cooperation in the interests of all nations. I hope that this appeal of our Congress will be heard in all parts of the country.

Comrades, much effort of fundamental importance has gone into the political reform. We realised the need for this as the processes of perestroika unfolded, when the ongoing economic change ground to a halt because it came into collision with the old political system.

The Central Committee treated this in all earnest and started a thorough examination of the entire set of problems. Here I would like to note the tremendous importance of the January 1987 Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee. It produced the first honest analysis of the functioning of our political regime, and of the place of the Party and the Soviets within it. That was when we spoke loud and clear about the need to implement Lenin's notion of popular rule.

It should be admitted, however, that the ideas of the January Plenary Meeting sparked different reactions in the Party and in society, and that they were not duly elaborated upon and expanded. Most important of all, they were not followed up by any practical steps.

Now it is quite clear why this happened. This was perhaps the first time that the question of the responsibility of the cadres was posed so acutely. This put some of them on their guard, and affected their attitude towards the decisions of the Plenary Meeting. In these conditions, the Politburo was not always consistent and principled enough. Life again compelled us to raise this whole set of questions, but this time under the pressure of the on-going democratisation in the country. That was when the idea of holding the 19th Party Conference arose. The main item on its agenda was that of an all-embracing political reform.

Now that the principles worked out at the Conference have been put into effect, and new institutions of power, formed through democratic elections, have been created in the country at all levels, we can say that a most important step, which is a major gain of perestroika, has been taken towards the renewal of our society, a step without which we could hardly have reached the new stage of revolutionary change.

Reforming the political system is a complicated process. The role and functions of Party, government and Soviet bodies, and non-governmental organisations, are changing. To put it bluntly, this is causing pain because it is affecting the interests of various social strata and groups, of the millions of people engaged in government. And that is all understandable. Let me stress, however, that if we had not taken this road, the increasing politicalisation of society might have become chaotic and fraught with explosive social consequences. In the present conditions, when society is worked up and alarmed, our Congress will fulfil its mission only if it acts responsibly, if it defines our immediate aims and tasks, and a programme of action that will consolidate society as well as the Party. This is not the time for quarrelling, but for advancing perestroika.

Now that the second stage of the political reform has been completed, we see the Party's task in facilitating the functioning of the newly-created bodies of popular power. Revolutionary changes are now taking place in the activity of republican bodies of power, which are gaining jurisdiction over much of what was previously handled by the Centre. This gives them new opportunities, but also enhances their responsibility for the state of affairs, for ad-

dressing socio-economic and other problems of everyday life.

The status of the local Soviets is also changing radically under the Local Soviets and Self-Administration Act. They will now have large material resources at their disposal, which must be used rationally in the interests of districts and towns. If we add that the Soviets now have a new legislative basis and new organisational forms, and that the structure and status of the apparatus of the Soviets are changing radically, we will see that there truly are many vitally important problems. We are all vitally interested in the new government bodies asserting themselves more quickly. And the Party committees must in every way promote the processes of democratisation and the Soviets' assimilation of their new powers.

The question of tightening law and order and legality has now come to the forefront. People address the Party and the newly-elected bodies of Soviet power most categorically at various forums to halt the mounting crime wave and anti-social acts, and to resolutely enforce the law.

The law must work everywhere, and we must not confine ourselves to merely stating this at our Congress. We have said so many times, but so far matters are too slow in changing for the better. Hence, we must make an in-depth study of the prevailing complicated situation and express our judgement and proposals.

To begin with, I should like to call your attention to the following. We should clearly see the immediate and direct connection between law and order and the level of political and social stability in the country. This being the case, the newly created bodies of power must first of all direct their activity precisely at consolidating stability. Nor should they await instructions on this score, or any new laws. There are enough political and legal instruments today to decisively rectify the situation. The thing to do is to act, to act with resolve. It is good that many Soviets realise this and are already tackling the problem in a practical way. On the other hand, there are Soviets that are still at "the heated debates" stage. That is the first point.

Second, it appears that much may be traced to a sort of uncertainty within the agencies of the Procurator's Office, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and even the courts,

which has taken shape under the pressure of meetings, demonstrations and various ultimatums, or under the influence of the elective organs, which have on one pretext or another obstructed the Procurator's Office, the militia and the courts in enforcing the law.

We cannot tolerate this. That would be going too far. Therefore, the Party organisations must address all our public with a statement that we oppose any and every type of pressure on the law-enforcement agencies. And I am sure that the public throughout the country is of the same opinion.

Third, we are in favour of strengthening the law-enforcement bodies, equipping them with everything they need, and improving the material well-being of their personnel. To be sure, the first step to this effect has already been taken. The Soviet people are behind this approach. Many Soviets have decided to use their own resources to strengthen the law-enforcement bodies on their territory. But in doing so our people expect more effective action by the administrative bodies to tighten legality and protect the rights and freedoms of every citizen.

And, comrades, one more thing. An atmosphere of intolerance must be built up in the country against breaches of the law. Here, much can and must be done by the mass media.

Comrades, when we started perestroika we were clearly aware that no political, social or economic reform would be possible without a revolution in people's thinking, without spiritual rebirth and ideological renovation in the broadest sense of the word. I think we all remember the ideological grip on society before perestroika, the dogmas and outdated notions that held sway over the mass consciousness. The first thing to do, therefore, was to grant freedom of thought, to liberate the mind. This was a crucial aspect of the perestroika strategy.

Absurd bans in our spiritual life have been lifted on the Party's initiative. The blinkers of Stalin's and Zhdanov's conceptions have been removed. Time and again, the Central Committee held counsel with scientists, writers, artists and other intellectuals. There were many effective and meaningful meetings and discussions. As early as June 1985, an important conference was held on scientific and technical progress. Steps were taken to close

the abyss that had formed over the decades between Party organisations and the intelligentsia. Party bodies renounced all patronage that was stifling creative activity. The good names of many wronged or simply discredited eminent scientists and cultural personalities have been restored.

The Soviet people have been returned access to outstanding works of culture. The shaping of the Party's new relations with intellectuals and professionals is not just one of the gains of the reform process but an important prerequisite for its continued advance. Without the contribution of the intelligentsia we could not have reached the new frontiers in the understanding of the society we live in and of the future prospects for its renovation.

The new role in the mass media is proof of the mental uplift in this country during the years of perestroika. The press has revolutionised society and helped bring millions upon millions of working people back into public life. And that is its tremendous contribution to the reform movement, whatever the side-effects, which sometimes are quite significant.

Now that we have reached the stage of deep-going change, we have the right to expect both Communists and non-Party members, all journalists, to work with a still greater sense of responsibility, rallying together all the sound forces of society, to resolve new major tasks.

Comrades, we have also had to sort out our own history, in order to delineate correctly the future prospects for our development. That, perhaps, has been one of the most difficult, painful, and at the same time indispensable revitalising processes. In this respect, too, the Party has taken the initiative. The documents related to the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution were a turning point in this context.

The review of the cases of all the victims of the lawlessness of the times of Stalin's repression has proved to be the most essential element in giving the people the historical truth. The deliberations of the corresponding Commission of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee have resulted in the posthumous rehabilitation of the Party and civic honour of thousands upon thousands of Communists, high-ranking Party and government leaders, workers, farmers and intellectuals. The Central Committee has stated its basic assessments of the policy of

compulsory collectivisation and that of the depeasantisation of the countryside with tragic consequences for the nation as a whole. But I consider that we have not yet finished the job. It must be carried on.

The draft Policy Statement for the Congress, along with many other documents and pronouncements of the period of perestroika, make fairly clear what part of our record we emphatically reject and do not want to take along with us into the future. But we are against the out-of-hand rejection of all that our people have done since the October Revolution and we give their due to each generation of Soviet people who have been inspired by the socialist idea. They wanted to make this country rich, culturally advanced and prosperous, and spared neither their efforts nor their health for it. They defended it in the most horrible of wars. They have a clean conscience before history.

By decision of the Central Committee, a group of authors is now at work writing the "Essays of the History of the CPSU", which will reproduce a truthful picture of our Party's life and struggle with, I hope, scientific honesty and impartiality, on the basis of authentic documentary evidence.

One objective set at the 27th Congress was to do away with the principle of "left-over funding" in the area of cultural activity in general, and in science and education in particular. There has been an attempt to reform the system of secondary and higher education. Decisions have been taken to promote basic research and to stimulate scientific and technological progress. But we must say frankly that little headway has so far been made in this respect, and the reason behind it is the failure to fulfil the decisions taken on these important issues. Evidently, comrades, we have not yet fully realised that unless we treat science and education as a matter of top priority, we will have no really dynamic reform, for perestroika will invariably get stuck due to the inadequacy of the intellectual potential.

You can see that, incidentally, from the record of the last few decades of our own history. The reason why we have fallen behind advanced nations in many areas, particularly in the field of high technology, is that our country has been lagging behind in the development of science and education. At the same time, a number of countries

which have literally bounded ahead in their social and economic development just in the last few years, started this breakthrough with a major revision of their attitude to education and science.

Having said all that, I would not want us to limit ourselves once more to self-criticism on these matters. It is necessary for the conclusions made to be translated into a full-scale national policy. And the Congress, as I see it, must take up a clear stand on this important matter.

A few words about the attitude to social sciences: the Party is decidedly in favour of their free development. We badly need the objective evidence and findings of science: we must treat the studies and recommendations of scientists with greater confidence and use the fruits of their efforts in politics to the good of the people.

One more point, comrades. A state that is wise always treasures its intellectual and artistic assets. And we have to take immediate measures towards removing the causes behind the brain drain and the exodus of talents from this country.

But, above all, the Congress must reflect the Party's position—it is in favour of the free development of culture, literature and the arts, using the whole wealth of world and national values. The state must finance culture rather than leave it at the mercy of profit-and-loss management. The commercialisation of art is possible to a reasonable and limited extent, but it is impermissible to surrender art to the rule of the market, where the artist will once again be exposed to the danger of losing his freedom and becoming dependent, while society will have to sustain moral damage.

Along with acknowledging the artist's freedom of creativity, the Party declares at the same time that we are against that kind of art which destroys and humiliates man and which insults his conscience and morality. We are against censorship in art but we believe in the artist's moral responsibility before the people.

In a message to the Congress, published yesterday, Soviet workers in the arts and culture urge the Party to use all its influence, its entire moral and material potential, to affirm new approaches towards the solution of all these problems, vital to society. It is our sacred duty to respond to that appeal, imbued as it is with concern for the spiritual world of the people. I'm convinced that all

delegates will declare themselves in favour of culture and the arts—the ecology of the soul, so to speak—becoming a priority goal of our policy.

Comrades, in drawing up the programme of reform, we understood that it could not be carried out unless the external conditions of this country's life changed radically. But to achieve that, we had to change approaches and to offer a new type of international policy to the world.

There have been sweeping changes—social, national, economic, political, technological, scientific, ecological and demographic—since World War II. They had transformed the image of the world by the mid-1970s and altered the very foundations of the existence of humanity. A new kind of civilisation is emerging. It is emerging either to perish, if it fails to cope with the enormity of the global threats, or to work out entirely new rules of community living and an entirely new type of world politics.

Basing ourselves on an analysis of the present-day international situation, setting course for disarmament and acquiring a certain experience in conducting the new type of foreign policy, we are convinced that we are right in our understanding of three key premises in international activities.

First, it is impossible to ensure one's own security at the expense of anybody else's, to uphold one's own interests at the expense of anybody else's and to pretend to know better how other peoples and nations should manage their affairs. The recognition of every people's freedom of choice is a fundamental precondition for building up a new type of world order. Second, it is impossible to bring about a prosperous, free and democratic society by going it alone and by setting one's option of societal development against other options. It is co-development, co-creativity and cooperation that are imperative in our times. And, third, the incorporation of our national economy in the world economy is necessary not only for the modernisation of our own economy but also for the joint construction with other peoples of the material foundation of an irreversibly peaceful period of history and for the resolution of the global problems of humanity.

Incidentally, I must note that one of the most promising areas of our integration is cooperation in the field of conversion of defence production. Contacts have already been established with the Americans, Italians, Germans

and some other nations. This field could set a kind of precedent in the field of integration links, for we do already possess high technologies and advanced R&D studies which are of interest to our partners, naturally on a reciprocal basis. This is one of the most effective channels for us in reconverting for civil needs the most scientifically and technically up-to-date lines of production within short time limits. And it is extremely important from the standpoint of international politics that this means reducing the intensity of one of the most active generators of suspicion and mistrust which has fuelled the arms race.

Without going into the details of the entire complexity of this large problem, since the national programme on conversion is being elaborated, I'll only say that it is the matter of state importance. It requires well-thought-out decisions. It is necessary to use scientific, personnel and production potential in the best way. We must do a great deal of work in this direction in order to get rid of mistakes that were made at the initial stage.

The policy based on new approaches and the initiatives launched within the framework of the new thinking have already substantially improved the international climate and removed the threat of a world war. An opportunity has opened up for us to reduce military spending and, as I have already said, divert the resources thus saved for peaceful purposes.

Due to perestroika and the new thinking there has been a swing in relations between the USSR and the USA—from confrontation and competition in the arms race to mutual understanding and, in a number of issues, even to partnership. This has changed the entire world situation for the better and launched a movement towards an unprecedentedly peaceful period in the life of humanity.

Relations with China have been normalised, which is a matter of tremendous importance for both great nations and the world as a whole.

A process of actual disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, has got under way for the first time in Europe, which was the scene of the fiercest Cold War and armed confrontation. We have never had such good and well-meaning relations with most of the countries of Europe as we have now, throughout the history of our state. The all-European process has begun to produce a form of

inter-state relations between scores of different nations and peoples, unprecedented in world history. One idea that has been put on the agenda for the first time here is that of creating an economic, cultural, ecological and information environment. All this has become possible due to our new international policy and cooperation.

Deep-going changes are under way in Eastern Europe. When anybody says that this is the "collapse of socialism", we counter it with the question: which type of "socialism"? The one which was, in point of fact, a variation of Stalin's authoritarian bureaucratic system, which we have ourselves discarded? We are even reproached for "leaving the field without fighting". It turns out that we are advised to resort to exactly what we resorted to before, and what we have unequivocally broken with and emphatically denounced.

Of course, which way these countries will go in their social and economic development is an open question. But that is up to the peoples concerned to decide which way to choose. We, on the other hand, have acted, and will continue to act, in strict compliance with the principle of the freedom of choice, which has become an imperative of the progress of all modern civilisation and a condition for its survival.

How are we to build our relations with the East European countries now and in the future? As with good neighbours, such as we are not only geographically but historically as well. There is much that has been really good and valuable in history, particularly after the war. The fact that the USSR played the decisive role in delivering those countries from fascism and sincerely aided them afterwards has remained in the memory of the peoples and cannot but have its effect on the continued development of our relations. Moreover, and this is the main thing, we have mutual economic and political interests. They bring us together in the joint pursuit of a peaceful Europe and its "common home". They coincide in the desire to reform the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, which we agreed upon at the Political Consultative Committee Conference in Moscow a month ago. The closest type of relationship is that which is built on the principles of voluntary association, mutual interests, respect and cooperation.

The Party and the people have given a high evaluation

of our new foreign policy. It has been approved and reaffirmed in the documents of the 19th Party Conference and in the special resolution of the First Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. Our new approaches and practical moves have fetched a widespread response and support from all over the world. And we unequivocally reject all attempts to discredit the foreign policy course worked out and pursued by the Party and the Soviet state.

I believe that the 28th Congress of the CPSU, properly appreciating the obvious results achieved in the international arena during these years, will reaffirm once again, in the face of the peoples of this country and the rest of the world, the immutability of the foreign policy course, based on the new way of thinking.

The effectiveness of our foreign policy lies in the fact that it reflects the pressing concerns and expectations of humanity. At the same time—and this, too, is clear to all—what makes our policy effective is the power of our state, with the Armed Forces as a component part. It has been a matter of tremendous importance that the new ideas and constructive initiatives have been proposed by one of the great powers. Moreover, it has not merely declared its new ideas but has confirmed its adherence to them in practice.

The most convincing evidence of this is our defence doctrine, which we take as our starting point in moving towards a major military reform. I hope its principles will be enshrined in the Policy Statement of the Congress. Nobody should be in any doubt that the army will go on enjoying the Party's support. Special care must be provided for those who have devoted their lives to the service of the fatherland in the Armed Forces. The army consists of millions of people doing a responsible and, in many cases, dangerous job for the benefit of the nation.

Such are, in a nutshell, the basic results of the work accomplished.

We have, indeed, become involved in a grandiose, unprecedented undertaking for the benefit and the sake of the future of our people. There have been some failures, mistakes and some loss of momentum. I have spoken about them and most likely you will have something to add concerning this question.

Well, actual experience has proved to be far richer than

we imagined it would be when we started our revolutionary change. Glasnost, the promotion of greater democracy and the involvement of millions of people in the process of history-making have lent the development of society its own objective logic which has borne many unexpected things, both positive and negative. Without the experience and without the knowledge we have gained during these years, including the knowledge about our own society, we would not have reached the most decisive phase of our reform effort now.

### **III. PARTY AND PERESTROIKA**

Comrade delegates, the major distinguishing feature of the 28th Congress is that we have gathered, as I've already said, at a turning point in the process of perestroika and radical change of our society within the framework of the socialist option. Everybody is anxious to know what the revolutionary change will lead to, how far it is responding to the interests of working people and whether it will strengthen social justice, democracy and freedom?

In this situation, there are, naturally, many different points of view arising. This has all been taken into account in the drafting of the Policy Statement which you have before you. In it, the Party, conscious of its responsibility to the people, is offering a short-term programme and policy.

The Party's theoretical activity has been a subject of keen interest throughout the pre-Congress debate. Some have even argued that the Party's leadership has involved the nation in a "global experiment", without having any theoretical formulation or a concept of reforms. This statement is repeated so often that even a kind of anti-reform stereotype has shaped.

Let us make it out. First of all, I must repeat what I have said more than once: the concept of reform is not the chance discovery by a particular group of individuals. The quest for it has been going on in the Party and in society ever since the 20th Congress of the CPSU. Unfortunately, it received no support and was even suppressed in most cases. In the years of stagnation, when attempts were made to whitewash Stalin's model of socialism, theory was cast in the role of an apologetic service to official policy.

We have every reason to say that we have indeed come to perestroika by the sweat of our brows. And the concept underlying it has taken in the best of what has long been germinating in the womb of society, the Party, science and culture. The April 1985 plenary meeting gave a powerful impetus to the theoretical quest and opened up an opportunity for the unimpeded discussion of the blackspots in the life of society. It is a major point of principle to note that the Party and its Central Committee have taken the lead in this creative effort, which is of paramount importance to the nation, and created the most favourable political conditions for it.

In opening stages of this we realised that this society needed a thorough overhaul. Thus the basic concept of perestroika was produced—within the framework of the socialist option to profoundly democratise and humanise society, to make it free and create living conditions worthy of a human being. The process of bringing this concept to fruition involved working out ideas for radical economic reform, fundamental changes in the political system and in the federation, and for the formation of a law-governed state. It also involved working out the foundations of the new political thinking predicated on the primacy of common human values. There could have been no theory of reform without the appreciation of all those far-reaching changes which the world had achieved by the closing decades of the 20th century.

We have been crystallising, step by step, our understanding of the aims and methods of revolutionary change. In point of fact, this had demanded, as Lenin put it, a revision of our entire view of socialism. In consequence, we came to see our reform movement as a new revolution, and as a logical follow-on to the cause which was begun in the Great October Revolution.

I am far from having any intention of presenting the theory of our policy of reform as something consummate in every respect, as some finite system or as the ultimate truth. We have had enough of such claims and ambitions. Experience has taught us to be ready to assess ourselves self-critically and to make necessary corrections which must reflect the actual processes going on in the country and in the world, both in theory and in political practice.

So when we are challenged to produce a consummate

new theory of socialism, we reply: it is only the actual course of life, only the emancipated work, self-government and well-being of the people that can fill the concept of "socialism" with new substance. If that does not happen and if this concept does no more than migrate from report to report, from editorial to editorial, whose authors indulge in category modelling, the socialist idea will be devalued beyond repair. You should say first what you intend to do for your own country and for your own people, and then it will be clear what you really want and what you mean by socialism. We say: socialism is a real movement, the creative endeavour of the masses, and I am convinced that the CPSU has correctly defined the purpose of this movement—a humane and democratic socialism.

Our views on the subject are set out in the draft Policy Statement of the 28th CPSU Congress. How do they correlate with Marxism? That is a matter of principle for our Party.

It is known that the substance of the social theory produced by Marx, Engels and Lenin had been formed on the basis of an analysis of the realities of the 19th century, and, in Lenin's case, also of the opening decades of the 20th century. The world has since changed beyond recognition, notably, under the impact of Marxist thought itself, the October Revolution and the international revolutionary and democratic movement. We, however, have been trying for decades to find answers to every contingency of life in quotations from classics, forgetting that classics themselves had insisted on taking the historical circumstances into account behind any theory and had mocked those who had sought to convert Marxism into a kind of Scripture. Actual experience has compelled us to recall that and appreciate properly the importance of the fundamental laws of Marxist dialectics, above all, the demand for a concrete analysis of a concrete situation, and to make conclusions for politics only on that basis.

The concept of reform is, I repeat, in a state of flux and self-development, and it must be enriched with new ideas and conclusions as we move forward. The CPSU is emphatically against dogmatism and scholastic reasoning, and in favour of a consistently creative approach to the theory and practice of socialism and to understanding of the historical experiences of the 20th century and of the

heritage of Marx, Engels, Lenin and other eminent exponents of revolutionary and progressive thought.

The work of upgrading our concept of perestroika continues. Therefore, it will be correct, it seems, after having adopted the Policy Statement, to consider the present CPSU Programme no longer valid and to move on towards a new Party programme. To this end, the Congress should set up an appropriate commission.

Comrades, Communists and the rest of the community are waiting for the Congress to reply to the key issues about the Party itself. The Party is now involved in the natural and, at the same time, difficult process of rethinking its own role in society and the principles of its structure and methods of activity, which have developed over the decades. The old ideas about the CPSU need a critical reappraisal and essential modification.

In recent times, the Party has come under a barrage of serious criticism, both fair and unfair. We do not spare ourselves, nor does anybody spare us. And this is what I would like to say at this point.

For many decades the CPSU has been adapted to serving the authoritarian and bureaucratic system and that led to serious deformation of intra-Party relations, in selecting personnel, and to the actual removal of millions of Communists from the decision-making process which created, in fact, a climate of indifference, apathy and passivity in Party organisations.

That is why, whatever criticism we may make of the deformation which has occurred in this country and for which the Party leadership is to blame does not, of course, at all mean that millions of Communists are to blame for it individually and collectively. Hardly anybody can deny the truly heroic role of Communists in the Soviet people's feat of valour on the battlefronts of the Great Patriotic War. In fact, this country's entire working history is replete with examples of the vanguard role of Communists.

We all know that very well. But that does not in any way spare us the trouble of constantly and critically reviewing our performance so as to make the right political conclusions for the future.

The pre-Congress discussion has generated a wide range of opinions as to the principles which should be followed in building up the Party and in Party work in

present-day conditions. But there is a point of convergence. This is the realisation that the Party has neither the political nor the moral right to absolve itself from its responsibility for the fate of perestroika, to shirk its role and retire to the sidelines of the social process.

What might the updated CPSU look like?

—A party of the socialist option and of communist perspective, a voluntary association of like-minded people, expressing through its policy the interests of the working class, the farming community and the intelligentsia.

—A party committed to common human and humanistic ideals, sensitive to national traditions and aspirations and, at the same time, intolerant of chauvinism, nationalism and racism, and of any manifestation of reactionary ideology and obscurantism.

—A party freed from its ideological blinkers and dogmatism, striving for its role as an initiator in political and ideological processes, resorting to means of persuasion and propagation of its policy, promoting a relationship of dialogue, discussion, cooperation and partnership with all the nation's progressive social and political forces.

—A party that will have its members build their mutual relationship exclusively on the basis of the Party fellowship, respect for each other's opinions, recognition of the right of minorities to a stand of their own, total freedom of debate, and with all decisions adopted by the majority being binding on everyone.

—A party that will enforce the principles of self-management in its internal life, the freedom of action of Party organisations and the independence of the Communist Parties of the Union republics, united by common policy objectives and statutory provisions.

—A party open to contact, interaction with Communists, Social Democrats and Socialists of various countries and orientations, and with representatives of many other tendencies in modern political and scientific thought.

The pre-Congress discussion has brought out several key points now central to the confrontation of judgements. Since they are of key importance for the understanding of the reform of the CPSU, it is worth taking up a clear position here.

A vanguard or a parliamentary party. By speaking in favour of amending Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution

of the USSR, the Party has officially dropped its claim to substitute itself for government bodies and to carry out administrative and managerial functions. Various documents, including the draft Policy Statement of the 28th Congress, refer to the need to revert to Lenin's concept of the Party as the vanguard force in society.

But doesn't that mean—and questions such as this are being asked—that we are once more aspiring to a kind of pre-eminence while just changing the term "leading role" to "vanguard role"? We must make this point clear. We consider that this vanguard role cannot be imposed on the community, that it can only be won by an active struggle for the interests of the working people, by actual performance and by the Party's entire political and moral image. The CPSU will pursue its policy and work to retain the mandate of the ruling party within the bounds of the democratic process, involving elections for legislative institutions at national and local level. In this sense it will operate as a parliamentary party.

The most difficult task before the Party today is to square its influence with the new political and organisational opportunities. We must proceed from the principle that the Party does not interfere in performing the duties of government bodies. And that means it will bear no responsibility for the decisions taken without consulting it and will reserve the right to criticise them in public.

Primary Party organisations do not think they can—and in fact no longer have the right to—control the management of enterprises and offices, the staff of ministries and departments or of government and economic bodies. However, the Party organisations cannot avert their gaze from what is happening in the work collectives or in different regions. They have to learn to influence the carrying out of various tasks by resorting to new political and organisational methods through Communists and, primarily, through communist executives. The new role of Party organisations is to collectively work out at meetings, congresses, conferences and plenary meetings their stands on the major issues in the life of society, to inform the respective state and managerial bodies about them, explain these stands at public discussions and orientate Communists towards upholding them in practical terms. The scale of the CPSU's influence will be determined, above all, by the strength of ideas advanced by the Party

and by their attractiveness for the working people.

Now about our relations with other political parties and public movements. I think our Congress will definitely come out in favour of broad cooperation with all progressive parties and public movements, and consolidation in the interests of perestroika and the people. All problems of public concern can be discussed and ways of achieving mutual understanding and joint action can be sought within the framework of such cooperation. I am convinced that the country would benefit immensely from the alliance in central and local government bodies of democratic forces and all those who are sincerely interested in profound social reform in conditions of political stability and civic and interethnic accord.

On the attitude to mass public organisations. Relations with the trade unions have always been of paramount importance to our Party. After all it is in fact a question of the Party's social base, of having direct contact with, and feedback from, millions of factory and office workers and, in the past few years, of farmers as well, in view of the emergence of trade union organisations in the countryside.

Working people's organisations, called upon above all to defend their economic interests and rights and to oppose, as Lenin put it, "administrative exaggerations" have always had an important place in the life of our society. But, as is known, they performed primarily auxiliary functions and were placed in a subordinate position. This also accorded with the traditional image of the trade unions as "levers", "conveyor belts" and so on. Such an approach has naturally distorted to a certain extent the very purpose of the trade unions, and is unacceptable at a time when society is being transformed and democratised.

As a matter of fact, relations between the Party and the trade unions are already changing. Long gone are the times when the latter meekly followed the instructions of Party bosses and at many enterprises were merely a kind of appendage to the managers.

The trade unions were late in beginning their restructuring, but this process is gathering momentum at present. Nevertheless, this procrastination and adherence to old methods of and mechanisms for interacting with the mass of rank and file members have in some cases sapped the workers' belief in the ability of trade union

committees to defend their legitimate interests. As a result the period of social tension saw the emergence of parallel structures—i.e. strike committees, which expanded their functions in view of the helplessness of government bodies and trade unions.

In fact we are witnessing the rebirth of the working-class movement in the Soviet Union. It is a question of exceptional importance which has a direct bearing on the fate of the Party, and it has to be dealt with seriously.

Decades of domination by the administrative-command system have alienated the working class from property and power. Workers suspect that, as before, some people want to manipulate them, by merely changing tactics and their way of dealing with them. Hence one task in the renewal of the Party is to complete the dismantling of the old command mechanism in its relations with the working class and to prove in deed that the Party is ready to defend its interests and just demands at all levels and to support its direct representatives in parliamentary campaigns and political activity at nationwide and local levels.

The touchstone for the Party's ability to defend the interests of the working people will be its success in ensuring that their living standards do not fall, especially those of the low-paid sections of the population, in the course of transition to the market economy.

What is needed here is constant effective contact with the mass of the people, competence and political skill in order to uphold the interests of this or that section of the working people, and give a free rein to progress and the dynamics of perestroika.

The Party will build its relations with the trade unions and other working-class organisations on the basis of partnership and comradeship. Far from interfering in trade unions' internal affairs, the Party committees should use their utmost influence to support their justified demands and initiatives.

Among other mass organisations special mention should be made of the Young Communist League. This organisation is closest to the Party and, if you like, akin to it both ideologically and politically. Our comrades in the Young Communist League are now going through a difficult period, as could be seen during its recent Congress. It became the scene of heated debates on whether or not the Komsomol should exist and, if it were to exist, what

sort of an organisation it should be and whether or not it would be able to transform itself radically, while retaining the best of its traditions.

The Young Communist League, just like the Party, has in fact to undergo a similar process of self-purification and break with all the negative trends it had in the past. I am not sure whether the YCL members will agree with me, but I am under the impression that they have not fully succeeded in doing that. Nevertheless, efforts have already been made to transform and restructure the Komsomol. And the main problem that the Komsomol has already resolved for itself is that it remains organically linked with the CPSU ideologically and politically. This is important to the Party as a matter of principle.

In today's conditions we should, of course, abandon the habit of seeing the Komsomol as the monopoly representative of all young people. Along with new parties, new youth organisations will obviously come into being. Ideological and political campaigns to attract the youth will flare up. We should, naturally, give all-out support to the Young Communist League organisations, while fully respecting their independence. To carry on as before would simply mean to lose the younger generation.

The problems of relations between the renewed CPSU and other public organisations lead us on to the broader topic of the modern social base of the Party. It was said during the pre-Congress debate that the CPSU should make it clear whose party it was. Claims to express the interests of all the social strata were said to be allegedly groundless because those interests far from coincided and in many instances were in conflict with each other.

This is a serious argument. Indeed we categorically denied differentiation and divergent social interests in the past. The slogan of the moral and political unity of society, as it were, supplanted the need to see the actual diversity of social needs and aspirations. Today we not only recognise this fact but are also building a political system within which various interests could be harmonised.

At the same time, alongside professional, national, age-group and other specific interests, the Soviet people obviously have common interests which cement millions of individuals into a single whole. We see the innermost meaning of perestroika as being to use democratisation

to reveal the huge potential of the country as a whole and on this basis to satisfy public interests at the level of developed modern states.

We are a party of perestroika and therefore the CPSU is acting today as the political organisation of the entire people. I want to stress that it is by no means a matter of bringing back to life antiquated and inadmissible claims to monopoly camouflaged by new slogans. Reflecting the interests of the entire people, the CPSU, as a party opting for socialism, will continue to rely on the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia.

The Party's attitude to women also requires radical rethinking. We have to admit that the women's question is among the most burning issues facing us. Despite all the slogans, of which there have been more than enough since the 27th Congress of the CPSU, the working and living conditions of our women require considerable attention and radical improvement. This is one of the key issues. And something that especially cannot be tolerated is the fact that women are taking a minuscule part in political life. I think we should be ashamed of ourselves, seeing that women are taking an active part in big politics in many countries. And just take a look at this assembly—how many women are there among the delegates? Let's wait for the report of the Chairman of the Mandate Committee to make it known. And how many of them are to be found in our government? We have neglected this matter to such an extent that the latest attempts have had next to no effect on the situation. Perhaps we should take real steps right now at this Congress to have women represented in the Central Committee, on the Politburo and in the Central Committee Secretariat. We should, perhaps, set up a department for work among women when reorganising the CPSU Central Committee at the present stage. I think women support this idea; they are applauding.

There is no doubt that the strengthening of women's organisations will be a new phenomenon resulting from the democratisation of society. We should welcome and support this process in every way. It is a matter of honour for men (this is how the question of men's honour is put) to do their utmost to ease the situation of women, though much can be done by the women themselves if they succeed in organising themselves.

Now let me turn to another important social pillar of the Party—the war veterans and veterans of labour. The CPSU is maintaining a firm position among them. We have to cherish the support given to us by the veterans and to draw them in active Party and political life in general. They are the people who demonstrated their patriotism in the most difficult times and who, as a rule, hold firm civic positions.

On the Communist Parties of the Union republics. I think the delegates to the Congress will agree that this is the most topical issue of the moment, not only from the organisational point of view, but because it has a bearing on the very nature of our Party as an internationalist organisation. It was founded by Lenin as such and has for many decades acted as a cementing force in our multinational state. It is therefore a matter of principle that the Party maintains precisely this nature, because otherwise the country, the state and the Party itself will suffer great and perhaps irreparable losses.

There is, probably, no doubt about our principled approach in trying to resolve the problems that arise. We proceed from the fact that the integrity of the CPSU accords with the maximum independence of the Communist Parties of the Union republics and autonomous units, in no way restricts their opportunities to take into account national, historical, local and other peculiarities, and to decide their personnel, financial and other matters on their own. But, as these problems are intermingled with the transformation of our Union, different tendencies exist here which advocate anything from turning the Party into a federal organisation to complete secession.

You know the situation in the Baltic republics. Despite all the measures taken by the Central Committee, we have failed to prevent the split in the parties between those adhering to the CPSU platform and those which have seceded from the CPSU. As a result the communist movement has been weakened drastically in those republics and other political forces have come to power there.

If we allow ourselves to be drawn now into a split and disunity, this will defeat the communist movement, weaken it and open opportunities for other political forces to strengthen their positions. We all have to learn a lesson from these developments and try to find new approaches towards strengthening the interethnic integrity of the

CPSU. I do not exclude the Communist Parties of those republics. The draft Rules already envisage the setting up of some mechanisms to coordinate the interests of the republican Communist Parties with those of the Party as a whole. We should also think of the corresponding procedures in making principled political decisions. It is important to see to it that no party places itself above any other, nor has the opportunity to impose its will upon others.

Many delegates to our Congress have had a chance to take part in, or observe the work of, the Conference which proclaimed itself the Founding Congress of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation. It concentrated on Communists' concern about the fate of the country, the formidable problems faced by the republic and the desire to make use of the opportunities of the newly founded party in the republic to promote the rebirth of Russia and her numerous nationalities and the strengthening of our multinational state. I consider it important to record in the Congress documents the desire of the Communists of the Russian Federation to work towards strengthening the CPSU as an integral nationwide party and to cooperate on an equal basis with the Communist Parties of other republics. I think we should welcome this principled position of the Communists of the Russian Federation.

As for the interaction of the constituent parts of the CPSU, I am sure we will be able to cope with all the tasks facing us, if we remember the most important thing—united, Communists form a powerful political force, but they will lose this advantage, if they confine themselves to their national homelands.

Territorial or production principle. The answer to the question of whether production units should have their Party organisations is unequivocally positive. Historically, our Party acted on the basis of workers' collectives, and herein lie its roots and sources. The production principle of the organisation of the CPSU is in keeping with the existing stable tradition, and we see no reason to renounce it. Furthermore, the Communists themselves have the right to determine the forms of their organisation. Needless to say, this fully applies to the members of other parties.

While advocating the production principle of the struc-

ture of the CPSU, the Party organisations should at the same time improve their work at places of residence. It should be admitted that the territorial principle has been poorly used by the Party. This was borne out, among other things, by the election of people's deputies. And the focus of political work in the course of such major political campaigns shifts precisely to the place of residence.

Recently many people have brought up sharply the problem of depoliticisation of the organs of state administration, courts, the procurator's offices and other law-enforcing bodies, and also of the army. Our position in this respect is determined by the fact that the right to association is one of the inalienable political freedoms. Nobody can forbid Party members to set up their own primary organisations at enterprises, offices and so on.

It is hard to imagine depoliticised state bodies, there is hardly an army in the world without agencies responsible for upholding its soldiers' and officers' morale and educating them. We lay no claims to any exclusiveness in this respect either—this is the legitimate right of all the parties which are to be legally registered in this country. Such is our approach.

On democratic centralism. In the past this Leninist principle was in fact replaced by bureaucratic centralism. An end has been put to this once and for all. By rebuilding our Party, we are creating conditions for the comprehensive development of inner-Party democracy, self-government and the control of Party members over the activity of the ruling bodies with the voluntary and reasonable observance of conscious discipline.

There are powerful tendencies in the Party which favour excluding this principle from the Party Rules, as it has been discredited by all the preceding practices. But many are in favour of retaining it because they see in its renunciation the danger of turning the Party into a debating club. I think that in the first case comrades want to part with the terms used in the past. But no real Communist wants to turn our Party into a formless organisation in which everything may drown in discussion and it will prove to be incapable of solving the tremendous tasks facing it as a political party.

The Congress has to make the choice. Let us discuss the problem and get to the heart of the matter. There are proposals on this score both in the programme statement

and in the draft Rules. The Rules should formalise principles to guarantee democracy, the capability of the Party, and the mandatory nature of the resolutions adopted by the majority.

Another question of principle, that of factions, is connected with this. We have taken a tremendous step forward in the development of democracy and inner-Party glasnost and openness. All attempts to suppress different opinions have been denounced. But there is a threshold which, if crossed, would cripple the Party. And that is to form factions with their own special discipline.

Let me specify this point. When speaking about the inadmissibility of forming that kind of factions, we allow for the Party members who have their own point of view on certain issues differing from that of the majority to discuss and popularise it freely and express it publicly and even address Party congresses. Let us make it clear that we have an understanding on this score.

On the power of the Party rank and file. Party reform essentially boils down to ensuring in deed the power of the Party rank and file and their real influence on Party policy. To ensure this we have to change radically the situation of the primary Party organisations.

Practically everything which was suggested in this respect during pre-Congress debates has been taken into account in the draft of the new Party Rules. It is being recorded that all primary Party organisations are free to organise their inner life on their own. Their decisions, in case they do not run counter to the aims of the CPSU programme or the Party Rules, cannot be cancelled by higher organs, with the exception of resolutions on personal cases. Any regulation of the activity of the primary Party organisations is to be abolished. They are to be responsible for admittance of members to the CPSU and are granted the right to the final judgement of the activity of any Communist registered in his or her primary Party organisation.

Financial problems shall be settled in a fundamentally new way. The primary Party organisations can themselves settle the problems of their structure, programmes and forms of activity.

Draft Party resolutions on key problems should be brought to the attention of Communists more frequently and Party discussions should be held regularly. The pro-

cedure for holding party referendums both within the entire CPSU and within its organisations should be evolved without delay so as to reveal quickly the will of the Communists.

The democratic principles of the electoral system in the Party should be strengthened. We have the initial experience of direct election of the delegates to the CPSU Congress, the congresses of the Communist Parties of the Union republics and the Party conferences. Direct elections of Party secretaries at meetings, conferences and congresses have gained currency on the eve of our Congress. Alternative elections have become the norm. All this experience calls for scrupulous and calm analysis.

An important step has been taken in the democratic development of the Party. It would be wrong, however, to close our eyes to the fact that the spontaneous election campaign was rather hard on workers, peasants, women and young Communists. Obviously, we have to think seriously about the suggested direct representation of primary and other Party organisations in the higher Party organs. Let us discuss this.

The structure of the Party's central organs is a special question. Proposals on this score which are contained in the draft programme statement and the draft Rules met no strong objections, although there were some. There is an opinion that new aspects of the Party building connected with the independence of the Communist Parties of the Union republics have not been properly taken into consideration, and that the Presidium of the Central Committee does not look sufficiently effective. This issue was rather thoroughly discussed on the eve of the Congress at the council of representatives of the delegations, and on their behalf I'm informing you that, as comrades believe, the majority of the Communists still do not favour the establishment of the Presidium and the institution of the posts of the Chairman of the Party and his Deputies, but are for retaining the Politburo and the post of the General Secretary elected by the Congress, and for the election of the Deputy General Secretary of the Central Committee as the second person in the Party leadership.

I think I convey the opinion of the council of representatives of the delegations correctly. We should discuss and solve these problems that are important for the Party.

The Party Central Committee in the period since the previous congress. The CPSU Central Committee in its present composition had to cope with the tasks of perestroika in conditions where developments constantly made it look for new approaches and revise what seemed to be already well thought out and clear-cut. If we read today the documents of the 27th Party Congress, we can see that life has left far behind the most daring of the ideas we were capable of generating then.

In the period under consideration the Party Central Committee worked intensely enough. It has held 21 plenary meetings, which is twice the number prescribed by the Rules for a five-year period, which, incidentally, has not yet been completed. Practically each of them was important in principle, important for every stage we passed through. Not only the atmosphere but also the topics of the problems under discussion and the contents of debates at the plenary meetings have radically changed the nature of activity of the Central Committee in the years since the 27th Congress. All the latest plenary meetings have become the scene of open, straightforward and often impartial discussion.

As a different assessment has been given to the fact, I would like to stress that, for all the diversity of opinions, opposing positions and even differences, the plenary meetings adopted unanimous decisions on all the issues of principle and we moved unswervingly forward step by step. This rather goes to show that the Central Committee, for all that it has been criticised for, has done much to advance the policy of perestroika and the process of the revolutionary reform.

Taking into consideration the most complicated period in the development of our society, the novelty and scale of problems we had to tackle in that period and the somewhat dramatic nature of events, we can state with full responsibility that the present Central Committee elected by the 27th Party Congress has in the main coped with the tasks with which it has been entrusted.

Does it disprove, comrades, what has been said earlier in the report, specifically, that this Central Committee has made mistakes, and in some cases has failed to respond to the demands of life and to come up with correct and timely answers to the problems posed by our dynamic time? Of course not. This should be seen as a shortcom-

ing in the work of the Party's leadership, and of many Central Committee members for that matter, since their work locally has also been sharply criticised by Communists.

The delegates may, of course, make their own judgements about the work of the Central Committee as a whole and its individual members in the posts they held. Besides, as I have already said, you will have a chance to form your own opinion of the work of the Politburo members after you have heard their reports. I would merely like to stress that the results of the political activity of both the Central Committee and the members of the CPSU leadership should be judged by the scale of perestroika and their contribution to the revolutionary transformations.

The present Central Committee has proved capable of setting forth the policy of transformations and of making a tremendous effort to carry them through. I repeat that considerably more could have been done and thus society could have been rid of many negative phenomena which have resulted in social tensions and which compel us now to search for a way out.

A lot of criticism has been voiced with regard to many of us and probably will be added at the Congress. After all, criticism also embodies polemics and the clash of ideas, which reflect the state of the Party and society. Only reality itself can make everything ultimately clear in one or another debate.

We should maintain, as before, the healthy atmosphere at all Party levels, preserve the spirit of debate, ensuring its fruitfulness, and, most important, ensuring Party comradeship, Party ethics, something we have lacked all these years. We have to master political culture, for it is only in this way that we can hope to discuss problems constructively and to arrive at the necessary joint decisions. And, in general, it is important that at our forums, especially such a high forum as this, the absence of arguments or analytical data should not be made up for, or replaced, with pungent expressions.

I am drawing my report to a close.

We, comrades, face most difficult problems, and the Party sees their solution and a way out of the crisis situation only by moving forward along the road of further democratisation and by the deepening of perestroika.

**SPEECH BY MIKHAIL GORBACHEV**  
**CONCERNING THE RESULTS OF THE**  
**DISCUSSION OF THE CPSU CENTRAL**  
**COMMITTEE POLITICAL REPORT TO THE 28TH**  
**PARTY CONGRESS**

The discussion is only getting under way, and there is a great deal still ahead. It has been going on both in this hall and in the working groups and commissions in which the Congress delegates are closely involved. Taking into account also the debates at our meetings with delegates—workers, peasants, secretaries of Party organisations and Party committees at district and city levels, and agrarian specialists—we can say that the Congress has raised a lot of issues. On the one hand, it confirmed what we already knew about processes developing in this country. On the other hand, it added a great deal to our knowledge, especially about the possible consequences if certain tendencies gain ground in our society.

It is not my aim now to sum up the results fully. This will probably have to be done after the Congress by a newly-elected Party Central Committee and its agencies, and by Party committees at every level. It is not easy to sum everything up at once. But I shall say what I feel, think and see at this moment.

The discussion as a whole reflected states of mind, the situation in the economy, the social sphere and political life, and the tensions of perestroika processes under way in the country. There were many superficial, incidental and overly emotional things said during the debate—either out of excessive anxiety, in anger or due to an inability to argue. Well, we shall all have to learn. Such is our reality.

I would single out the most important issues which were in the focus of the debate, which prompted the most heated arguments and the most questions. I think it is correct to pose the question in the following way: what lessons can be drawn already today from the discussion, from what is happening at our Congress?

The first thing that should be stressed is that with a few exceptions, the political course of perestroika, the course of renewing our entire society in the context of the socialist choice, is not put to doubt and is supported by the Congress. Most delegates realise that this course has been put by life itself and that, materialising in policies in every area—from the economy to culture—it has already led to sweeping changes in society and continues to influence our development greatly. My position—and it should be completely clear to you—is as follows. Despite the mistakes, miscalculations and foot-dragging, which delegates here were right to point out and sharply criticise, because this has cost society and the Party a great deal, and despite the dramatic situation in the country today, I consider the overall results of the changes to be substantial and progressive.

There were clashes of opinion at the Congress about the achievements of perestroika. Some people attempted to weigh it on a scales, using the four rules of arithmetic. This is not a serious approach, comrades. Such a phenomenon as perestroika, a revolutionary change in society, should be judged by new criteria, by historical criteria.

Those who really understand that perestroika is essential and that it is a revolution rather than a facelift, realise that we still have a great deal to overcome. While accepting criticism, however sharp, in relation to the initiators of perestroika and being aware of critical attitudes to the Central Committee's Report, I do not renounce anything in it because it is thoroughly considered and balanced.

The principal positive result is that society has won freedom, which unfettered popular energies, offered scope for ideas previously gripped in the vice of dogma and old formulas, gave vent to concern about the future of the nation and the future of socialism, and made it possible to involve millions of people in politics and launch vital changes. Without freedom, this Congress would not have been held, or at least would not have been held in the atmosphere we have here now.

Not all that accumulated in the stifling and repressive atmosphere of Stalinism and stagnation, and is now surfacing, is pleasant or constructive. But this has to be reckoned with. This is what revolution is all about. Its

primary function is always to give people freedom. And perestroika, with its democratisation and glasnost, has already fulfilled this primary task.

Society needs spiritual revival just as it needs oxygen. This is taking place right before our eyes. With all the miscalculations involved in this process, it has already exerted a huge impact. Society has changed. All of us have changed. It is entirely another matter that neither the Party nor the country as a whole, neither the old nor the newly formed organisations and movements, nor our new authorities, none of us, comrades, have yet learned how to use the freedom we have gained.

Therefore the priority task is to learn sooner and better how to do this.

We have made considerable progress in political reform. We have created new government structures from top to bottom on the basis of the democratic expression of the people's will. They are still being perfected, but they have already started to take effect, giving real substance to our democracy, to the concept of a law-governed state. It has been said more than once during these few days that there are many shortcomings in the work of these new structures, that experience is lacking, that procedures and mechanisms are not yet operating smoothly and that political culture, competence and specific knowledge are lacking at times. The process of forming the personnel corps of the Soviets has not yet been completed. Nevertheless, the new Soviets got down to business, People's Deputies assumed a more responsible attitude and are striving to tackle the specific problems and attend to the needs of the people as soon as possible.

In this way real Soviet power is being restored, and this is a gratifying factor, one of the most important achievements of perestroika, in which Communists and Party organisations have been taking and continue to take part. But still sometimes there is a certain distance, I would even say coolness, between Soviets and the Party. And here Communists should be more attentive. They should first of all consider their own attitude. One should always begin with himself. The Communists should consider whether this alienation is linked with the fact that we still cannot abandon the old methods of dealing with local Soviets, methods inherited from the command-and-

administrative system. New government bodies, in turn, are very touchy about such methods.

I said in the Report and would like to repeat again that the consolidation of legality, putting things in order, and the creation of a mechanism by means of which the decrees and resolutions will be implemented, are now directly related to the early achievement of full power and rights by the Soviets at every level. It is the sacred duty of the Party, of Party organisations and committees and of Communists working in the Soviets and production collectives to assist in this. But at the same time, I would urge the deputies to the Soviets to act constructively, within the framework of the Constitution and the law. I address them first of all as President. To be perfectly honest, some deputies have begun to assume a confrontational stand, and this can bode nothing good. It is bad if Communists fail to understand what the renewed Soviets now mean, and that they themselves should contribute to normalising the situation in the interests of the people. It is also bad if the Soviets fail to see the need to cooperate with Party organisations.

As regards another lesson learned from the debate, I would go along with the appraisals made by those delegates who, while supporting perestroika, made many critical remarks about this line not always being pursued consistently. Many important decisions and laws which should have guided social processes and precluded the emergence of negative phenomena have not been fulfilled. All this should be thoroughly considered and conclusions be drawn.

It so happened that when trying to react promptly to the requirements of life, to work out urgently-needed laws and decisions, we gave little attention to their fulfillment. In fact, a real mechanism for this has not been created. Hence it became apparent that there was a need for presidential power and that there was a need to proceed faster with political reform, to create new Soviets, for without them all these laws were not working.

The centre is to blame for this to a considerable degree. But I also want to mention the responsibilities of comrades working at republican and local levels. There is no need for us to shift the blame onto the local bodies, nor for them to shift the blame onto the centre. We

should cooperate, to combine efforts and not to look for culprits somewhere.

Many things can perhaps be explained by the fact that comrades in the republics and localities, and, let us not deny it, in the centre too, became confused, even shocked. And then there was a relapse to the old ailment—lack of initiative and independent approaches, and the inability to act in unconventional ways in conditions of democracy, in unusual circumstances.

And I would like to say about this for the following reason. All the difficulties in the way of perestroika, and the fact that new organs encounter difficulties starting up and gaining momentum, should not be explained only by the resistance of those who refuse to accept perestroika. There is no denying that such people exist, and I spoke of them in the Report, at meetings with workers and with secretaries of Party organisations. But many people have yet to understand the present situation.

And now we are talking about a crisis in the Party. Its roots are none other than the inability, and in a number of cases unwillingness, to understand that we are living and working in a new society characterised by unprecedented politisation, in a society with broad and practically unlimited glasnost, and freedom unprecedented throughout its entire history. Meanwhile, many Party organisations and Communists continue to use the customary methods inherited from the past which are holding us back. And if any of the delegates, and going by the speeches there are some such delegates among us, came to the Congress hoping to take the Party back to the old command and order situation, I must say that they are deeply mistaken. We should devote every hour to advancing perestroika and adjusting our work to new conditions.

The Party will be the vanguard of society and will be able to act successfully only if it is wholly aware of its new role, completes its democratic reforms rapidly and learns to work with the masses in a new way more promptly. It is necessary to overcome the alienation from the people we have inherited from the past. This is to be achieved first of all by renewal of the activity of primary Party organisations, by appointing new personnel and by enhancing their authority.

I am deeply upset by the misunderstanding that has

emerged here. We shall fail to advance, to consolidate the Party's positions, to offer an effective policy to society and thus impart fresh dynamism to perestroika, unless we do not realise that everything that went on in the past is now outdated and unacceptable. From the atmosphere of the Congress, from many speeches and the methods of debating used by some delegates, I sensed that not everyone by any means has understood that the Party is living and working in a different society, that a different Party, a renewed one, with a different style of work is needed. We are not changing our line or our choice and are committed to socialist values. But, believe me, the Party's success depends on whether it realises that this is already a different society. Otherwise it will be ousted by other forces and we shall lose ground. We now have immense opportunities and it is important to realise the main thing, namely, that we shall not be able to achieve much without renewal, democratisation or the strengthening of the live link with the people or without active work among the masses.

I spoke a lot with comrades personally during the Congress and I must say that I have felt a better understanding of the unconventional and novel nature of the situation in which the Party has found itself on the part of, so to speak, rank-and-file comrades—workers, farmers, intellectuals, and secretaries of primary Party organisations. Generally speaking, though, this is an expression from the lexicon of the past, and, perhaps, I should not have used it.

Comrade Gaivoronsky from Donetsk spoke here. He correctly stressed that the most important thing is for the Party to extend its broad and deep contacts with the working class. This also became evident at a meeting with workers, both delegates and those invited to the Congress. Party committees, including the Central Committee, are to blame for the fact that during major political campaigns they were unable to defend the interests of the working class properly. They procrastinated over their attitude towards new forms emerging in the working-class movement. We have lost a great deal because of that. The working class has put this question right at our feet.

Another lesson from the discussion is that we must continue to act in the main directions of perestroika. The

Party and state leadership were scathingly criticised for the economic situation, the state of affairs with the market and the provision of goods for the population.

The solution of the food problem is the key task in this respect and I would put it at the top of the agenda. Once we remove its urgency, 70-80 per cent of tension in society—the transition to a regulated market and the housing shortage—will be eased as well.

In this connection, and I will not try to hide that, I was worried when three-quarters of the Congress delegates decided to change the name of the commission for economic reform and to exclude the word "market" from it. This means that there is a persistent lack of understanding of the need for an abrupt change of direction aimed at radically altering the economic situation, proposed to society.

Has our entire history not shown, comrades, the futility of attempts to get out of the plight in which both the state and citizens have found themselves by patching up the command-and-administrative system? We have already incurred tremendous losses by clinging to it stubbornly for decades and continuing to do so even now, thereby slowing down the process of renewal and the transition to new forms of economic life in the country. If we continue to act in this way, then, and I shall be perfectly honest about this, we will bankrupt the country. I am expressing my views explicitly.

The advantages of the market economy have been proven on a world scale and the question now is only whether a high level of social security—which is characteristic of our socialist system, the system for the working people—can be ensured under market conditions. The answer is this: it is not only possible but it is precisely a regulated market economy that will make it possible to increase social wealth and consequently to raise everyone's living standards. We hold state power and can therefore make laws and take decisions to shape the process of the transition to market relations.

Of course, the market has to be formed before its advantages can manifest themselves in full. The most complex task during this period is to work out and take a series of special measures aimed at social security, particularly for the lowest income groups. The Report mentioned that people were frightened by the way in which

the intention to move to a market economy was announced. They visualise a market in terms of high prices, rather than shop shelves with a plentiful supply of goods. From the beginning I insisted that raising prices was not the way to proceed. But when launching the reform, one should bear in mind that there can be no transition to a market without price reform. Basically, we should rectify this impression and, most importantly, submit well-thought-out proposals to both the Supreme Soviet and society as a whole by September, so that they can determine their attitude and make the choice.

I have already had an opportunity to answer, in detail, questions concerning agrarian policy. These issues were raised here urgently and were, I feel, supported by the entire audience. On the whole, we made considerable headway during our meeting with agrarian workers, formulating an understanding of what action is to be taken in the agrarian sphere. We have already begun to take specific measures. On Monday, Nikolai Ryzhkov signed a decision to write off the debts of rural areas.

I have expressed my own attitude: here at this Congress we must take up a political position with regard to farmers and to the rural areas, and not just on the question of food supplies, which constitutes only part of the problem. Once the countryside is standing solidly on its own two feet, once our farmers become confident, start to live well and get an opportunity to work with initiative, the food issue will be resolved more quickly.

As far as the agrarian question is concerned, I still felt that there was no full understanding of the issue. Moreover, two main approaches to the revitalization of the countryside have been opposed to each other. What I am referring to is, on the one hand, the reorganisation of relations of production on the strength of the laws on ownership, land and lease arrangements, and, on the other hand, assistance to rural areas in the provision of social amenities and facilities, the construction of roads, production of farm machinery, etc. There are some people who are, it seems, trying deliberately to provoke a negative attitude to Party policy set out at the March Plenary Meeting and who try, by hook or by crook, to create the impression that the leadership does not want to help the countryside. Moreover, I heard this remark from the audience: "Gorbachev should be put at the

head of the agrarian commission because he does not like agriculture." That was quite a suggestion! Do I look like a person who does not like agriculture?

You know that I am no proponent of strong language, but in this case I have to say that such things are either the result of the lack of understanding or are prompted by unseemly considerations. I repeat from this rostrum for the Congress, the Party and the entire country to hear: our position is, first, that it is essential to give full freedom to all types of economic management in the countryside on the basis of totally free choice. Second, it is necessary to establish reasonable exchanges between town and countryside, industry and agriculture, exchanges which would promote the revitalisation of the countryside within the shortest possible period of time. Third, the state should promote as comprehensively as it can a solution to the urgent problems of the countryside, primarily the creation of decent living conditions for our farmers. These are the three major strategies, with the help of which it is possible to revive the countryside and provide the country with food. None of these principles can be removed from this threesome because the entire system would collapse.

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

Yet another two subjects were raised here urgently and it was not easy to listen to them because they concerned people's life and have already had damaging consequences. They are, to begin with, the ecological problem, one of the most acute problems today. We should not put off its solution. We came to realize its acuteness too late. But a great deal, comrades, can still be put right. This is illustrated by experience abroad as well.

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

Therefore, however hard the situation we now find our-

selves in, it is necessary to allocate large funds to nature conservation, regarding it absolutely on a par with such vital tasks as the provision of people with food and housing.

Clean air and water are no less essential for people than bread, comrades. Of course, I think state programmes will be needed to tackle ecology as a whole and specific major ecological problems.

The aftermath of the Chernobyl accident is harrowing for all of us. Comrades from Byelorussia, the Ukraine and Bryansk Region must come to realise that we stand alongside them in their misfortune.

We have come up against a situation that confronts us with more and more problems, and this is a cause for deep reflection. Just one reactor, and what consequences! Imagine what would happen if a nuclear war broke out. Nuclear reactors would be destroyed even in a conventional war, and the consequences would be far more grave than those at Chernobyl. A huge country like ours is unable to cope with these consequences at one swoop. Billions of roubles have been spent, and more will be spent, but new needs are constantly emerging.

I want the people in Byelorussia, the Ukraine and Bryansk Region to hear my words, I want them to know that the entire country is by their side, is aware of their tragedy and will continue to help. Similarly, we have mentioned the Aral problem, and the people there should feel that we will come to their aid as well.

The delegates are rightly concerned about what is going on in the spiritual sphere, in culture, science and education. I have received dozens of collective letters from intellectuals. It is not merely a matter of the material base, which is lagging behind, although this too should be borne in mind. I hope the Congress will state firmly that we should support the development and promotion of our culture, science, education, art and literature.

I fully share the concern of those teachers who spoke here at the Congress that the genuine revival of our schools is crucial for the country's future. There is a direct dependence—we will never be able to create a prosperous economy, raise our science and technology to world standards or succeed in the fight against alcoholism, drug abuse and moral decline, unless we attach

proper priority to education and enhance the role of the teacher.

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

Bluntly speaking, we have had our share of rude treatment too. All of us still lack arguments and constructive proposals. We have not as yet made sufficient progress here.

I do not doubt the gravity of the situation in some spheres of intellectual development. And I share the alarm over moral standards that are incompatible with the ideals of humane socialism and which have become widespread. This is not only a legacy of the past but also the result, I repeat, of the explosive nature of freedom which society regained all of a sudden, after being confined for a long time, as it were, in a room full of stale air. We were simply unaware of many things. The Party, intellectuals, schools and our entire system of cultural and educational establishments must devote a great deal of attention to all this. This is so.

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

The ideology of socialism is not a textbook where everything is divided into sections by chapters, paragraphs, rules and principles. It will take shape together with socialism itself, as we work to create a well-fed, well-housed, civilised, spiritually rich, free and happy country, as we come to embrace universal human values again, not as something alien from the class point of view, but as something normal for mankind. These values have been worked out over centuries and millennia. What their neglect has brought us is well known.

The ideology of socialism will take shape as the country becomes integrated into the general progress of civ-

ilisation. It is for this reason that the new thinking, which is being accepted in the world as our new internationalism, bringing the world together rather than splitting it up into opposing camps, underlies the widest possible framework for shaping it.

We have inherited from Marx, Engels and Lenin the top methodology, the dialectical way of thinking, which we will draw on in theory and politics. But we will not allow everything created by the classics to be reduced to just another short course, which some people seem to regret, judging by some speeches. This will not happen. It would be disastrous for perestroika and society.

It struck me that as soon as this rostrum was mounted by a speaker who tried to set the current problems in a philosophical way and look at our work in this context, apathy could be felt in the audience and a slow handclap started. But how have we grown accustomed to simple and straightforward formulas: "to be—not to be", "down with—not down with". Let us think. We are after all a party which claims to be the vanguard of society.

And another lesson to be drawn from the debates. Delegates have brought to the 28th Congress their concern over the instability in society. At the meeting with workers, one said impatiently: "Mikhail Sergeyeovich, Nikolai Ivanovich, answer two questions: When will there be order in the country and when will there be no black-marketeers?" These are seemingly simple questions which need simple answers, but they simply do not exist. I would say that the sooner we saturate the market, the sooner and more effectively the economy starts to work, the quicker we will defeat black-marketeers and the countereconomy.

A regional Party secretary asked: "Can you do what Andropov did?" I replied to this question and can repeat here at the Congress: the fight against profiteering is an 80 per cent economic issue. Where there is no advanced economy, the swindler flourishes. Black market dealers and corrupt elements thrive on shortages.

But does this mean that we should sit with our arms folded until we have tackled these issues? Certainly not. You rightly demand that we reinforce order. I want to demand something of you: let us set in motion the entire system of Soviets that we've been forming for a whole year while the profiteers and criminals have been oper-

ating. Now that the system is formed, let's pool our efforts and really strike back. Stabilisation in society will now be linked precisely to this, to the work of government, economic and Party bodies.

We all should draw a lesson from the fact that we have overlooked a great deal in ethnic relations, we have lost time, and when we noticed this, we were too late to act. I will not try to justify myself. I do not like making excuses. You cannot undo the past, although there were a great many sessions of the Politburo, meetings with Party chiefs and as part of various commissions, and many trips. But evidently, all this was not enough.

The main thing is that we failed to see the danger in time. All of us, let's honestly admit, thought that everything was all right on this score, everything was solved, and we mostly proposed toasts to peoples' friendship. This was our work as far as the nationalities policy was concerned.

Suddenly, we became aware of the problems. But we did not react at once. Neither did we make a correct assessment at once. Only later did a platform appear, on which we could base our work. We must act now without wasting time. We have political assessments and the Party's platform. Many decisions have been adopted by the Supreme Soviet. Lastly, the Council of the Federation has started work and the elaboration of a new Treaty of the Union has got under way.

On behalf of the Communists represented at the Congress, I propose to issue a call to all the peoples of the country: Let's stop, let's stop tempting fate. Let's get down to injecting new vitality into our Union on the basis of documents and approaches that are already clear to all of us. This is the most important thing today. I think everybody will hear us and respond to this call, but it presupposes active work on our part.

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

Our new foreign policy has affected the economy, the

army and defence. We are moving towards reforms in all these areas, including a state programme for the social protection of servicemen. We must do this so that the army could feel the people's concern.

Help needs to be given to our work collectives in the defence industry as well, where the best personnel and teams of scientists are grouped and where there are funds and good opportunities to restructure production within the shortest possible time and get down to producing the high-quality goods the country so badly needs. The entire country stands to benefit from this, especially as regards the retooling of industries turning out consumer goods.

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

One should not let oneself fall under the thumb of political incompetents. There would be trouble. A party that claims to be the vanguard should be a guiding force rather than adapt itself to various sentiments.

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

I am certain that the whole world is paying heed to us as we pursue perestroika and seek to show that our society is capable of being progressive and kindly disposed to all peoples, capable of offering cooperation. This is how we influence the world.

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

And further. Did we act wisely in adjusting and devel-

oping good relations with dozens of countries on all continents? I am sure we did, and they responded in kind. Not only rulers, but peoples as well. One must be blind not to see that.

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

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

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

But there is one delicate point. Those who occupy important state positions and are directly involved in our international activity, even if they disagree with the policy pursued by the country's leadership, are obliged—despite their own opinion—to pursue state policy. It's unthinkable that the President and the government stick to one policy while someone else pursues another. This does not happen in any state. All officials must be loyal to the government. And if they are decent people, they must resign if they disagree with the government policy.

Now about the Party and its fate—the main issue which has brought us here. As far as I am concerned, this is the issue of my whole life and outlook.

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

I will say one thing straight away. Comrades, in essence this criticism is largely justified. I am only against the form. Two extremes are impermissible at this Congress—obsequiousness, on the one hand, and boorishness, on the other. This is all, as for the rest, we must speak plainly.

The conclusion I draw from this is that the impulses

emanating from the Central Committee along all these lines were insufficient. At the same time, a share of the blame belongs to Party committees of all levels.

The time, comrades, has gone for ever when a kind of mandate could be received from the Central Committee to administer a district, city, region or republic, and you could then sit there quietly until your last hour, irrespective of how well you conducted your affairs or what people thought of you. This is the way it used to be here, at the top, the way it used to be at republican and all other levels. We have to admit that. But that time is over and done with, never to return. I am convinced of this. There is no way to bring back the past, and no form of dictatorship—if this crazy idea is still being entertained by anyone—will solve anything.

We are on the right road. We must follow the path firmly and resolutely, overcoming our weaknesses. This is the prime task, and we must work out a policy and tactics which will ensure its accomplishment. No one can take the Party's place here. It can cope with this itself.

What should be done now to increase the authority of the Party, to give us the influence we want? The main thing is to have people who think in a modern way at every post, people who are politically sharp and truly committed to perestroika, not time-servers who readily speak about perestroika, democracy and glasnost but are actually unable and unwilling to work in a new way, and who only seek to dominate as before.

I fully agree with the delegates from among workers who spoke at the Congress in favour of promoting advanced, educated workers who are ardent supporters of perestroika to leading posts. What people perestroika has discovered! Even at the meeting attended by those who represent the working class at the Congress, either as delegates or invited guests, it was clear that they were people capable of thinking things out and analysing them politically. They were not loudmouths, like some who strive to speak "the direct language of the workers", declaring that they come from their midst.

It is, of course, important that we have people from there—from the shopfloor and the like, from any place where our might is being forged, where the foundation on which we all stand is being laid.

Well, we are debating here, voting, arguing, forming a

system, but what does the country rest upon? Workers, farmers and intellectuals who propel the economy forward.

To continue. It is necessary to discard the ossified ideological stereotypes from which some take their guidance not only in debates but also in practical matters. As before, there are still frequent cases of priority being given not to the demands of life and results of work but to keeping one's behaviour consistent with stale dogma.

Adherence to dogma is a special hindrance to the development of new forms of economic management and people's initiative. If we act like this, we are bound to discredit our socialist choice, and the people will turn away from us.

Moreover, the Party will be unable to restructure itself unless we all realise that an end has come to the CPSU's monopoly on power and management. Even if we manage to win a majority in an election—and we can and must act so as to win a majority and maintain our position as the ruling Party—even in this case it is advisable to cooperate with non-Party deputies and representatives of other legally recognised political trends who are sincerely concerned about the future of the country. We must put an end to sectarian moods and this monopoly for ever: we must erase its vestiges from the minds of Party workers and all Communists.

Cooperation is essential. On this score I share the view voiced here by Comrade Luchinsky. In the Central Committee report the question was raised about the desirability under the present conditions of forming a coalition with all democratic and socialist forces. Only by setting aside Party, political and national differences shall we be able to pool all efforts in order to take the country out of the present critical situation and implement far-reaching reforms in every sphere of society.

I am convinced that millions of Communists and the overwhelming majority of Soviet people are looking to us for this—to consolidate the Party itself and all sound political forces which truly care about the welfare of the people.

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

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

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

Some issues were raised very sharply, issues which are crucial for the Party and society. But there were comrades who accused the General Secretary of a policy leading in the wrong direction. They said they did not need the type of foreign policy we have. I completely dismissed these accusations. I will say this: the only accusations that can be made against perestroika are that it is not being implemented resolutely and consistently enough.

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

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

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

**FOR THOROUGHGOING RENEWAL OF  
THE PARTY AND A BROAD COALITION IN  
THE NAME OF PERESTROIKA  
CONCLUDING SPEECH BY MIKHAIL GORBACHEV**

Dear comrades,

The congress has ended its work. The agenda has been exhausted and I have only this to say in conclusion.

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

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

Further, the Party intends to radically change its attitude towards the Soviets, to give up attempts to act in their place, to intensively assist their formation and help People's Deputies resolve problems connected with meeting the essential demands of the population.

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

I can see that this is not easy, and it will probably not be easy to adapt to, but we have made our choice. I believe it is the right and necessary choice, dictated by the very course of perestroika. We extend our hand to everybody who supports democracy and socialism, and call on them to cooperate.

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

At the same time, we resolutely reject all attempts to eradicate everything positive that has been done for the country by several generations of Communists. Those who demand repentance from the Party, who want to settle scores and declare it all but a criminal organisation, are simply trying to remove it from political life and to damage the cause of the revolutionary renovation of society. This is how we see it.

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

During the past few days, much has been said here about how perestroika should proceed further and about its priorities. We finally agreed that priority should be given to drastic measures: the development of the countryside, the solution of the food problem, the elaboration and signing of a new Treaty of the Union, the improvement of the situation on the consumer market, the radicalisation of economic restructuring and the strengthening of discipline and order. These are the things to be addressed at once.

For my part, I want to assure you that I shall use all the constitutional powers of the Soviet President to implement this. We shall not let anybody thwart perestroika.

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

At the recent meeting of leaders of seven Western countries in Houston, they discussed the possibility of

economic support for the Soviet Union. What is our position in this respect? The very fact that such a question is raised not only by the public, but by Western governments, is proof that our striving to overcome self-isolation and to integrate ourselves into the world economy meets with a positive response.

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

Now, about the Party itself.

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

First, it should resolutely and without delay restructure all its activities and structures on the basis of the new Rules and the Policy Statement of the Congress in order to fulfil its role as vanguard effectively in the new conditions. We should do everything to establish the power of the Party's rank and file in the CPSU on the basis of all-embracing democracy, comradeship, openness, glasnost and criticism.

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

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

The Central Committee and I, personally, as General Secretary, will do everything we can to help republican Communist Parties acquire, as soon as possible, a new independent status that will lead not to the dissociation of Communists and nations, but to a new internationalist

unity of the Soviet Communist Party on a common ideological and political basis, in the interests of the integrity of our great multinational state.

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

It is no secret that before the Congress and even during its work, especially at the beginning, apprehensions were voiced both in this country and in the world press that the Soviet Communist Party had lost its capacity for renovation and could not break away from the dogmatism and sectarianism that had penetrated it, and that it was doomed to conservatism and, therefore, to a split and withdrawal from the political arena.

We can say confidently that these apprehensions were not justified. Those who counted on this being the last congress and on holding a funeral for the Soviet Communist Party, were wrong again. The Soviet Communist Party is alive and will continue to live on. It will make its historic contribution to the country's progress and the progress of world civilisation.

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

This is perhaps the most important thing that we can boldly state with deep satisfaction as people who are deeply concerned about their Party, socialism, the Soviet people and their present and future.

Now that we have picked up the right course, we should hold on to it, and not revert to our old habits or go back to the beaten track. This would spell death for the Party. We simply have no right to thwart the hopes of millions of Soviet people who believe in the Party as a political force that is capable of expressing and defending their interests in the new conditions.

Let us prove that the Soviet Communist Party, by restructuring itself, can live up to the people's expectations and then it will restore its prestige and become a real vanguard party whose power lies not in issuing orders, but in influencing minds.

In conclusion, let me wish all of you good health and success and thank you for the work we have done together here, at the Congress.

# **TOWARDS A HUMANE, DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM**

**(Policy Statement of the 28th Congress of the  
CPSU)**

The 28th Congress of the CPSU attaches fundamental importance to the objective evaluation of the current time, and to defining the basic principles of the Party's policy at the present stage with the aim of overcoming the crisis in society and the Party, of renovating and advancing them towards a humane, democratic socialism.

## **I. THE CRISIS IN SOCIETY AND THE PARTY'S STRATEGIC AIMS**

### **Evaluation of the Current Time**

Perestroika has given a start to democratic changes in the country. For all the contradictoriness of the processes of social development, we are witnessing the people's spiritual and political emancipation; people are winning civic and national dignity, and taking the affairs of society and state into their own hands. The myths that clouded people's minds and prevented them from seeing the road ahead, are collapsing. The barriers that fenced the country off from the outside world are being removed. Step by step, in bitter struggle between the old and the new, the way is being paved to release society from its present crisis.

The Congress believes that the basic roots of the crisis are not to be traced to any deficiency in the socialist idea itself, but to the deformations to which that idea was subjected in the past. The étatisation of all aspects of social life and the dictatorship imposed by the top Party-and-government echelon in the name of the proletariat, gave rise to new forms of people's alienation from property and power, and led to misrule and lawlessness. Nature was exploited in a predatory manner. Dogmatism reigned supreme, generating intolerance of any dissent. Contempt was cultivated for historical and cultural treasures and the intellectual wealth of nations. The world was regarded as an arena of irreconcilable confrontation between social systems.

In the 30s, 40s and 50s, distortions of socialist principles were already creating complicated problems in the country's development. In the latter half of the 20th century, when serious changes started being made in the life of the whole of humanity in connection with the scientific and technological revolution, the authoritarian bureaucratic system betrayed its inability to lead the country into the mainstream of world civilisation.

All the same, the insistent need for cardinal change was ignored for a long time. The resolution of the historic conflict was artificially held back by the Party-and-government structure of power, which had isolated itself from the people.

Perestroika signified a radical turn towards a policy aimed at the country's renovation, and its liberation from social structures that were alien to socialism. But it also showed how incredibly difficult it was to simultaneously reconstruct all spheres of life in an enormous country with a population of nearly 300 million. Moreover, some of the decisions and actions of the Party-and-government leadership in recent years turned out to be ill-considered and inconsistent, and in some cases simply erroneous. Miscalculations in investment and export-import policy, in combatting unearned incomes, and in the campaign against alcoholism, and mistakes in organising the cooperative movement have all had adverse consequences.

The old economic mechanism is in the process of being dismantled, but the new mechanism has not yet been created. Control over the circulation of money and the market has largely been lost. The creation of a legal basis for urgent economic and political changes has been unjustifiably delayed. The country is shaken by interethnic conflicts. The prestige of governmental power has declined. Spiritual and moral criteria are being eroded, and the wave of violence and crime is on the rise.

The Central Committee and the Politburo have often tailed behind developments and acted by way of trial and error in making and implementing decisions, and reforming the CPSU.

The Party is going through a complicated period of radical change. The renunciation of its former role as nucleus of the command system of administration, and its newly-shaping character as a socio-political organisation, are being accompanied by a painful sharpening of contradictions, a drop

in activity in many Party branches, a polarisation of opinions and stands, and mounting criticism of the Party.

Various social and political groups and movements are springing up all over the country.

The dogmatic conservative tendency, whose members consider renovation an encroachment upon the principles of socialism and preach a return to authoritarian rule, has become more active. Objectively siding with them is that part of the bureaucratic structures that is incapable of changing course and which sees democratisation as a threat to its political influence and social status, and therefore goes out of its way to try and halt the process of change.

Movements that reject the socialist option are gaining strength and calling for the unrestricted privatisation of public property and the total commercialisation of education, health care, science and culture. There are extremists of a monarchist and even fascist nature.

Various social-democratic trends have become a notable element in the country's social and political life.

National movements in which chauvinist and nationalist sentiments are felt increasingly strongly alongside the democratic tendency, have grown to considerable proportions. Opposing one nation to another, brandishing slogans of separatism and "national exclusiveness", they often express the interests of old or power-seeking new anti-democratic groups.

At the centre of the country's emerging political spectrum are the democratic forces of perestroika who have set their sights on the socialist option. They include the majority of CPSU members and many organisations representing the political and professional interests of the working class, the farmers, the intelligentsia, young people, servicemen and veterans.

At this time of political instability, fraught with social and economic chaos, the Communist Party sees its task in becoming a party of civic concord, ensuring constructive cooperation between the different socio-political forces that have a stake in ending the crisis and restructuring society on democratic lines, in uniting, backing and defending those who create, have created or will create the people's prosperity and spiritual values by honest labour. It opposes forces that want to take society back to the bourgeois system or to a barrack-room order, to immerse the country in anarchy or cause civic confrontation, and disunite nations

and ethnic groups.

The Congress regards a consistent policy of renovating the social system within the framework of the socialist option as the basis of the present-day strategy for advancing towards a prosperous and free society, and of the tactics by which to end the crisis.

### **The Sort of Society We Are Striving For**

The essence of perestroika is to move over from the authoritarian bureaucratic system to a society of humane, democratic socialism. Though difficult, this is the only correct way of securing a worthwhile life and realising the country's material and spiritual potential.

Breaking with everything that is alien to socialism, the CPSU will not accept any negation of the ideals of the October Revolution or a nihilistic attitude towards the revolutionary achievements of the Soviet people. We must clearly distinguish in our country's past between things bred by Stalinism and stagnation, on the one hand, and the tangible achievements of the Soviet peoples, on the other. The Party acknowledges the constructive labour and self-sacrifice of all generations of the working class, the farmers and the intelligentsia, and their dedication to their Motherland. We pay tribute to the sacrifices made by the people in the years of terrible trial.

The CPSU favours a creative approach to the theory and practice of socialism, and their development through the constructive conceptualisation of the historical experience of the 20th century and the legacy of Marx, Engels and Lenin, relieved of its dogmatic interpretation. We consider it essential to make use of the finest achievements of human reason and the world's effective experience of running the economy, resolving social problems and promoting democratic institutions.

The CPSU is a party of the socialist option and communist perspective. We consider this perspective a natural historical orientation in the advancement of civilisation. The Party's social ideal encompasses the humanitarian principles of human culture and the everlasting striving for a better life and social justice.

As we see it, humane and democratic socialism is a society in which:

—the purpose of social development is the human being; it is for him that living and working conditions worthy

of present-day civilisation are being created; the alienation of the individual from political power and from the material and spiritual values created by him is being overcome, and the individual is being actively involved in the social processes;

—diverse forms of property and management help turn the working people into the masters of production, provide strong motivation for high labour productivity, and provide the best conditions for the progress of the productive forces and the rational use of nature; social justice and the social protection of the working people are guaranteed;

—the sole source of power is the sovereign will of the people; the state, subject to control by society, guarantees protection of the rights, freedoms, honour and dignity of the individual, irrespective of his or her social status, sex, age, national background or religion, and free competition of all socio-political forces acting within the law.

This society will consistently work for peaceful and equal cooperation among nations, and respect for the right of every nation to determine its own future.

## **II. THE CPSU'S PROGRAMME OF ACTION**

The policy aims of the CPSU call for urgent anti-crisis measures, as well as a long-term comprehensive policy of reconstructing society. The CPSU will work for these aims by political methods and through conscientious, concerted efforts of Communists, including those active in Soviets and other government bodies, and mass organisations, using its constitutional right to initiate legislation and winning the confidence of the masses.

### **Urgent Anti-Crisis Measures**

The Party recommends the following urgent measures:

First, to elaborate within the current year a new Treaty of the Union of republics as sovereign states, based strictly on their own free will, mutual benefit and freedom of national self-determination, taking account of the specific features and needs of the republics as well as the interests of the Union as a whole.

Second, to carry out the following tasks in the socio-economic field within the next 18 to 24 months:

—to normalise the consumer, and particularly the food, market by means of the quickest possible reorientation of the economy towards the consumer, the all-round encour-

agement of enterprise and initiative, and the importation of commodities; to maintain fixed prices for a number of necessities during the transition to free price-setting;

—to stabilise monetary circulation by means of a financial and credit reform, the sale of stocks and shares to the population, the sale of surplus material resources and housing, an increase in the interest rate on people's savings, the sale of loan certificates against the future delivery of commodities, and the reduction of the state budget deficit to a minimum;

—to provide additional funding for urgent social and economic projects by means of a reasonable reduction of defence expenditures, ineffective capital investments and the upkeep of the administrative apparatus, and by upgrading foreign economic ties;

—to substantially increase housing construction on funds from the Union, republican and local budgets, from enterprises and cooperatives, and by utilising people's savings; to provide low-interest credits;

—to work out effective health-building measures for the people and allocate additional funds for health care, using the resources of enterprises, economic associations, and republican and local Soviets for this purpose;

—to render emergency aid to zones stricken by ecological and natural calamities, and devise effective levers to encourage environmental protection;

—to work out measures to prevent forced migration; to adopt a social status for refugees, who are to be granted the necessary aid.

Third, to resolutely tighten discipline, law and order; to strengthen the fight against crime and promote crime prevention. To use all available means—economic, political and juridical—to combat the shadow economy. To promptly enact laws providing a legal foundation for emergency anti-crisis measures, and elaborate mechanisms to put them into effect.

### **For the Freedom and Well-Being of Man**

The Party regards the provision of worthy living conditions for the Soviet citizen as central to its strategic policy.

**Civil rights and liberties.** The Party stands for:

—realising the rights of man in accordance with internationally recognised standards;

—ruling out any discrimination on ethnic, political or reli-

gious grounds, and also on the grounds of age or sex;

—securing dependable legal protection for the individual, guaranteeing the dignity of every citizen, the inviolability of his home and property, his freedom of choice of profession, place of residence, freedom of entry into and exit from the country, privacy of correspondence and telephone conversations, freedom of speech, the press and information;

—giving the individual the freedom to choose his own outlook and intellectual pursuits, and guaranteeing the freedom of conscience;

—enhancing the role of the court of law and public organisations in the defence of civil rights.

**Labour and well-being.** Honest work is the basis for the well-being of society and each of its members. The Party stands for:

—assuring the right to work and to fair pay in accordance with the final results of an individual's labour, without any restriction; overcoming the egalitarian tendencies and the syndrome of dependence, and uprooting illegal incomes and privileges;

—creating a flexible, modern system of vocational training;

—creating healthy and safe working conditions, and extending vacations as labour productivity increases.

**Social guarantees.** The Party proposes:

—to create an integral government and non-government system of social protection and material support for low-income and large families, to make sure that the level of their income from wages, salaries, pensions and benefits is not lower than the subsistence level;

—to provide for each person socially guaranteed housing, free education, medical care and other social benefits; to simultaneously develop paid services, and to create a housing market;

—to implement large-scale recreational and disease-prevention programmes, to make high-quality medical aid available to the population by fundamentally improving the material and technical facilities used in the public health service, and by providing medicines and medicinal preparations;

—to take sweeping measures to improve women's living and working conditions, to give them the right to a shorter working day, to work in accordance with a convenient schedule, to increase the length of maternity leave, and to

provide additional leave for mothers with many children, and single mothers;

—to increase allocations for the maintenance and development of child-care institutions; to eliminate the shortage of children's goods and ecologically safe food products; to take urgent measures to improve the medical service for children; to lower sickness and the mortality rate among children; to expand state assistance for families with children;

—to assure equal social opportunities for young people about to start out in life on their own, and good prospects for their professional, political and cultural development; to work out programmes for helping young families;

—to improve the position of invalids, veterans, servicemen who have fought abroad in the line of their internationalist duty, the families of servicemen who died in action, and all those who suffered from the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station and in other accidents and natural calamities, and to raise the level of their social and medical service; to implement special programmes for providing them with housing, goods and services.

**Education, science and culture.** In its policy the CPSU gives priority to the development of education, science and culture. By defending freedom of creation, the Party will defend the supreme humanistic values. It is opposed to administration by command in the spiritual sphere or to putting culture, the arts and education upon a purely commercial basis. The Party will work hard for the following:

—the all-round strengthening of the material and technical base of education, science, and culture, an increase in budgetary allocations, the encouragement of social initiatives and donations in the interests of the spiritual development of the population, broad and free cultural and scientific exchanges with foreign countries, and the promotion of physical training and sport;

—the planning and adoption of a state programme to develop the public education system, greater independence for educational institutions; the improvement of the material situation of all those employed in this sphere and the enhancement of their social status and social protection;

—the raising of the level of Soviet science to world standards, more state allocations on basic research; the expansion of state programmes for the development of science and technology, and applying scientific achievements in

work and public life. The Party will encourage the development of modern structures and forms of organisation of scientific work, extirpate bureaucracy and nepotism in science and help strengthen the experimental base of science; it will promote the development of libraries, archives and information technology;

—the placing of cultural values within the reach of all strata of society, the demonstration of a considered attitude towards artistic talents as a national asset and towards the cultural heritage of the peoples of the USSR, the raising of the level of general aesthetic education and closing the cultural gap between urban and rural areas;

—the planning and adoption of legislative acts that will regulate activities in the sphere of education, science, culture and sport.

### **For an Effective Economy**

The creation of a stable base for social progress calls for the democratisation of economic relations, for the emancipation of people's initiative and enterprise and for setting in motion the incentives of highly productive labour. Therein lies the essence of the CPSU programme for restructuring the existing economic system.

#### **To become a true master, to revive a love for work.**

The Party deems it necessary to create conditions for formulating and developing multifarious and equitable forms of proprietorship, for their integration and free competition:

—state property (all-Union, republican, and communal) must be transformed from the property of state bureaucracy into public property, administered by the working people themselves on the basis of existing legislation; working people's collectives must be given the right to lease state enterprises and property, to buy industrial establishments and facilities in the sphere of trade and services; they must also be given the right to use the joint-stock method of organising enterprises;

—it is necessary to develop various forms of cooperative property, property of public organisations, and also mixed forms of property;

—the private property of working people, which can be used for improving the life of the nation, must also have its place in the system of different forms of ownership.

The Party is against total denationalisation or the enforcement of one form of property or another.

**Towards a regulated market system.** A market economy is an alternative to the obsolete command system of administration of the national economy. To carry out a stage-by-stage transition to a market system the CPSU considers it important:

—to speed up the drafting of legislative and legal standards and mechanisms to ensure the transition to a market economy;

—to give independence and freedom of enterprise to establishments and to all commodity producers, regardless of the form of ownership; also to facilitate the development of healthy and fair competition between them; to separate the functions of state management from immediate economic activity;

—to demonopolise production, banking, insurance, trade, and scientific research; to support the development of a network of small and medium-sized enterprises;

—to direct the state policy of regulating market relations towards the protection of the social rights of citizens, towards effecting large-scale structural changes in the national economy and in scientific, technical and ecological programmes, and towards ensuring the interests of the nation in the system of global economic relations. To retain state management of the main transport facilities, communications, power engineering and defence facilities within the framework of one integral market system, using the principles of cost-to-profit management and self-government of work collectives;

—to proceed within the planning system to the development of strategic long-term plans for economic advance, to the development of state-run target-oriented programmes, and also to the indirect regulation of the economy by way of state orders, prices and depreciation mechanisms, customs policy, taxes, interest on credits, etc;

—to ensure the transition to a convertible rouble, to open our economy up to the world market, and to create favourable conditions for the external economic activity of enterprises, for drawing on foreign capital to enable progressive technologies to be introduced swiftly and for the saturation of the markets with consumer goods.

**The market system and protective mechanisms.** Bearing in mind that the transition to a market economy is not an end in itself but a means of resolving social problems, and also bearing in mind the possible negative conse-

quences of this transition, the CPSU proposes:

—compensation for the losses incurred by the public as a result of the revision of retail prices on goods and services; introduction of a flexible indexation system for cash incomes of the population depending on the rise in consumer prices;

—creation of an effective mechanism for sustaining employment, for job placement and professional retraining; introduction of a system of benefits for periods of temporary unemployment, retraining and requalification;

—exercise of public and state supervision of compliance with the laws regulating market relations.

**Agrarian policy.** In its agrarian policy the Party proceeds from the following principles:

—that the right of Soviets of People's Deputies to administer land, and also the right of state, collective and individual farms to own and use land be upheld;

—that equivalence in economic relations between urban and rural areas be ensured;

—that any attempt at diktat and administration by command in any work on the land be ruled out; that peasants' free choice be relied on; that equal opportunities for the development of both social—collective- and state-farm—and the newly-arising individual, family, and leasehold methods of farming be ensured;

—that the priority development of the material and technical base of the agro-industrial complex, with the needs of all forms of farming taken into account, be ensured;

—that every rural resident, or anybody who would like to live and work on a farm be given the opportunity to own a house and farmyard; that social amenities in rural areas be improved, and that farm work be made socially attractive and economically effective.

### **Towards Genuine Power of the People**

**Civil society and a law-based state.** The Party is consistently in favour of:

—the building of a civil society in which the state exists for man, and not man for the state; all social groups and communities have rights guaranteed by law and the real chance to express and stand up for their interests;

—the consolidation of the law-based state in which the dictatorship of any class, political party, grouping or the managerial bureaucracy is ruled out, and in which all citi-

zens will have guaranteed access to participation in state and public affairs, and to holding any position or post; the state and its citizens are linked by the bonds of mutual responsibility, in which democratically adopted laws and the equality of all citizens before the laws have undisputed pre-eminence;

—free competition between socio-political organisations within the constitutional framework;

—the embodiment of the principles of universal, direct and equal suffrage.

We understand democracy not only as human rights and freedoms, but also as civic responsibility, which is part of it, and as strict observance of the law and the exercise of self-control.

**Division of powers** into legislative, executive and judiciary will set up barriers to prevent the usurping of unlimited power and the abuse of office, and will make it possible to delineate clearly the spheres of competence and responsibility. The Party favours:

—the democratic and open character of the legislative process; the completeness of law-making and control functions of Soviets at all levels; formation of a reliable financial and material basis for them;

—the submission of annual reports on the activity of executive and administrative organs to the Soviets; public control within the framework of the law over the activities of the executive branch of power;

—independence of the law courts and procurator's offices, the raising of their status in society, improvement of the procedural law, strict observance of the rule "innocent until proved guilty" and judicial standards, and the right to legal defence; the effectiveness of the corrective-labour system; cancellation of acts of ill-founded deprivation of Soviet citizenship;

—the creation of a dynamic, modern state apparatus built on a competitive basis and subordinate within the framework of the law to representative bodies and the public.

### **The Security of the Country**

As long as the danger of armed conflict exists, the country needs a reliable defence. The Party deems it necessary:

—to carry out military reform on the basis of a new defence doctrine, the principle of reasonable sufficiency, and the priority of qualitative parameters in the development of

the armed forces;

—to retain the fundamental questions of the country's defence and security, as well as the development, training and employment of the Armed Forces under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

—to enhance social security (including life and health insurance for servicemen) and to improve the living conditions of servicemen and their families;

—to use the army strictly for its intended purpose and in full accordance with legislation;

—to exercise effective political leadership in the sphere of defence and control by the supreme bodies of power over the military department which must operate with the utmost openness, taking into account the level of trust achieved between states;

—to strengthen the ideological influence of the CPSU on personnel through Party branches and Communists in the Armed Forces;

—to carry through the state conversion programme and to use the potential released for civilian production, providing social protection for the employees.

Remaining a vital institution, in present conditions, defending the constitutional system and maintaining public order, the internal affairs and state security organs should act strictly within the law and be controlled by the representative authorities. It is necessary to raise the standard of professional training and material security of those employed in the law-enforcement organs.

### **Towards a Renewed Union of Sovereign Republics**

**For a voluntary union of peoples.** The CPSU maintains that the development of centrifugal tendencies can be prevented only on the basis of the democratisation of relations among nations and national-state formations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the successful economic development of all regions and of the integral nationwide market system. The Party proceeds from the recognition of the right of nations to self-determination, including secession, but does not confuse the right to withdrawal from the USSR with the expediency of such a withdrawal. It considers that, bearing in mind the interests of the peoples themselves and the tendency of world processes towards integration, it is important to preserve the integrity of the re-

newed Union as a dynamic multinational state. The CPSU advocates the friendship and international unity of all nations and ethnic groups in the country.

The Party will pursue the policy of strengthening the sovereignty of the Union republics. It proposes the political and legal multiplicity of relations among the republics themselves and with the Union as a whole and their diverse economic relations on the basis of the economic independence of enterprises.

The CPSU is in favour of raising the constitutional status and expanding the rights of the autonomous republics, regions and areas.

The Party deems it necessary to provide favourable conditions for the development of all nations and ethnic groups:

—to strengthen legal guarantees for cultural and ethnic communities with no administrative or territorial status, as well as their right to table draft laws in the state organs of the USSR and republican authorities and to have a quota representation in them;

—to take urgent economic, legal and ecological measures to preserve the environment and to reproduce conditions ensuring the normal development of ethnic minorities;

—to confirm the right of peoples deported in the past from their historical homeland or traditional places of residence to return to them, and also citizens' right to return to their historical homeland from abroad.

**Human rights and the rights of nations.** The CPSU is:

—in favour of expanding the rights of nations while recognising the priority and unfailing and unconditional guarantees of the rights of every human being;

—against the existence of any legal norms or laws allowing inequality of citizens on the basis of their nationality, and in favour of a complete freedom of choice in individual national self-determination;

—in favour of respect for the cultural traditions and interests of all the ethnic groups of the population in adopting the republican legal norms and laws.

### **Towards the Peaceful Development of Mankind**

The Party believes that Soviet foreign policy should proceed from the ideas of peace, cooperation, interaction, progress and humanism and promote in every way both do-

mestic reform and international stability.

**Foreign policy guidelines.** In order to strengthen universal security, the Party advocates:

—a vigorous continuation of the successfully launched policy of demilitarisation of international relations, armament and armed force reductions to the limits of reasonable defence sufficiency, the complete exclusion of the use or threat of force from international practice, the further lessening and then utter elimination of military confrontation;

—the building of a global and regional security structures on the basis of the balanced interests of all parties to preclude conflicts and international instability;

—putting the relations between states on a legal footing guaranteeing the freedom of social and political choice, sovereignty, independence, and the development of cooperation and partnership with all countries of the world;

—the further normalisation of Soviet-American relations and their channelling into constructive partnership; creative participation in the all-European process and putting an end to the historical split in Europe; the development of new forms of political and economic cooperation with the East European countries; the consolidation in all areas of positive trends in relations with the People's Republic of China; active policies in the Asia-Pacific Region, with the aim of turning it into a zone of peace and cooperation; participation in the political settlement of regional conflicts; interaction with the non-aligned movement and cooperation with the developing states.

**Towards qualitatively new international cooperation.** The Party deems it of vital importance to pool the efforts of all members of the international community in solving problems common to all mankind.

It is in favour of:

—vigorous joint initiatives to improve the environment and prevent an ecological disaster;

—our country's participation in the efforts of the international community to overcome hunger, poverty, mass epidemics, serious diseases, drug addiction, international terrorism and critical imbalances in the development of different parts of the world;

—intensive expansion of world economic contacts, the elimination of impediments to scientific, technological and economic exchanges, and the development of contacts in

the humanitarian field;

—interaction and cooperation with all international organisations on a regional and global scale, acting on the principle of historical responsibility for the future of mankind.

The CPSU is in favour of overcoming the historical split in the workers' movement and developing cooperation between Communist, Socialist, Social-Democratic and National Democratic parties, as well as all organisations and movements advocating peace, democracy and social progress.

### **The Renewal of the Party**

Being the core of the command system of administration for many years, the Party itself has undergone serious deformations. The overcentralisation and suppression of critical thought have had a pernicious effect on inner-Party relations. The ideological and moral degradation of some Party leaders has caused enormous damage.

The Congress points out that the CPSU, as the ruling party, is politically and morally responsible for the situation in this country. It has been frank about the mistakes made by the country's Party and government leaders and has denounced Stalinist crimes and gross violations of human rights. The Congress, however, resolutely opposes wholesale accusations levelled against honest Communists of both the past and present generations. Millions of Communists have selflessly served the people, working and fighting courageously for the freedom and independence of their homeland. Progressive forces have always been active in the CPSU and it was they who initiated and spearheaded the restructuring of society.

The CPSU firmly renounces political and ideological monopoly and supersession for the bodies of state and economic management. Dynamic changes call for a speedy transformation of the CPSU into a genuine political party which reflects and defends the vital interests of the working class, the peasants and the intelligentsia and acts within the framework of a civil society.

### **The Party's Role in Society**

The CPSU is becoming a political organisation which will uphold its right to political leadership in free competition with other socio-political forces through its practical activity

and constructive approach to tackling society's development problems.

The Party will perform the following functions:

**Theoretical.** Relying on the scientific analysis of the objective trends of social development and the theoretical assessment of its prospects, ascertaining and taking into account the interests of different social groups, it works out the strategy and tactics of socialist renovation, along with social, economic, political and other programmes.

**Ideological.** The Party defends its world outlook and moral values, advocates its programmatic goals and policy, and draws the citizens to its side and into its ranks.

**Political.** The CPSU works daily among the general population and in work collectives, organises cooperation with public organisations and mass movements, strives to win seats in the bodies of power at every level in elections and, in the event of victory, forms the corresponding executive bodies, engages in parliamentary activity and fulfils its election programmes.

**Organisational.** The CPSU engages in organisational work to implement its programme guidelines and decisions. It renounces formalism and the **nomenklatura** approach in its personnel work. The bodies of state power and management enjoy full jurisdiction in making personnel decisions, and within the Party itself these matters are transferred from the top level to Party branches and all Communists.

Under the present circumstances it is necessary to form Party factions and inter-Party alliances in the Soviets at all levels, in which Communists should be guided by the will of their voters and the programmatic goals of the CPSU.

### **Democratisation of the Party**

The CPSU cannot play its role in society without ensuring the profound democratisation of inner-Party relations.

The CPSU resolutely rejects democratic centralism the way it took shape in the conditions of the command-and-administrative system and rigid centralisation, and upholds democratic principles such as electiveness and replaceability, openness and accountability, the subordination of the minority to the majority and the right of the minority to defend its views, even in the Party mass media.

The democratisation of the Party presupposes the participation of all its members and structures in evolving Party

policy by means of all-Party and regional discussions and referendums, the right of individual Communists and groups to reflect their views in platforms, the collective and open work of all Party bodies, and freedom of criticism. The deep-going transformation of inner-Party relations and Party activity aims at ensuring the democratic unity of the CPSU ranks and at preventing factional splits.

Attracting fresh forces into the Party ranks and introducing younger Party personnel is an important factor of renovating the CPSU.

Party branches form the basis of the CPSU. They determine their tasks and the forms of their work, the structure and numerical strength of their bodies and apparatus, the frequency and order of holding meetings and political actions independently, taking due account of specific conditions, and have the conclusive right to admit new members to the CPSU. The decisions made by them within the framework of their powers granted by the CPSU Rules cannot be repealed by superior bodies.

The territorial-production principle of building the Party has to be amended. While preserving Party branches in work and other collectives, it is necessary to shift the emphasis to creating strong and active Party branches in places of residence in view of the growing importance of election campaigns conducted in residential areas. Any member of the CPSU has the right to choose the Party branch he or she is going to work in, be it a production or territorial branch, or both. The freedom of setting up horizontal structures—Party clubs, councils of Party branch secretaries and other purpose-orientated, professional and interest associations—is guaranteed.

The Congress does not consider it correct to deny Communists in the Army, the State Security Committee and the Ministry of Internal Affairs the right to membership in the Party or the creation of Party branches, or to other forms of political activity. But these organisations must be kept separate from administrative, governmental and politico-military bodies engaged in the moral and political education of servicemen in the Armed Forces, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the State Security Committee.

The Congress favours direct and, as a rule, competitive, secret elections for secretaries of Party committees and delegates to Party forums, with free nomination of candidates. The concrete election procedure shall be determined

by the Communists themselves.

Party control must also become democratic. Central, republican, territorial, regional, area, city and district control bodies shall be elected independently and shall be independent of Party committees; they shall be accountable only to the congresses and conferences which elected them.

To perform their tasks, elected Party bodies shall, within the framework of the budget, form an apparatus exercising organisational and consultative functions.

**Independence and unity.** In the process of the renovation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Communist Parties of Union republics shall be assured independence, which shall be dialectically combined with the Party's unity on the basis of the fundamental programmatic and statutory principles of the CPSU. They shall work out their own policy documents and standards, in accordance with which they themselves shall tackle their political, organisational, personnel, publishing, financial and managerial tasks, advancing the Party line in the sphere of governmental structures and in the socio-economic and cultural development of the republic, and maintain contacts with other parties and public movements, including foreign ones. The leaders of the Communist Parties of Union republics shall be ex-officio members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee. In the event of disagreement with a decision of the central governing bodies of the Party, the Central Committees of Communist Parties of Union republics are entitled to demand a discussion of the issue at a plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee or at a joint plenary meeting of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the CPSU.

### **The Party and Other Public Organisations**

The CPSU strives for cooperation with movements and organisations of the socialist orientation, and for dialogue and equal partnership with all progressive ideological and political tendencies. The Party is prepared to form political blocs with them.

Members of the CPSU may participate in mass movements that act within the law. The Party, however, considers it impermissible for Communists to be members of other parties or organisations propagating chauvinism, nationalism, racism and anti-socialist ideas.

The CPSU will promote the revival of the workers' and

farmers' movements, and the greater public activity of the intelligentsia.

The CPSU welcomes the renovation of the trade unions, and backs their striving to operate actively in the interests of the working people, defending their rights and freedoms.

The CPSU regards Komsomol as an independent socio-political communist youth organisation, and expects its immediate participation in the elaboration and realisation of the Party's policy. Party and Komsomol organisations must learn to maintain relations as political allies. The emergence of new youth organisations should be treated with understanding; their socialist and general humanitarian orientation should be encouraged, and so should the cultivation among the younger generation of a sense of involvement in the fate of the people. The CPSU calls on all its organisations to resolutely face up to the problems of young people. This is also prompted by the interests of the Party itself: it has no future without the younger generation.

\* \* \*

Such are the ideological and theoretical positions and political aims of the CPSU, which Communists, Party branches and Party bodies should follow in their practical work until the adoption of a new CPSU Programme. The Congress expects that they will be supported by all democratic forces in the country who back perestroika and the renovation of our society.

# **RESOLUTIONS OF THE 28TH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU**

## **ON THE CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE'S POLITICAL REPORT TO THE 28TH CONGRESS OF THE CPSU AND THE TASKS OF THE PARTY**

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

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

The entire political superstructure is being radically altered, and true democracy is taking root, asserting human rights, free elections and a multi-party system.

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

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

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

Conditions are being created for free competition between socialist producers.

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

The Congress stresses that the future of the Party and its

historical perspectives are directly linked with the achievement of the goals of perestroika and the improvement of the people's quality of life. The Congress calls for the resolute renovation of the CPSU and its liberation from dogmatism, for mastering the art of political work among the masses and the ability to win people over by the power of the truth, by valid arguments and by the ability to cooperate constructively with other socio-political forces, and, the main thing, to win people over by concrete actions.

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

The Congress is opposed to authoritarian thinking and stands for the creative development of the legacy of Marx, Engels and Lenin, of socialist theory, and for profound study of the historical experience of the 20th century, the activity of the CPSU itself, and the achievements of worldwide social thought.

The CPSU attaches top priority to multiplying society's intellectual wealth as expressed in science, education and culture.

The Congress resolutely condemns any attack on Lenin. It is the duty of every Communist and every decent person to protect him as a politician and thinker against slander and defamation, but also against nominal official honours and overpraise.

The Congress rejects attempts at implanting and cultivating anti-communism and anti-Sovietism in our society, or extremism on the pretext of criticising the deformations of socialism and the Party's mistakes; it expresses its firm intention to use all legitimate means to counteract attempts to pressurise the Party economically or politically.

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

The Congress considers it a vital task to ensure the pri-

macy of the Party rank and file in the CPSU, a real opportunity for every Communist to participate in the elaboration and realisation of the Party's policy, and the radical enhancing of the role of its local branches. The ideological and political integrity of the CPSU is based on the self-administration of Party branches and the independence of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics incorporated in the CPSU.

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

In the context of a multi-party system, the CPSU is prepared for open competition and cooperation with other parties and movements on a legal basis, elections and parliamentary activity included.

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

However, as perestroika was being put into practice, the CPSU Central Committee, the Politburo and the CC Secretariat, did not take due account of the economic, social and moral consequences of some of the steps being taken. The campaign against alcoholism, the practice of organising co-operatives, the transition to regional economic autonomy and independence of enterprises, along with a number of other major actions, were carried out unsystematically, without preliminary substantive consideration by Party branches. This either lowered the effect of these important and necessary measures or was even counter-productive.

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

As a result, many of the tasks set by the 27th Congress

of the CPSU and the 19th All-Union Party Conference remained unfulfilled, thus aggravating the crisis phenomena and complicating the situation in society and the Party.

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

The abrupt decline of state and labour discipline, the increase in crime, violence entailing loss of life and the appearance of refugees, corruption, profiteering, drunkenness, drug addiction and the fall in moral standards have all given cause for alarm and are complicating the political situation.

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

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

The Congress points out that the Party was taken un-awares by the deteriorating interethnic relations. The Central Committee often failed to use initiative in settling conflicts and reconciled itself to half-hearted measures in the centre and the provinces. The conclusion of a new Treaty of the Union has been dragged out, jeopardizing the integrity and the very existence of the USSR itself.

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

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

The Congress points out that the CPSU leadership, which took a bold step towards renovating the Party, failed to use

all the possibilities for its radical transformation from a government party into a political leader. The CPSU Central Committee and other Party committees failed to reorganise their work and to mobilise the creative potential of the Party branches.

The 28th CPSU Congress holds that the activity of the CPSU Central Committee, its Politburo and the Secretariat needs to be dramatically improved, while their cadres policy needs renovation. The Central Committee and its Politburo should concentrate their efforts on such key problems as the unity of the CPSU and the development of democracy within the Party, the consolidation of society, the attainment of civic peace in the country by political means, and the elaboration and implementation of immediate measures to extricate the country from the crisis. Fundamentally new approaches are needed in working among women, young people and veterans, taking into account their specific positions in society, in order to involve these groups effectively in Party activity and in the social structures.

The Congress entrusts the new CPSU Central Committee to work out, in the course of three months, practical measures for implementing the Congress decisions and putting into effect the delegates' critical remarks and proposals.

Taking account of the complicated socio-political situation in the country, it recommends that the current situation and the Politburo and Secretariat reports be discussed at the meetings of the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Control Commission. The Congress entrusts the CPSU Central Committee to consider within a year the problem of renovating the ideological work in the Party. It recognises the expediency of reorganising the Academy of Social Sciences, the Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the Institute of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee in view of the new Party tasks.

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

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

The Congress declares that it is the duty of the CPSU to

complete the political reform and to bring to a conclusion the transfer of all power to the Soviets. The Party committees should arrange to interact with the new Soviets, help them emerge as bodies of real authority and give effective support to workers and farmers during election campaigns. The constructive stand of the Communist deputies and Party branches should help the Soviets to pass over to effective and normal work as soon as possible.

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

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

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

The positive shifts on the international scene do not eliminate the task of ensuring the reliable security of the country on the principles of reasonable sufficiency. Problems of military policy and concern for servicemen and their families should be constantly borne in mind by the state and the Party.

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

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

The CPSU offers society and the state a programme of action for the forthcoming period. It is expounded in the Policy Statement of the Congress "Towards Humane, Democratic Socialism" and in the resolutions on the key problems of the country's development.

The Party Congress draws the attention of all the Communists and those who will be entrusted to work in the CPSU's ruling bodies to the inadmissibility of repeating the mistakes of the past, which have led the Party and society into a crisis, brought about stagnation and one-man rule in the country and caused deformations in socialism.

The country is going through difficult times. It is more necessary than ever before to consolidate all the democratic forces. The CPSU proposes that all the champions of the socialist idea should rally within a broad coalition in the Soviets, mass organisations and movements and in everyday practical activity. It is ready to conduct a dialogue on an equal footing, upholding all constructive ideas for the sake of the working people, civic peace and national accord.

### **ON THE MAIN ASPECTS OF THE PARTY'S MILITARY POLICY AT THE PRESENT STAGE**

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

Having made an exhaustive study of the military and political state of affairs and prospects for its development, the Congress declares that so long as guarantees of irreversible positive changes have not emerged, the military danger to the USSR continues to exist. In the circumstances, it has been and still remains one of the most important tasks of the people as a whole, the Party and the state, to observe the constitutional duties related to the defence of the socialist homeland, and strengthen and maintain the country's security and defence capability at a level of dependable and reasonable sufficiency.

The CPSU is in favour of the maintenance and consistent development of the Soviet defensive military doctrine and reaffirms its readiness to assist in formulating an all-embracing system of international security, expanding political and military cooperation for this purpose, and advancing towards a world without wars and violence.

The Party considers it necessary that the fulfilment of the tasks of defence guarantee the preclusion of wars, secure the inviolability of the state borders of the USSR, prevent impingements on the country's sovereignty, and, in the event of outside aggression, guarantee that it is repulsed, the independence and territorial integrity of the country defended, and a just peace restored.

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

A considerable number of acute problems have built up in the Army and Navy, including those of performing functions which are alien to them, bringing units up to full strength, ensuring professional training, obtaining new types of armaments and materiel of the right quality and in requisite numbers, maintaining discipline, dealing with the imperfections of the organisational and personnel structure, and settling the question of inferior social security for servicemen and their families. This is creating negative feelings, tension and dissatisfaction.

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

The Congress declares that the CPSU is in favour of centralised leadership in matters of defence, security and development of the Armed Forces, on a basis of single Union-wide legislation.

The Armed Forces of the USSR must abide by the principles of one-man leadership, extraterritoriality, a multinational army recruited on a mixed principle, combining universal military service with voluntary enlistment under contract, social justice for and the equality of all servicemen and re-

servists before the law, and their use only for their direct purposes, as fixed in the Constitution of the USSR.

It is necessary to work out and raise to a qualitatively new level the forms and methods of Party influence on the training of young people for service in the Soviet Armed Forces and on the service itself. Work on patriotic and internationalist education and on the readiness of the Soviet citizens to perform the sacred duty of guaranteeing the security of their homeland should be improved. The role of local Party organs in this field should be increased.

**3.** The CPSU holds that the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society and the processes taking place in international relations call for the implementation of military reform stage by stage on the basis of laws of the USSR.

The reform is to ensure the scientifically based level of defence potential in keeping with the principle of reasonable sufficiency; the elaboration of a long-term military-technological policy and the equipment of the Army and Navy with modern high-quality weapons and materiel on the basis of latest scientific, technical and technological achievements; the optimisation of the organisational and personnel structure and of the governing bodies of the Soviet Armed Forces; the restructuring of personnel policy, democratisation of military service relations, transformation of the systems of recruitment and personnel training, the raising of personnel professional level and better training of the reservists; and strengthening of the legislative base as regards Soviet citizens' active service.

The Congress deems it necessary to speed up the adoption of the Defence Law and the Law on the Conversion of Defence Enterprises, taking into consideration the development of their scientific, experimental and production base depending on external factors and also with due account for the state target-oriented programme aimed at guaranteeing the social security and legal protection of servicemen, members of their families, reservists and the retired militarymen. In particular, some of the forces and means released due to the reduction of the Armed Forces and of defence spending should be used for the above purposes.

The Congress considers its top priority tasks to improve the material and social status of the military personnel, to ensure decent housing for servicemen and to introduce measures to compensate for rising prices and inflation.

**4.** A fundamental trend in military reform is the radical reorganisation of the entire system of Party and political

work in the Soviet Armed Forces, including the transformation of the existing structure, the definition of the functions of the Party organisations and political bodies, their adjustment to the new tasks and conditions, democratisation of internal Party relations, and development of a new moral climate, and a high level of discipline, legality and comradeship in the troops.

Political work in the Armed Forces of the USSR should be based on the creatively developed ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and the achievements of world socio-political thought and culture. The CPSU will strive to enhance its role as political leader in the Army and Navy and to consolidate all healthy and progressive forces in the interests of improving the country's defence capability. The Congress is against the depoliticising of the Armed Forces.

The military and political bodies of the Army and Navy are working in a way which corresponds to the country's defence policy and the USSR Constitution and aiming at giving political, military, moral and legal education to the servicemen in the spirit of loyalty to socialist ideals, the unity of the army and the people, patriotism, friendship among the Soviet peoples, internationalism, vigilance and constant readiness to defend the homeland.

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

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

### **IN DEFENCE OF DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS AND AGAINST PERSECUTION OF COMMUNISTS**

The CPSU recognises the right of every nation to choose its own social system and way of life independently. Democracy is incompatible with any debasing of human dignity, creating an atmosphere of hatred and revenge, or with attempts to outlaw on various pretexts communist parties and other socialist-oriented movements as such, as well as

their members and followers. They cannot be held responsible for the actions of regimes which have been rejected by time.

Many thousands of honest people truly faithful to the ideas of progress are being persecuted in the process of change under way in a number of East European countries. These people are being subjected to persecution and discrimination, and denied work, for their convictions. An unbearable situation that often leads to human tragedy is being created for their families.

In the past, anti-communism bred a great deal of trouble and distress. In the conditions of a self-proclaimed civic society, persecution for political motives and psychological harassment are intolerable and create a sense of bitterness and protest wherever they may occur—whether abroad or in our own country.

The Congress expresses its comradely solidarity with Communists and all other people subjected to political persecution and moral terror, and calls on progressive forces to defend the honour, dignity and rights of every human being.

### **ON THE BUDGET AND PROPERTY OF THE CPSU**

1. Acknowledging the report of Comrade N. E. Kruchina, General Manager of the CPSU Central Committee, on the budget and property of the CPSU.

2. The Congress notes that the procedure of forming and executing the budget is being updated too slowly to suit the new functions and role of the CPSU in society; openness and information about the Party's material resources and budget have not been assured; a number of decisions on financial and property issues did not take into account the opinion of the Party's elective bodies and the rank and file; the CPSU Central Committee and other Party Committees have used funds irrationally, and have been extravagant in construction and offhand in transferring CPSU properties.

3. The Congress is in favour of broadening the rights and duties of Party Committees and local Party branches in expanding sources of revenue and the rational use of Party property. The financial and economic activity of Party organisations shall rest on democratic principles and suit the specific characteristics of regions, with the purpose of creating the necessary material conditions for the work of each CPSU organisation.

**4.** The Congress instructs the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Control Commission to work out before the end of the year a new mechanism for forming, executing and controlling the Party budget in line with the expanding independence of Party organisations, the transition to self-financing and the redistribution of funds in favour of local Party branches, and to lower general expenses by improving the structure of Party Committees and Party institutions, and reducing the payroll.

The available medical and recreational facilities of the CPSU shall be used for treatment and recreation by all members of the Party.

**5.** The Congress confirms that in exercising its legitimate right to possess, use and dispose of property created by many generations of Communists, the CPSU considers the property of the Party as a necessary condition for practical work in pursuance of the Party's Programme and statutory aims.

In the course of 1990 and 1991, the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Control Commission shall produce an estimate of the value of CPSU properties and work out proposals for their effective utilisation.

The sale, transfer and other means of alienation of CPSU property are possible only with due consideration for the opinion of the rank and file and according to principles established by the CPSU Rules and the law.

Party committees, and organisations and institutions of the CPSU shall exercise the rights of a legal representative to the full, and shall rationally use them to consolidate the Party's financial and material resources.

**6.** The Congress entrusts the recently formed Commission on Privileges to examine within a three-month term the state of affairs in the Party, and to submit its findings and proposals to a joint sitting of the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Control Commission. The resolution on this issue shall be published in the Party press before the end of the year.

\*\*\*

The Congress is confident that Party committees, Party branches and every Communist will take an active part in consolidating Party property and will work for the effective utilisation of financial and material resources in the new conditions of the CPSU's activity.

## **ON THE CONDITION OF THE PEASANTRY AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PARTY'S AGRARIAN POLICY**

**1.** The Congress declares that the revolutionary reconstruction of society and solution of the food problem are impossible without a radical improvement of the condition of the peasantry, a change in the destiny of the countryside, and perseverance in consistent implementation of the agrarian policy worked out at the March 1989 Plenary Meeting of the CPSU Central Committee.

Agriculture accounts for more than a quarter of the national income; more than two-thirds of consumer goods are manufactured from farm produce, as is nearly the entire volume of foodstuffs.

The social and economic condition of the countryside, however, has not changed for the better in recent years. A disproportionate amount of resources is being extracted, while public consumption funds are growing too slowly. There is a shortage of housing, schools, hospitals, cultural facilities and community utilities. Meagre supplies, lack of amenities and the absence of good roads are making people's lives worse.

The material and technical provision for agriculture has deteriorated. Half the basic assets of collective and state farms, and of processing enterprises are physically obsolete and require renewal.

In many regions, the countryside is in such a sorry state that it cannot be equal to the tasks set by society on its own without strong support from the state.

The monopolisation and direct economic diktat of enterprises producing capital goods have increased. Non-equivalent exchange of agricultural and industrial production is more pronounced. Needless reorganisations continue within the agro-industrial complex.

Efforts to set priorities for the countryside are not backed up by organisational work on the part of either the CPSU Central Committee or the government, and are not being implemented in practice.

**2.** The Congress believes that the practical solution of the food problem is directly dependent on the social and economic position of the peasantry in society.

The CPSU places the defence of the interests of the peasants at the centre of its political work, and is helping them to assert themselves as the true masters of the land and of the results of their labour. It is essential to promote

diverse forms of ownership; to assert the peasants' right to land ownership and selection of the mode of production on a voluntary basis; to further the complete independence and equal economic conditions of collective farms, state farms, small-holdings, subsidiary plots and leaseholdings, and to promote opportunities for every working person to become a co-owner of collective property taking account of his personal labour contribution.

**3.** The Congress is strongly in favour of a considerable increase in capital investments by the state, and of raising targets in building, assembly and material resources during the thirteenth five-year-plan period beginning in 1991, thus ensuring the comprehensive advancement of the countryside and the production of foodstuffs in quantities which meet the needs of the country's population. Special attention should be paid to the construction of houses, hospitals, schools, roads, water- and gas-supply facilities, farm produce processing plants and storage facilities, and to effective land improvement. It is essential to adopt special government programmes for the revival of Russia's Non-Black Earth areas, the Aral Sea and other ecological-disaster regions, and for dealing with the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident.

The Congress stresses the need for concerted efforts in urban and rural areas to resolve the food problem and create specialised zones for food production in the environs of large cities and industrial centres. Benefits should be established for urban dwellers who wish to resettle and work in the countryside on a permanent basis.

The founding of enterprises processing farm produce, and manufacturing consumer goods, arts and crafts and building material, shall be actively promoted in the countryside, and the output of up-to-date equipment for them should be increased.

The Congress is opposed to any and all diktat in relation to the peasantry, as well as infringement on its interests; it is in favour of the social equilibrium of town and country and creating a rural infrastructure at the expense of the state.

**4.** The Congress backs the principle of phased transition to a market economy for foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials, and guaranteed provision of resources enabling the fulfilment of state orders. It calls for the strict observance of equivalent economic relations between town and country, between industry and agriculture, writing off the unrepaid loans taken by farms and other enterprises of the agro-

industrial complex, working out for them a system of financial benefits, allowances and subsidies, eliminating the monopolism of their suppliers, and creating a market for capital goods.

**5.** The Congress is in favour of the effective development of agrarian science; of its closer integration with production; of giving priority as regards funding to vital fundamental and applied research; of making wide use of advanced domestic and foreign experience; and of effecting radical changes in the training and retraining of managers and specialists for farms and enterprises, of leaseholders, farmers and personnel in major trades.

**6.** The Congress reasserts that the agro-industrial complex system of management must work in the interests of the producers according to their voluntary wish. To ensure the proper working of the functions of the state, observance of the legal norms governing the activity of the agro-industrial complex, and development of priority research and personnel training, it is essential to establish a ministry of agriculture and food, a ministry of tractor- and agricultural machine-building, and an agro-industrial system for material and technical supplies and services. Assessments of their performance must be linked to the end results achieved by the agro-industrial complex.

**7.** The Congress welcomes the founding of the Peasant Union of the USSR, a public and political mass organisation, and approves its policy of consolidating the peasantry with the working class and the intelligentsia, and with all forces of society, in the interest of resolving the food problem and improving the wellbeing of the working people.

**8.** The Congress calls on Party organisations to work hard jointly with the Soviets of People's Deputies, trade unions, the Komsomol and other public movements for the social reconstruction of the countryside, the spiritual and moral development of the family and the revival of the traditional rural way of life. They must put concern for the health, education and cultural needs of people in the countryside at the centre of their activity. It is essential to enlist the intellectual and creative potential of the towns for this purpose.

The 28th Congress of the CPSU calls on the mass media to propagate the importance for the country's entire economic complex of participating in the resurrection of the countryside; to disseminate more broadly the experience of various modes of farming, and to enhance the importance and prestige of agrarian labour in society.

## **ON THE CPSU'S POLICY CONCERNING ECONOMIC REFORM AND TRANSITION TO MARKET RELATIONS**

The Congress notes with concern that the country's economic situation is deteriorating and that the people's living standards are declining. The production structure is being remodelled too slowly, output of consumer goods and services is lagging behind the increase in earnings, losses of working hours and of material resources are still considerable, and the economy remains unreceptive to the latest achievements of scientific and technical progress. The break-up of the consumer market is a concentrated manifestation of the crisis phenomena, with not only social but also political consequences undermining the people's faith in perestroika.

The main reasons for the economic crisis: deformation of socialist production relations, alienation of the working man from property and management, the psychology of egalitarianism and dependence, monopolism and the absence of market evaluations of the results of labour, and lately the poor state of economic management from the Centre, in the Republics and at local level. Imbalances that have arisen in the economy, outlays and expenses that society cannot afford, the survival of the cost-intensive management mechanism, foot-dragging and miscalculations in carrying out radical reform—all this is limiting the growth in efficiency of the economy.

Two extreme positions have appeared in the search for a way out of the crisis, in attempts to work out the strategy and tactics of social and economic change. Society is insistently being offered a choice between restoring the old model of rigid administrative-distribution management, a model based on universal state control in economic life, and immediate denationalisation of all means of production and total renunciation of a state-regulated economy. The Congress considers both these approaches to resolving urgent economic problems equally unacceptable. Both of them contradict the main values of socialism and world practice, lead to the infringement of basic human rights, and are unable to create a highly effective system of management.

The Congress emphasises the Party's commitment to the socialist option and considers that the radicalisation of economic reform and improvement of the state of affairs in the economy hinge on the transition to market relations. A reg-

ulated market economy will increase opportunities for exercising the principle, "From each according to his ability, to each according to the results of his work." It will strengthen the motivation for highly productive and creative labour, make it possible to create an effective mechanism of mutually beneficial relationships between producer and consumer, put an end to chronic shortages and queues, and undermine the basis of profiteering and other attributes of the shadow economy.

In order to further this task, the CPSU will follow a policy aimed at ensuring effective employment and at preventing a decline in living standards for the majority of the people. The Party believes that a system of social compensation measures must be devised and introduced in good time, particularly for the lowest-income sections of the population.

The Congress stresses that in the new conditions public consumer funds must be kept at a socially guaranteed minimum in the case of pensions, housing, health care, education, culture and science, and facilitate more efficient production and the development of society's intellectual potential.

The Congress favours the creation of an effective economic structure that would ensure legislative equality and competitiveness in all forms of property and enterprise, ruling out exploitation of man by man. Mutual ties between independent enterprises, the main subjects in the market, must become the basis of economic relations.

The Congress is firmly in favour of a single Union-wide market abiding by the economic equality and sovereignty of the republics on the basis of an updated Union treaty.

This Congress supports the decisions of the Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR and the USSR Supreme Soviet to plan a clear, considered and comprehensible programme of phased transition to a regulated market economy, including urgent measures for the stabilisation of the country's socio-economic situation.

This Congress considers it the key task of Communists to work on a broad scale to educate and prepare the public for market relations. The political and organisational activity of Party branches and committees should be directed towards creating in society a profound appreciation of the fact that there is no alternative to the market economy and that this is not an aim in itself but a means of increasing labour efficiency, achieving a qualitatively new standard of living,

strengthening freedom and democracy, and maintaining the integrity of the Soviet state.

The delegates to the Congress call on Communists to give public support to all undertakings that increase efficiency in production and further initiative and enterprise in the interests of the people.

The key tasks of all Party organisations and of every Communist are to participate actively in pursuing the Party's economic policy in conditions of the revival of the Soviets' full power, the cultivation of a new economic thinking, and facilitation of training of personnel capable of working in the new economic conditions.

### **ON THE CPSU'S POLICY IN EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND CULTURE**

The years of perestroika are a time of overcoming ideological dogmas and administrative abuses and turning to the spiritual heritage and to a tangible interaction with the world community.

The changes taking place are, however, unstable and contradictory. The residual principle of funding in government and Party approaches to the intellectual sphere has not been overcome. The Party leadership has not been insistent enough in carrying out secondary and higher school reform, and the development programme in science and culture.

Public education and many national centres of culture and science are in a sorry state. Nihilism, apathy and mistrust of the Party are spreading among the intelligentsia, and nationalist sentiment is on the rise. The aggressive onslaught of mass culture on the youth, commercialisation of spiritual life, and a drain of talents abroad, constitute a special danger.

The Congress declares: the present state of the spiritual sphere, the low standard of culture and education, and the neglect of results of scientific research are a threat to the renewal of socialism and the country's future. The country's intellectual and spiritual rebirth must be in the forefront of CPSU activity. No underestimation of these issues should be tolerated.

The Party's policy in education, science and culture, based on recognition of the priority of universal human values, must be open to, and accepted by, society.

The Congress considers the main aims and principles of the CPSU policy **in the field of education** to be:

—assertion of the humanitarian aim of education, its fundamental importance in the economic, social, political and cultural advancement of society;

—continuous education as an organic part of this country's way of life and a necessary condition for social progress; creation of an effective system of advanced training and retraining of personnel in line with the far-reaching structural changes in the economy and the dynamic change in the spheres of the application of labour;

—providing a tangible right to free choice of profession or trade suiting the aspirations and abilities of the individual; creating conditions for the comprehensive education of young people by founding various types of educational establishments and introducing diverse forms and methods of instruction;

—adapting the structure and content of training in higher and specialised secondary schools to the long-term needs of society and to the socio-economic development of republics and regions;

—restructuring of the civic, moral and physical education of children of preschool and school age, and of students, in accordance with the democratisation and humanisation of society, and enhancing the role of the family in the upbringing of children;

—democratisation of education, greater independence of educational institutions, development of international co-operation in the educational field;

—humanisation of secondary and higher schools, closer ties in instruction with the sources of national culture and the achievements of social thinking both at home and abroad, and elimination of any gaps between culture, science and education;

—provision of legal and economic protection for public education, and creation of social guarantees for teachers, students and schoolchildren; enhancement of the prestige of the teaching profession, care for teachers' working and living conditions, and proper payment for teaching.

**In the field of science:**

—enhancing the status of science and the prestige of the scientists' work in society and the state; encouraging competition between scientific schools; transition from excessive centralisation and administration to a flexible system for regulating innovative processes by government and society;

—enhancing the role of fundamental sciences and state-sponsored scientific and technological programmes as, among other things, a factor to further consolidate society; integrating Soviet science with world science, and introducing broad international cooperation and division of labour in this field;

—freedom of scientific endeavour, organically combined with the scientists' moral responsibility for the social, economic and ecological consequences of the implementation of research projects;

—diversifying economic mechanisms linking scientific and technological research and production on the basis of different forms of property; independence of research collectives in dealing with all internal issues concerning their activity;

—improvement of the system of training and promoting scientific personnel; payment for research to correspond to its results;

—remodelling the entire system of social sciences, with a considerable expansion of resources and facilities for the advancement of humanitarian sciences;

—direct support by the CPSU for the advancement of philosophy, political economy, history, sociology, psychology, politology, and the study of culture; stimulation of research of theoretical aspects of the renewal of socialism, the development of the Party and its activity in the conditions of the democratisation of society and the state, pluralism and the multi-party system.

#### **In the field of culture:**

—overcoming the monopoly of departments and organisations of the cultural sphere, with the state guaranteeing that culture should be within the reach of the people; improvement of the system of regulation of cultural processes by the government and the public, and ensuring protection of people active in culture on a legislative basis;

—respect for the specific nature and equality of the cultures of all nations and ethnic groups living in the USSR; expansion and improvement of their free interaction and mutual enrichment, and provision of conditions for the formation and development of national cultural centres;

—freedom of creativity, the encouragement of talent, unhampered competitive development of various cultural tendencies, styles, and schools;

—the openness of multinational Soviet culture to humane ideas and values, assuring the country's comprehensive in-

clusion in the cultural life of today's world.

The Congress instructs the newly-elected Central Committee of the CPSU:

—to propose on behalf of the CPSU conceptual principles for the solution of the entire range of problems related to the fullest possible use and further development of the country's intellectual potential, and for increasing the funding and expansion of material and technical resources in the cultural sphere over the next few years, namely, additional purpose-oriented allocations from the state budget; a taxation policy benefitting institutions of learning, science and culture, and stimulating financial input by enterprises and cooperatives; organising funds for the development of the cultural sphere. It is desirable to work out and implement a long-term government programme for the development of public education;

—to assist actively in working out and implementing large-scale programmes in education and science, increasing intellectual potential and developing the cultural sphere. To use for these purposes the potential and material resources of educational and research institutions and of socio-political centres of the CPSU;

—to protect the morality of Soviet people against propagation of vulgarity, violence and cruelty, the Party shall come up with the initiative of enacting a USSR law in defence of morality, which, among other things, should, with consideration for the Soviet Union's international commitments, provide for the effective regulation of imports into the country of foreign video films and motion pictures;

—to set up a CPSU Central Committee commission for culture, education and science with the aim of analysing the current state of affairs and making recommendations concerning the content and methods of the activity of Party organisations in the cultural field.

### **ON THE CPSU'S MASS MEDIA**

The Party press has played a prominent part in furthering the processes of renovation and democratisation, and in making glasnost a norm of our life. Journalists have initiated important Party and government decisions, the enactment of a number of laws, and the elaboration of vital government programmes.

But the reorganisation of the Party press is not taking place at the rate and to the extent of the changes taking

place in society; it is failing to keep up with events, and has lost its militancy and sometimes even its sense of principle in the face of the burgeoning anti-socialist and anti-perestroika forces.

Some central and local Party publications seem to be confused by the onslaught of new problems and complexities. The columns of Party newspapers and journals are sometimes made available to the propagation of views that are alien to the CPSU, to material that distorts the historical past of the Soviet Union and the heroic struggle of the Party and the people for our Motherland's independence and freedom. They fail to duly repulse those who encroach upon the spiritual and moral values of the people, the people's patriotic and internationalist traditions, and the prestige of the Soviet Army and the law enforcement agencies.

All this reduces the Party's ability to explain and exercise its policy, and weakens the role of the Party press as a collective organiser of the renovation and consolidation of the Party and society. So far, these things have not been adequately assessed by the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Communist Parties of the Union republics or the Party's central publications.

1. The Congress holds that in the face of the emerging multi-party system, the Communist Party requires a press capable of:

—protecting the ideals and values of socialism, the aims and objectives of perestroika, the full power of the Soviets, the democratisation of society based on the socialist choice, and the formation of a law-governed state;

—objectively reflecting the processes of perestroika, the innovative ideas of social development, and counteracting all types of parasitic attitudes and group egoism;

—furthering perestroika and the consistent democratisation of Party life, reflecting in its columns different tendencies within the CPSU, including minority positions and the diversity of approaches to the solution of social problems, and, at the same time, seriously analysing the essence of these tendencies and approaches;

—coming out firmly and sharply against adverse developments in society, the state and, especially, the Party, and fighting for the moral purity of Communists;

—promoting the ideological and organisational unity of the Party and resolutely combatting attempts to split it.

Attempts by certain journalists, who consider themselves to be Party members, to turn Party publications into instru-

ments of forces opposing the CPSU from the right or the left, are not to be tolerated.

**2.** The Congress suggests that the State Committee of the USSR for Television and Radio Broadcasting should work with public movements and organisations on a contract basis. It favours setting up a regular television programme about the problems of the CPSU and its central and regional policies.

The Congress backs the founding, wherever necessary, of mass media representing district, city, regional and territorial CPSU committees.

**3.** The Congress recommends the fuller use in editorial matters of the new forms of management provided for in the Law on Enterprises; the substantial expansion of commercial advertising in Party publications; and the bolder introduction of the contractual system. In future, the Party intends to base its economic relations with all non-Party publications printed by its printing facilities on the provisions of the law.

Laying no claim to any special legal or economic protection, the CPSU nevertheless, rejects demands to deprive the Party of its own publishing facilities.

**4.** The Congress sets the task of substantially expanding and systematising daily contacts between Party committees and the mass media. The relationship between Party committees and their printed organs must rule out categorical judgements and bureaucratic diktat. It must rest on political interaction and creative cooperation. Party committees, above all the Central Committee of the CPSU, are called upon to show special concern for the training of highly qualified Party journalists, for their salaries, and their working and living conditions.

To overcome the corporate, professional exclusiveness of editorial staffs, and enhance the influence of public opinion on the work of the Party press, it would be desirable, where necessary, to include authoritative workers, managers, scientists and cultural workers alongside members of the editorial staff on editorial boards formed by Party committees. In this way they will be able to chart the line of their publication more competently and correctly.

In the present conditions, the Party press must eliminate any hardheaded, imperious and didactic tones. The voice of the Party can be heeded and taken to heart not for its imperious tone but solely due to convincing arguments and its consonance with people's concerns and aspirations.

The new relations between the CPSU and its bodies, and journalists are based on respect for the Law on the Press and Other Mass Media. Influence on public, trade-union and youth publications is to be exercised not by command but by virtue of prestige.

## **ON THE CPSU'S YOUTH POLICY**

The future of socialist society and the Communist Party greatly depends on the younger generation. Its active position and social status largely determine the political situation in the country.

The Congress deems it necessary to speed up the elaboration and implementation of an effective integral policy with respect to the growing generation, which should ensure real conditions and incentives for the all-round development of the personality, the attainment of young people's vital objectives and their involvement in vigorous political, social and economic activity.

**1. Priority trends in the CPSU's youth policy.** The Congress holds that the Party's youth policy should be implemented through the participation of the Party branches and Communists in its elaboration and realisation by government bodies and also through their direct work among young people. The policy should be based on complete trust in the younger generation, respect for the right of young people and their organisations to independent political activity and the renunciation of any interference in their affairs.

The CPSU stands for the broadest dialogue with young people and cooperation with all youth organisations and movements of the socialist option, and aims to support youth associations orientated towards consolidating mass forces. The Congress is in favour of pooling the efforts of government bodies and public organisations in settling young people's problems.

By working actively among young people, the CPSU will seek to win their support for its action programme, to create conditions for the inflow of fresh forces into the Party ranks and to give them effective help in political and social work, thus producing the prerequisites for the rejuvenation of all spheres of social and state life.

The CPSU will advocate the priority development of education and culture, the strengthening among young people of socialist ideals and human values, and the forming of patriotic and civic-minded attitudes among the young boys

and girls on the basis of their profound assimilation of the national and cultural traditions of the Soviet peoples, and their readiness to defend their homeland. The development and strengthening of the family's moral foundations and its greater contribution to raising the younger generation should form the groundwork of social education.

The Congress deems it expedient to set up commissions under the CPSU Central Committee and local Party committees for the Party's youth policy.

**2. The mechanism of implementing the CPSU's youth policy.** The Congress stands for the development by the state of effective social, economic and legal mechanisms to work out and implement youth policy at all levels with due account of regional and national peculiarities, from rural and urban Soviets to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers, and advocates the establishment of structures to deal with youth problems in legislative and executive bodies. It is important that the young people themselves take an active part in working out and effecting youth policy, but in so doing no government duties with respect to the younger generation should be placed on the Young Communist League (Komsomol) or other youth organisations.

The Congress deems it necessary to adopt as soon as possible a law of the USSR and laws of the Union republics on the basic aspects of government youth policy, to work out norms and social indicators pertaining to young people, and to introduce special youth sections in the Union, republican and regional socio-economic development plans.

**3. Settlement of young people's social problems.** The Congress supports young people's demands for the rapid development and implementation of Union, republican and regional programmes for the cultural and physical upbringing of the younger generation; for guaranteeing and protecting the rights of the child; for young people's employment and labour training; for the social rehabilitation of disabled young people; for the expanded production of goods and services for children and young people; for housing construction taking account of the needs of young people; for rendering support to young families; for seeking and developing young talents; for developing international youth contacts; and for promoting youth enterprise. These programmes should receive target-orientated financing from the Union and local budgets. Young citizens and young families should get allowances and credits on easy terms in

order to settle their housing problems and to receive modern vocational training and education, both at home and abroad. The delegates approve of the Komsomol's proposal to set up a system of social aid for young people and believe that this could become a component of broad social and governmental services. It is necessary to humanise the exercising of young people's legal responsibility and to combat vigorously alcoholism and drug addiction among the younger generation.

Society has to help young people make a start in life and to give all the necessary legal guarantees for this in the conditions of the transition to the market economy.

The Congress delegates advocate the establishment of the USSR President's Youth Foundation and the carrying out of Presidential youth programmes in key areas, and entrust the CPSU Central Committee to consider taking part in this foundation.

#### **4. Relations between the CPSU and Komsomol.**

The CPSU regards Komsomol as its political ally and an organisation ideologically akin to the Party, capable of assisting it in carrying through its social transformation programmes.

The Congress supports Komsomol's striving, borne out by its 21st Congress, to take an active part in building humane democratic socialism, to consolidate the youth movement on the ideals of perestroika, to join forces with organisations of the socialist option, and to promote dialogue and cooperation with all democratic movements and organisations.

The CPSU will help Komsomol to become a fully-fledged and authoritative member of the political process, work to expand Komsomol's rights and opportunities in running society's affairs and develop its relations with Komsomol as an independent socio-political organisation of Soviet youth on the basis of comradely cooperation and interaction. It is interested in Komsomol's direct involvement in working out and implementing Party policy.

The CPSU Congress supports the steps taken by Komsomol to renovate the League organisationally and politically, to create conditions for its self-development, and to improve the forms and methods of its work in keeping with the younger generation's attitudes and moods. The CPSU can derive strength for its renovation only from an independent, democratic and open organisation which expresses and protects the interests of young people and in which young Communists actively work.

The Party will give Komsomol necessary help in training and retraining its personnel, strengthening and developing its material base, publishing newspapers and magazines and making use of the mass media and its other means of working with young boys and girls. It is expedient to organise the publication of Party newspapers and magazines intended for diverse sections of the younger generation.

The CPSU is in favour of democratising the children's movement and reiterates the need to renovate the Lenin Young Pioneer Organisation so as to make it an organisation which truly promotes the development of the personality, encourages social and artistic creativity and moulds the citizens of our socialist homeland. The Party will protect the interests of children in government bodies and strive to strengthen and develop the material base for working with youngsters.

The Congress deems it expedient to consider the problems of working among young people at joint plenary meetings of the CPSU Central Committee and the Komsomol Central Committee, and of local Party and Komsomol committees.

\*\*\*

The CPSU confidently counts on the active support of the Soviet youth and the Lenin Young Communist League in everything creative, vital and progressive that our Party and people have in this complicated and crucial period of national history.

### **ON THE POLITICAL EVALUATION OF THE CHERNOBYL ATOMIC POWER STATION DISASTER AND PROGRESS IN ELIMINATING ITS CONSEQUENCES**

Being deeply conscious of the pain of millions of people in Byelorussia, the Ukraine and the Russian Federation who have suffered as a result of the Chernobyl disaster, we, the delegates of the 28th Congress of the CPSU, share in this pain and consider the disaster our common grief.

In conditions of the command system of administration, the country's former leadership made major mistakes in the planning of scientific and technical policy as regards atomic power engineering and the protection of people in emergency situations. The Ministry of Electrical Power, the Ministry of Medium Machine-Building, the Ministry of Health, the State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental

Control, the State Committee for Supervision of Safety at Work in Nuclear Engineering, the Academy of Sciences and USSR Civil Defence proved incapable of ensuring the safety and protecting the health of the population, and were not prepared to carry out the requisite urgent measures. Relevant material shall be submitted for consideration to the USSR Procurator's office. The CPSU Central Control Commission shall be instructed to look into the question of Party responsibility of Communists concerned.

The over self-confidence and irresponsibility of a number of leading scientists, and ministry and department chiefs who were involved in designing, building and operating atomic power stations, and their claim that atomic power stations were absolutely safe, have resulted in the virtual absence of any government procedure for dealing with special emergencies.

The Congress notes that the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Ukraine and Byelorussia, and the Councils of Ministers of the Ukraine and Byelorussia, failed to assess the scale of the disaster and its possible consequences promptly enough. Nor did they work out or implement quickly a government plan for the safe habitation of people in radioactively contaminated territories.

All this is undermining people's faith in the Party and the state, in the CPSU Central Committee and the government and is affecting their prestige.

Social tensions in the afflicted areas are increasing. This is being compounded by the long and unjustified secrecy surrounding the Chernobyl tragedy, conflicting assessments, especially concerning the medical aspects, and a lack of objective information available to the population about the actual state of affairs.

The Congress acknowledges that the measures taken to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster were unsatisfactory and insufficient.

The Congress recommends:

—placing special responsibility on Communists in charge of implementing the state Union and Republican Programme for the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl atomic power station, a programme approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet;

—taking prompt and exhaustive measures to protect the health of the population in areas subjected to radioactive

contamination; resettling people from the danger zones; showing special concern for children and for all citizens, including servicemen, who suffered as a result of the elimination of the consequences of the Chernobyl tragedy.

The Congress calls on People's Deputies of Soviets at all levels, on work collectives, mass organisations and movements, to show the greatest possible concern and consideration for those living in the affected areas, to provide them with proper housing and suitable living conditions, and to resolve all problems concerning medical, retail and community services.

The Congress instructs the new Central Committee of the CPSU to allocate 500 million roubles specially out of the Party budget to be spent on measures for improving the health of children living in polluted territories.

We call on the public in this country and the world community as a whole to take a direct part in resolving the diverse problems connected with the Chernobyl tragedy, and to assist in alleviating its consequences.

### **A DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL POLICY— THE WAY FORWARD TO VOLUNTARY UNION, PEACE AND CONCORD AMONG PEOPLES**

The 28th Congress of the CPSU notes that the union of Soviet peoples is going through a serious crisis. The acuteness and insolubility of ethnic contradictions in the Soviet Union are creating a tangible threat to the ongoing democratic processes; any further escalation of tension threatens the break-up of our society and possible destabilisation of the situation in the world as a whole.

The existing situation has deep roots in past history. Lenin's model of national relations envisaged the creation of a voluntary union of states based on the free self-determination of the peoples. Undeniable successes have been achieved along this path. But, in effect, the Soviet Union was formed in accordance with Stalin's notions of a unitarian state. There was forced deprivation of statehood. There were deportations, including deportations of entire peoples, in total disregard of their economic and spiritual interests. This resulted in the destruction of the natural and social habitats of many nations, in the degradation of their unique cultures, and in mutual grievances and claims. Despite all this, Party documents and propaganda kept proclaiming that the national question in the Soviet Union had been solved.

The processes of social renewal triggered by perestroika have in many cases taken on the natural form of national revival and national movements. The democratic forces of these movements represent the legitimate aspirations of citizens of all nationalities towards self-determination and self-administration, the improvement of social conditions, and the preservation and advancement of national cultures. These movements are a reaction to bureaucratic centralism and its inability to reckon with the intrinsic value of national forms of social life.

However, the memory of historical injustice, dissatisfaction with the rate of democratic change, decline in living standards, crisis of power structures and criminal exploitation of national feelings for narrow group and selfish interests have all created a basis for the aggravation of interethnic contradictions and centrifugal tendencies.

Ethnic conflicts have already resulted in considerable loss of life, in hundreds of thousands of refugees and in tremendous moral, political and material damage, with a deleterious effect on the processes of democratisation and national revival. If there is no improvement in the economic situation, no real self-administration of districts, regions and republics, if intolerance continues to prevail in the national movements, and if nationalist and chauvinist extremism is not halted, then tens of millions of Soviet citizens, and society as a whole, can expect still more serious upheavals and tragic times ahead.

The Congress states that the Central Committee of the CPSU and its Politburo have, especially in recent times, shown concern about the current situation and the state of some particularly acute problems, and have sought ways of resolving them. At the same time, the CPSU Central Committee and the Party's top leadership have failed to realise the magnitude of the deformations and contradictions in the national policy promptly enough, to anticipate their impact on the course of perestroika, to overcome dogmatism, and to work out fundamentally new approaches to forestall any course of events. Nor were many Party committees ready to take the lead in revolutionary change or to find ways and means of resolving problems and eliminating conflicts in specific national conditions. Quite a number of Communists failed to stand the test of internationalism and succumbed to the pressure of the nationalist forces; they failed to provide arguments that would have convinced people of the danger of following the calls of those who incited national

strife. In some republics, the political initiative was lost to national mass movements in which democratic principles often intermingled with the overambitious political aspirations of their leaders.

The 28th Congress of the CPSU sees the way out of the existing situation in clearly defining the prevailing realities and their possible consequences, and in suggesting a political strategy in this area.

This strategy should be based on the unconditional recognition of the right of every nation, and likewise of every individual, to self-determination based on free, democratic choice.

For the people to back the Party's new national policy, platforms and policy statements, concrete efforts are needed to resolve socio-economic and national cultural problems. It is essential to secure a continuous and steady, even if modest, increase in positive results in raising the standard of living and restoring respect for national languages, cultures, traditions, customs, and concord between citizens and nations.

This must begin with manifestations of special concern for the fate of the small peoples and national minorities, for those who have in the past been denied their status and historical homeland. Urgent measures of an economic, legal and ecological nature are essential here to help preserve traditional forms of management and expand opportunities for using the achievements of present-day civilisation, and provide special conditions in the disposition of territories and their resources, and the results of economic activity.

The Congress advocates the carrying out of decisions, already made by the higher organs of power, to restore the rights of the repressed and deported peoples. These decisions should be mutually acceptable for all peoples inhabiting a certain territory, and should be backed with concrete programmes of Union, republican and local authorities. In this way genuine internationalism and humanity will be demonstrated in practice. These programmes should be carried out fully in accordance with legal requirements. The refugee problem also calls for concrete and urgent measures today.

Tens of millions of citizens of different nationalities live side by side throughout the country. It is they who are the most frequent victims of interethnic conflicts or hasty and ill-conceived actions designed to revise the existing national state structure.

Using political methods and legislative initiative, the CPSU

Central Committee and the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Union republics must do their utmost to ensure that the implementation of the principles of sovereignty includes the protection of the rights of all citizens and such forms of self-government and cultural autonomy programmes in republics, territories, regions and areas that will guarantee the rights and interests of ethnic minorities and small nations.

Union and republican legislative acts adopted of late have created the necessary prerequisites for the solution of the fundamental problem—the preparation and conclusion of a new Treaty of the Union. The Congress maintains that this should be based on the idea of a union of sovereign states, which presupposes in effect equal rights of all parties to the treaty, a clear-cut definition of the status of every member, the differentiation between the jurisdiction of the Union and that of the Union republics, multiple contacts among them, voluntariness and mutual benefit. All the national state formations, including the autonomous ones, should be equal partners in this process.

The transformation of the USSR from a unitary state into a genuine commonwealth of peoples calls for considered decisions and responsible actions. It cannot be hasty: it is, after all, a matter of the destiny and historical choice of hundreds of millions of people and a large number of nationalities. The Congress holds that throughout this period both the Union and republican authorities on the one hand, and all the social and political movements and forces on the other, should show wisdom and constraint and avoid actions that could lead to new conflicts and the destabilisation of the situation. Under the circumstances the republics, along with the centre, should bear the responsibility for laying the foundations of a civil society and safeguarding national life, relying on age-old experience of goodneighbourliness and peace-making. The Congress renounces all forms of violence in the settlement of national problems and considers political means and constitutional norms the only means of settling all conflicts.

It is the duty of Communists to combat the ideology and political practice of national extremism. The Congress resolutely denounces all sorts of chauvinism, Russophobia, anti-Semitism, propaganda and the practice of national intolerance and discrimination, and demands that the state should respect and protect the national dignity of its citizens.

The delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress are aware of

the degree of their historical responsibility for the decisions made. Humane and just society born in painful circumstances has to ensure peace and accord among peoples. Otherwise, democratic socialism and the Communist Party have no future, nor any grounds to be trusted. We will be able to take a respectable place in the world community only if we combine the efforts of all the peoples inhabiting our country and renew all aspects of the life of our society qualitatively.

Novosti 