



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

19980616 104

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

**Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited**

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-052

CONTENTS

15 NOVEMBER 1988

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

- Burlatskiy Discusses Problem of Pluralistic Democracy, Human Rights Issues
[A. Korotkov; MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 23 Sep 88] 1

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

- Armenian CP Central Committee Rehabilitates Leaders Purged in 1930s *[KOMMUNIST, 4 Sep 88]* 3
 Armenian Historian Blasts Azerbaijani Scholar's 'Falsification' of NKAO History
[Kh. Barsegyan; KOMMUNIST, 29 Sep 88] 3
 Monograph on History of AzSSR-International Proletariat Ties Reviewed 7
 Obkom Secretary Discusses Rehabilitation Question
[I. Lisochikin; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 17 Sep 88] 7
 Historian on Stalin's Relations With Military Leaders
[E. Iodkovskiy; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 23 Aug 88] 10

CULTURE

- Proceedings of History, Literature Conference *[VOPROSY ISTORII No 6, Jun 88]* 15

SOCIAL ISSUES

- 'Disillusionment' of Soviet Jewish Emigres with Israel Described
[S. Sandler; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 17-21 Aug 88] 89
 AzSSR MVD Minister Meets With Journalists 97

REGIONAL ISSUES

- Armenian CP Central Committee 27 September Meeting on Armenian Situation 98
 Arutyunyan Addresses Central Committee *[Armenpress; KOMMUNIST, 28 Sep 88]* 98
 Buro Reviews Events *[Armenpress; KOMMUNIST, 28 Sep 88]* 98
 Armenian Education Officials Appeal to Teachers, Students for Order
[S. A. Ambartsumyan et al.; KOMMUNIST, 29 Sep 88] 99
 Professor, Writer Spar Over Armenian Secession Issue *[E. Agayan et al; KOMMUNIST, 29 Sep 88]* 100
 ArSSR: New Commission to Investigate Masis Mass Poisoning Case *[KOMMUNIST, 30 Sep 88]* 100
 Armenian Party Officials Hold 28 September Meetings with Workers
[Armenpress; KOMMUNIST, 29 Sep 88] 101
 Yerevan Students Explain Support for Protests, Seek Armenian History, Language Instruction
[G. Gevorkyan; KOMSOMOLETS, 24 Sep 88] 101
 ArSSR: Teachers, Officials on Revising Armenian History Textbooks
[G. Rubinyan; KOMSOMOLETS, 24 Sep 88] 103
 Armenian Papers Provide Updates on Stepanakert Events 106
 27 September Situation Report *[KOMSOMOLETS, 29 Sep 88]* 106
 28 September Situation Report *[Armenpress; KOMMUNIST, 29 Sep 88]* 106
 29 September Situation Report *[Armenpress; KOMMUNIST, 30 Sep 88]* 106
 KOMMUNIST Provides Stepanakert Situation Report for 25-26 September
[KOMMUNIST, 27 Sep 88] 106
 Armenian CP Officials Meet with Workers on 26 September *[KOMMUNIST, 27 Sep 88]* 107

Burlatskiy Discusses Problem of Pluralistic Democracy, Human Rights Issues

18000023 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 88 p 3

[Exclusive interview for MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA with Fedor Mikhaylovich Burlatskiy by TASS correspondent Andrey Korotkov: "Policy: From Thaw to Spring"]

[Text] A Candidate of Sciences at 24 and a Doctor at 36, he dreamed of science and literature. Life authoritatively led him into politics, raising him at one moment to a breathtaking height and sinking him into a sleepy coldness of stagnation at another.

[Korotkov] Fedor Mikhaylovich, your books, sharp articles, and publicistic plays are so to the point exactly now, during the time of trials and changes, and of breakthrough into a new political thinking. What do perestroika and recently completed Party conference mean to you?

[Burlatskiy] After the Great October and, possibly, the New Economic Policy, there was no more important event in the life of our country than perestroika. It is our hope, salvation for our society, and the only possibility to give the people what they deserve, that is, a normal, civilized life. Of course, perestroika requires time, but even its first steps turned out to be impressive. In my opinion, those are three. The first step is glasnost, which opened the road for discussing problems of the country's development. The second step is the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan. I think that with the passage of time, this event will be higher and higher assessed in our society as a certain result of our interior and foreign policy, as a salvation of our sons and grandsons who were being killed there. The third step is the beginning of changes in relations with the West and, firstly, with the United States of America. I refer not only to the signing of the INF Treaty, but also in the broader context of the Summit, to the dialog between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. From my point of view, the conference meant the most important step on the road of perestroika since the 27th Party Congress. It represented the culminating point of sharp discussions and political struggles taking place not simply among the real supporters of structural, radical, and revolutionary reorganization, and the advocates of organizational, personnel, and other changes. Today, after the conference, we have not simply a general line, but rather a detailed plan of reorganization. M. S. Gorbachev's presentation, his speech, which was saturated with innovative ideas even compared with the Theses published the day before, had the greatest importance. And the adopted resolutions were even more important. They open possibilities for broad reforms. Thus, we enter the stage of institutionalism, that is, of consolidating and materializing the economic, political, and social reforms. I do not think that the present stage will be less acute and controversial. However, today the reforms have a foundation created by the Party conference.

[Korotkov] You are a specialist in the political sciences. Please, tell us which political problems in our country will emerge now as the most acute.

[Burlatskiy] First of all, this is a radical reform of the political system that was announced at the Party Forum... The main problem is in creating a socialist pluralistic democracy under the conditions of a single-party system. In essence, nobody was ever solving such a problem. At the same time, for example, there are states in the USA, where one and the same party is in charge for decades.

[Korotkov] What do such reforms mean in practice?

[Burlatskiy] They represent a concrete distribution of rights, authority, and, finally, of power between the Party and the State; between the State and public organizations and self-government bodies; and inside the State between the government bodies and representatives of the judicial system. The judicial reform, securing glasnost through a law, determining the role, place, and type of activities for the nonformal organizations, specifying the status of public opinion in the political process, democracy inside the Party, pluralism in the Party, and protecting the rights of each Communist represent a work of a tremendous scale. This work requires a high degree of professionalism and the profound conviction in the fact that without democracy we will not achieve anything in economics, culture, and development of the human personality itself.

[Korotkov] How do the processes taking place in the country affect activities of the Commission on international cooperation in humanitarian relations and human rights, which you chair?

[Burlatskiy] This commission exists since November 1987, and its emergence itself became possible due to restructuring of thinking. Writers D. Granin, A. Adamovich, and A. Rybakov, Academician B. Raushenbakh, director of the GMII [State Museum of Fine Arts] imeni Pushkin I. Antonova, and many others became members of the commission. In a short time the commission managed to obtain recognition from the foreign colleagues with whom we had meetings in Holland, Austria, France, USA and here in Moscow. We established contacts with some 15 international organizations and using joint efforts, it seems, we made a turn toward a constructive dialog.

[Korotkov] Could you not give us examples of such cooperation?

[Burlatskiy] I just came back from the United States of America. In the Carter Center in Atlanta together with the American and West European representatives we created a stable movement named the West-East Conference on human rights problems. Rosalyn Carter and I were elected its co-presidents, and the former US President James Carter agreed to become its honorary president. Representatives of the USSR, USA, and East and

West Europe became members of the Conference's council. We worked out a method for our joint actions. It consists, firstly, of an exchange of experiences and comparative analysis of resolving similar problems in different countries. We, the Americans, and the West Europeans, all of us recognize that certain problems in the area of human rights exist. Some of the problems coincide, other problems intersect, but all participants of the meetings experience the need to compare and to search for cooperation. Let us take, for example, the ethnic problem, which at the present time has become so acute in our country. This problem is also very urgent for Great Britain, which for many decades cannot resolve the Irish problem. Or let us take the race relations in the USA... We are looking for methods to exchange opinions and to turn from mutual accusations to a concerned dialog. Another example, the ecological rights of a person. Contamination of environment due to industrialization became a problem of all mankind. What are the rights of residents of one or another region with regard to this issue? And what about drug addiction, prostitution, and crime? These problems exist everywhere. In short, there is a huge area of social, civic, and political problems, where we can cooperate instead of fighting for each minor disagreement as we did during the times past. Release from prisons of a number of Soviet dissidents and permission to leave the country for Jews greatly impressed public opinion of the West and became striking examples of the democratization processes taking place in our country. These processes are trusted and cooperation emerges on their basis.

[Korotkov] Your article "Khrushchev" in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA caused a sensation in public. In essence, you were one of the first people who openly started to discuss a period in our history, the same existence of which quite recently was being diffidently hushed up by the official historical science.

[Burlatskiy] I was an editor of KOMMUNIST when I received an article by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov, then the director of the Department of Socialist countries at the CPSU Central Committee. Our joint work resulted in an offer to become a consultant for the department. In the early 60's I six times accompanied Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev in his travels in the USA in a capacity of a speech-writer, as it is called in the West; that is, I was writing speeches and statements for the press. Of the most memorable statements of this former leader, I can recall his speech at the USSR Supreme Soviet session after the Caribbean crisis of 1962. In this speech Khrushchev explained the motives for deploying

our missiles in Cuba and for their withdrawal, and described the character of agreements he reached with John Kennedy. After the "October" coup d'etat of 1964, I participated in preparing the first speeches of L.I. Brezhnev. However, already after the first contacts I realized that I got a task of completely canceling those achievements of the 20th Party Congress which were especially dear to me; that is, I had simply to write everything in a way contrary to what I was writing before. I asked Yuriy Vladimirovich for my resignation. He became very angry because, it seems, I did it in an unacceptable, boyish manner, and for many years we have not seen each other. Later, I worked for PRAVDA and the Academy of Sciences. I wrote the books "Lenin. The State. Politics" and "Mao Tsetung" in which I criticized not only Mao's personality cult but also Stalinism. I wrote a book "Mystery And Lesson. Niccolo Machiavelli," where I examined problems of personal power psychology. In general, I am attracted to the political biography genre. Later, I and the Academician A.M. Rumyantsev made the first in our country attempt to organize an institute for concrete sociological studies. Two years later our institute was attacked by certain circles of scientific community, namely, by our colleagues-philosophers, who disliked the institute's orientation toward studying such then "closed" problems, as distribution of income, social equality, crime, and alcoholism. In the early 70's A. Rumyantsev was released from his duties of the director of the institute, and I lost my post of his deputy. When Yu.V. Andropov became the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, he remembered me. I was offered to become a political observer for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and to be simultaneously engaged in scientific work.

[Korotkov] Fedor Mikhaylovich, we know your books about Lenin and Mao Tsetung, Hitler and Franco, the play about John Kennedy and the publicistic plays for the Central TV "Two Views From the Same Office" and "One Year Later." What are you presently working at?

[Burlatskiy] I am finishing a fiction-memoir about N.S. Khrushchev. In it I will try to describe not only Khrushchev but also the people, who surrounded him, namely, Kosygin, Suslov, Shelepin, and Andropov. I think that the time has come to start a serious historical analysis and direct discussion of the first wave of democratization in our country nicknamed "the thaw." It was not destined to become a spring, but it became the forerunner of that spring which has started now.

**Armenian CP Central Committee Rehabilitates
Leaders Purged in 1930s**

18300055a Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* in Russian 4 Sep 88
p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] At its regular session, the Buro of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee considered the question of the party rehabilitation (posthumously) of S. Ye. Akopov, former second secretary of the Armenian CP Central Committee, G. K. Saakyan, former secretary of the Yerevan Party Gorkom, G. Kh. Gumedin, former Armenian SSR people's commissar for agriculture, and M. A. Engibaryan, former rector of Yerevan State University.

In 1937 S. Ye. Akopov, G. K. Saakyan, G. Kh. Gumedin and M. A. Engibaryan were accused of taking part in a rightist-Trotskyite, counterrevolutionary nationalist terrorist organization and were sentenced to the supreme punishment.

After examining the materials of the criminal cases brought against them, the judicial and investigative agencies of the republic and the USSR have overturned the convictions of these persons, and the cases against them have been dropped because of the absence of the elements of any crime.

In connection with the complete judicial rehabilitation of S. Ye. Akopov, G. K. Saakyan, G. Kh. Gumedin and M. A. Engibaryan, their party membership has been restored by a decision of the Buro of the Armenian CP Central Committee.

Previously A. S. Amatuni (Vardapetyan), former first secretary of the Armenian CP Central Committee, who had suffered repression in 1937, was rehabilitated in terms of the party by a decision of the Party Control Committee of the CPSU Central Committee.

8756

**Armenian Historian Blasts Azerbaijani Scholar's
'Falsification' of NKAO History**

18300055b Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
29 Sep 88 p 3

[Letter from Prof. Kh. Barsegyan, doctor of historical sciences, chairman of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences' Interdepartmental Research Council for the Study of Nationality Processes, and honored Armenian SSR cultural worker, under the rubric "Letter to the Editor": "The Truth is More Valuable (Concerning D. Guliyev's Article 'From the Positions of Internationalism')"]

[Text] Upon returning recently from a business trip abroad, I read Doctor of Historical Sciences D. Guliyev's article "From the Positions of Internationalism: Concerning the History of the Formation of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan SSR,"

published in the newspaper BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY for 14 July 1988. [For a translation of this article, see pages 1-7 of the SOVIET UNION: POLITICAL AFFAIRS series, JPRS-UPA-88-044, dated 3 October 1988.] I read it and could not believe my eyes!

Could it be the scholar D. Guliyev we know? After all, until recently he stood for the friendship of peoples, and friendship between the Armenian and Azerbaijani peoples, in particular. And now he was singing a different tune. The matter at issue is the article "Studying History," which was published in the Yerevan newspaper *KOMMUNIST* on 15 July 1988 [For a translation of this article, see pages 49-52 of the SOVIET UNION: POLITICAL AFFAIRS series, JPRS-UPA-88-027, dated 25 July 1988.], to which the scholar responded in an article that turns everything upside down. After all, what he accuses us of was asserted for decades in Soviet historical writing and is not subject to doubt, and I was only reiterating those truths.

The Azerbaijani scholar is perfectly familiar with this literature and, in particular, with Doctor of Historical Sciences S. Kharmandaryan's monograph "Lenin i stanovleniye Zakavkazskoy Federatsii 1921-1923" [Lenin and the Development of the Transcaucasian Federation, 1921-1923] (Izdatelstvo Ayastan, Yerevan, 1969, in Russian), from which he now generously draws other people's facts with regard to the study of sources and ideas, adapting them to his own (or his group's) "manner of exposition," and thereby presents the history of the formation of the NKAO in a distorted light. In the final analysis, what is the historian striving for, and what has made him indignant? After all, in our article we only dealt with the just demand of the Armenian population of Nagornyy Karabakh and the Armenian people for the reunification of the NKAO with its motherland.

For more than six months the Transcaucasus has been boiling like a kettle. Events in Nagornyy Karabakh and surrounding it are at the center of attention of the party and government and the entire Soviet people. One important decision after another has been made. The tragedy of Sumgait aroused everyone and evoked the anger of decent people. Acceptable ways of solving the urgent problem under present conditions have been found. Yet according to D. Guliyev, no problems exist at all. If there is no problem, what has brought about the tension in relations between two neighboring peoples? What has caused the migration of Armenians out of Azerbaijan? The reader knows what we said in the article "Studying History: Internationalism and Soviet Armenian Historiography." In that modest newspaper article I attempted to show how the works of Soviet Armenian social scientists reflect internationalism, the friendship of peoples and the essence of nationality processes at the present stage. In addition, I put forward proposals for the 19th All-Union Party Conference that had been discussed in the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences' Interdepartmental Research Council for the Study of Nationality Processes. Most of them are already being

implemented and have been received with understanding by the people. For your information, following my article the historical reference book "Nagornyy Karabakh" came out; prepared by a collective of authors, it is written with a high degree of scholarly integrity and has played a certain role in elucidating the problem of the autonomous oblast that concerns everyone. V. Mikaelyan and L. Khurshudyan's article "Certain Questions Concerning the History of Nagornyy Karabakh" (VESTNIK OBSHCHESTVENNYYKH NAUK AN ARMYANSKOY SSR, No 4, 1988) is written in the same key. Its authors are very well acquainted with the history of the problem.

There is no need to set forth the essence of our article in any greater detail in the press. And it is not for D. Guliyev to issue an appraisal of our article and our scholarly competence. A sharp turn in his judgments concerning us is evident at this time. In the eyes of my Azerbaijani colleague I have become a "falsifier of history." Strange. We repeat the truth (which requires no proof) that "Nagornyy Karabakh, the historical Artsakh, is part of Armenia and the first bridge uniting the Armenian people with Russia. The Karabakh that is the part of Armenia that first made contact with the Russian people, and the part where the Russian political orientation of Armenians was formed."

In the historical reference book "Nagornyy Karabakh," prominent scholars, on the basis of rich historical source materials, including the "Ashkharatsuyts," have scientifically demonstrated that Karabakh-Artsakh was one of 15 oblasts in historical Armenia and in certain periods was called Malyy Syunik. If D. Guliyev does not know that, let him know that the Karabakh has been the Artsakh from ancient times, and is not so by dint of our will.

The political solution of a problem and the discussion of it are not within a scholar's competence. Removing the problem from its impasse is the concern of the party and the government, which have appealed to the people and, in particular, the intelligentsia in search of a correct way of solving the problem. But scholars bear great responsibility for the truthful treatment of our country's history. If one were to be governed by the drift of D. Guliyev's thought, all efforts are in vain, since the problem of Nagornyy Karabakh does not exist at all. Yet the problem does exist and, as was pointed out at a meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, it continues to occupy the center of attention; sooner or later this problem will find a just solution (Art. 78 of the Constitution will not be an obstacle to that. All that is needed is time, patience, and more inspiration by restructuring and the democratization of Soviet society.). As an historian, I have taken and will continue to take that position as the only historically correct one! And no one can force us to retreat from the truth by means of pressure.

D. Guliyev stubbornly asserts: "Nagornyy Karabakh has been Azerbaijani land from time immemorial." And at this point he shifts the historical facts we have cited to a different plane and cries "Help!" "But why only the Armenian people? After all, the Azerbaijanis who inhabited the region were no less interested in becoming a part of Russia." Let us respond that we were dealing exclusively with Armenian-Russian historical and political ties in the given context, and the treatment of other issues did not fall within the limits of our article. One could ask with equal success why Prof. Kh. Barsegyan failed to mention the representatives of other peoples in the multinational region.

As director of the Azerbaijani CP Central Committee's Institute of Party History (let us recall, incidentally, that that institute bore the name of St. Shaumyan when it was founded, and it is not known through whose fault or ill will the name of the flaming Bolshevik and leader of the Baku Commune disappeared; Also of interest is the fact that the highly significant inscription, "The newspaper was founded by S. Shaumyan and A. Dzhaparidze-Alesha," disappeared in the 1930s from beneath the BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY head), D. Guliyev pretends that he knows of sources that cast light on the history of the formation of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, but the entire contents of his article convinces one of just the opposite.

Everything concerning which the angry scholar pours his bile on us is fed by "buniyatovshchina," to which there is no end. Incidentally, D. Guliyev's right hand does not know what his left hand is doing! Thus, for example, the collection, G. K. Ordzhonikidze. "Izbranniye proizvedeniya" [Selected Works], which came out in 1986 under the seal of the three Transcaucasus republics' institutes of party history (edited by D. Guliyev, D. Sturua, et. al.) contains an eloquent document that discredits D. Guliyev himself: "Baku, 2 December 1920. Relay the following to Comrades Lenin and Stalin. Jut received report from Erivan that the Soviet regime has been proclaimed in Erivan and the old government has been removed. At present the revolutionary committee is in Dilizhan, and tomorrow morning it will go to Erivan. Yesterday Azerbaijan declared in favor of transferring Nagornyy Karabakh, Zangezur and Nakhichevan to Soviet Armenia" (G. K. Ordzhonikidze, "Izbranniye proizvedeniya," Yerevan, 1986, p 116). As they say, no comment required.

Let us again look at the historical facts. On 4 December 1920 PRAVDA and other newspapers carried an article by I. Stalin, RSFSR People's Commissar for Nationality Affairs, "Long Live Soviet Armenia!" which stated: "On 1 December Soviet Azerbaijan voluntarily gave up the disputed provinces and declared for the transfer of Zangezur, Nakhichevan and Nagornyy Karabakh to Soviet Armenia" (I. Stalin, "Sochineniya" [Works], Vol 4, p 414).

On 7 December 1920 the newspaper KOMMUNIST (subsequently SOVETSKAYA ARMENIYA) published a 30 November 1920 declaration of the Azerbaijani Revolutionary Committee recognizing Nagornyy Karabakh, Zangezur and Nakhichevan as an **inseparable** part of Soviet Armenia. We give its text below:

"To everyone whomsoever!

"On behalf of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Azerbaijan, announce the 30 November decision of the Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan:

"Azerbaijan's workers' and peasants' government, having received a report on the proclamation in Armenia on behalf of the revolting peasantry of a Soviet Socialist Republic, hails the fraternal people's victory. From this day forward the former borders between Armenia and Azerbaijan are declared annulled. Nagornyy Karabakh, Zangezur and Nakhichevan are recognized as a part of the Armenian Socialist Republic.

"Long live the fraternity and union of workers and peasants of Soviet Armenia and Azerbaijan.

"N. NARIMANOV, chairman of the Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan. "GUSEYNOV, people's commissariat for foreign affairs."

In the same issue of the newspaper, the article "Disputed Provinces" set forth the history of the issue and reaffirmed that the government of Soviet Armenia had decided to annex Nakhichevan, Zangezur and Nagornyy Karabakh to Soviet Armenia. On 26 December 1920 the same newspaper published a declaration of the Revolutionary Committee of Armenia on the inclusion of Nakhichevan in Soviet Armenia. A letter from S. Kas-yan, chairman of the Armenian Revolutionary Committee, to N. Narimanov has been preserved that states: "With a feeling of fraternal enthusiasm, the Military and Revolutionary Committee of the Socialist Soviet Republic of Armenia has received the news of the Azerbaijani Soviet Government's historic act of 30 November 1920 concerning Zangezur, Nakhichevan and Nagornyy Karabakh.

"This act will serve as a living example of the new, historically unprecedented relations between neighboring countries in which authority is actually exercised by the working people themselves, and when they are guided not by a desire to enslave their neighbors at the price of blood and tears and expand the boundaries of their holdings, but by the radiant idea of socialist construction. The Soviet states easily, in an instant, resolve issues that had previously seemed so difficult and insoluble.

"The unselfish act of the government of Soviet Azerbaijan has filled Soviet Armenia with the same feeling of trust and readiness to extend a fraternal hand to its age-old neighbor. With the proclamation of the Soviet

socialist system in both states and the establishment in them of the rule of the worker-peasant masses, there is henceforth no place in the fraternal peoples' life for bourgeois nationalist instincts, and no threat to use arms against the working people of neighboring countries. The just resolution by the Azerbaijani government of an issue that had been, in the hands of the overthrown repressors of the free will of peoples, the Dashnaks and the Musavatists, a disgraceful and bloody tool of mutual destruction, lays an unshakable foundation for the two republics' political and economic cooperation.

"Henceforth within the borders of Soviet Armenia there will be no place for the savage and senseless oppression of foreigners and people of different faiths, and all the benefits of the Soviet system will be extended to all Armenia's citizens in equal measure.

"Long live the brotherhood of the Soviet republics of Azerbaijan and Armenia!

"Long live the world proletarian revolution and its headquarters the Communist International!

"KASYAN, Chairman of the Revolutionary Committee of Armenia" (TsGAORSS Arm. SSR [approximate expansion: Central State Archives of the October Revolution ?? of the Armenian SSR, collection 40113, schedule 3, d[ocument] 2, sheet 13).

Four months later, on 12 June 1921, a decision of the Council of People's Commissars was promulgated under the signature of A. Myasnikyan that was based on the declaration of the Azerbaijani Revolutionary Committee and the mutual agreement between the Soviet republics of Armenia and Azerbaijan on the recognition of Nagornyy Karabakh as an **inseparable** part of Soviet Armenia. That decision was published in the newspaper KOMMUNIST, the (Russian-language) publication of the Azerbaijani Communist Party Central Committee and the Baku Communist Party Committee, for 22 June 1921: "Armenia. Karabakh to Armenia. Erivan, 17 June. On the basis of the declaration of the Revolutionary Committee of the Socialist Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan and an agreement between the governments of the Soviet socialist republics of Armenia and Azerbaijan, it is announced that Armenia's Nagornyy Karabakh will henceforth be an inseparable part of the Soviet Republic of Armenia. [signed] Comrade Myasnikov, chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of Armenia" (KOMMUNIST, Baku, 22 June 1921).

Let us recall one more fact. In his memoirs A. Mravyan wrote of his meetings, together with S. Ter-Gabrielian, with V. I. Lenin on 13 December 1920. Ilyich said: "After all, you and Azerbaijan have resolved disputed territorial issues" (A. Mravyan, "Statyi i rechi" [Articles and Speeches], Yerevan, 1961, p 222).

Such is historical reality, recorded once and for all in documents. And anyone who does not accept them, sins against history.

Of course, the documents from the 1920s contain certain contradictions, which stem from the heated polemics of that complex period, but it is impossible to ignore the fact of their existence, and to call those who use those documents contrary to the wishes of D. Guliyev falsifiers. We know that N. Narimanov expressed himself in different ways at different times on this issue. If we cite only those words of his that were used by the leaders of Transcaucasus Kray at that time (G. Ordzhonikidze, A. Myasnikyan, et. al.), is that a reason to call me a falsifier? After all, D. Guliyev himself utilizes a different opinion of N. Narimanov's that is convenient for him, and he thereby only heats up an atmosphere that is already complicated. Can it be that this is D. Guliyev's purpose? One doesn't want to believe that. Only let us advise D. Guliyev to reread the historical reference book "Nagornyy Karabakh," which gives a clear and exhaustive answer to the questions that for some reason arouse perplexity in the Azerbaijani scholar (see pp 27-35). Just how dissatisfied A. Myasnikyan, chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of Armenia, was with the unjust decision regarding Nagornyy Karabakh is evident from the following lines: "If one is to characterize the latest meeting of the Caucasus Buro (the reference is to the 5 June 1921 session.—Kh. B.) it is as though Agaronyan, Topchibashev and Chkhenkeli were sitting there" (he lists the leaders of the Dashnaks, Musavatists and Georgian Mensheviks.—Kh. B.; see Central Party Archives of the CPSU Central Committee's Institute of Marxism-Leninism, collection 1, schedule I, d[ocument] 232, sheets 22-23, as well as the historical reference book "Nagornyy Karabakh," Yerevan, 1988, p. 33).

Let us note that the decision of the Caucasus Buro of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on Karabakh was taken up by the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee on 16 July 1921 and not approved. "The resolution of the issue of Karabakh," the Central Committee's resolution notes, "does not satisfy us" (see Archives of the Armenian Branch of the CPSU Central Committee's Institute of Marxism-Leninism, collection 1, schedule 1, document 40, sheet 29).

Thus, no one is casting (or has any right to cast) any shadow on the problem itself and its history. We merely recorded historical reality, no matter how contradictory and bitter it might have been. After all, the roots of the urgent problem of the NKAO lie precisely in those decisions of the 1920s. That is the truth that cannot be ignored. History is the memory of the people.

As early as March 1919 S. Gorodetskiy, the prominent Russian poet, writer and public-affairs journalist had, for his part, stressed in his article "Karabakh," which was published in KAVKAZSKOYE SLOVO: "Every country and every nation has its own cherished citadel. When a people's history develops happily, it becomes a

center of cultural and political life. When fate persecutes a nation, it becomes a bulwark of national life, an island of hopes, and a pledge of rebirth.

"It is precisely the latter role that the mountainous oblast of Karabakh has played and continues to play for the Armenian people.

"Nature itself has given it tremendous importance.

"There, in the inaccessible heights of the Karabakh, which are an extension of the Kars and Sevan plateaus, for more than 2,000 years the Armenian people withstood the onslaught of nomadic tribes, preserving its culture and defending its national identity.

"Unified ethnically, economically and linguistically, Karabakh became the citadel of Armenia, its Eastern flank. Thus it was in the past, thus it is now, and thus it will always be, for the heart of Armenia, the Ararat Valley, cannot be defended without command of the Karabakh" (See VESTNIK OBSHCHESTVENNYKH NAUK AN ARM. SSR, No 5, 1988, p 74).

It would not be a bad idea for the Azerbaijani scholar to observe tactfulness and ethics and to respect his fellow writer or opponent. He is certain that we are casting a shadow on "prominent figures of the Leninist party of Bolsheviks." Yet D. Guliyev knows well enough that our entire scholarly life has been devoted to illuminating their activities. If D. Guliyev has N. Narimanov in mind, we have repeatedly argued in our works for a worthy treatment of his life and work.

The Azerbaijani scholar cites A. Mikoyan's 22 May 1919 report to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), which states that "the Dashnaks are agents of the Armenian government." Yet in 1918-1920 the Armenian bourgeois government was headed by the Dashnaktzutut Party, and consequently the idea was absurd, and A. Mikoyan subsequently repudiated it, as he repudiated many other contradictory and incorrect formulas of those years, including those expressed in the well-known "Theses Regarding the Caucasus Problem" (Party Archives of the Central Committee of the Azerbaijani Communist Party (Bolsheviks), document 39, sv. [expansion unknown] 12, pp 8-9, 18-23), which were presented to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). And it is no accident that subsequently in his memoirs A. Mikoyan circumvents these issues.

Instead, let us remind D. Guliyev that in the 19 July 1919 report of the Buro of the Caucasus Kray Committee, which A. Mikoyan had a hand in preparing, the section "Armenian-Tatar Complications" states: "In recent weeks, in addition to the Denikin danger, public opinion has been captured by the exacerbated relations between the Armenians and Tatars, both within the boundaries of Azerbaijan and in Armenia. Karabakh (half of Yelisavetpol Guberniya), where the majority of

the population is Armenian, has never yet subordinated itself to Azerbaijan and is not a part of it" (Party Archives of the Georgian Branch of the CPSU Central Committee's Institute of Marxism-Leninism, collection 2914, schedule 1, document 82, sheet 9). We have cited only one of numerous party documents that convey not the individual opinion of A. Mikoyan but the political appraisal of the existing situation in the Transcaucasus of the Buro of the Caucasus Kray Committee of the Russian Communist Party, i.e., the opinion of the nucleus of the region's Bolshevik organization. It would not hurt D. Guliyev also to take a look at the materials of the Second Congress of the Azerbaijani Communist Party, which were published in IZVESTIYA of the Azerbaijani Communist Party of Bolsheviks (Nos 4,6, 1921), which are kept in the Central Archives of the institute that has been placed in his charge.

D. Guliyev's attempt to isolate I. Stalin, considering him a minor figure in the resolution of Nagornyy Karabakh's fate, is also unsuccessful. The scholar writes: "Stalin at that time did not yet occupy a leading position in the party leadership." It is not hard to guess D. Guliyev's drift.

Since the well-known 15 June 1988 session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet, the 18 July 1988 session of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the speech of M. S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which presented a party evaluation of events in and surrounding Nagornyy Karabakh and deemed that problem to be "supremely important," it is utterly pointless to continue discussion in the spirit of D. Guliyev.

As a Communist I have always been in the vanguard along with my internationalist people, and I have stood and will stand for reason and a just settlement of the demands of the population of Nagornyy Karabakh. Let me recall that during the troubled days I repeatedly came out in the local and central press appealing to the people for calm and for sober decisions. The leitmotif of those statements was an assertion of the genuinely fraternal relations between the two neighboring peoples, and restoration of the traditional friendly ties between Armenians and Azerbaijanis, which have developed a crack because of the shortsighted policies of former leaders of both republics.

D. Guliyev is not simply a historian. He is a representative of Azerbaijan's ideological front and director of the Institute of Party History. Consequently, his responsibility to the people and to history is a double responsibility.

The people expects only the truth from him and believes him, but what does he do?

In falsifying a region's history, can it be that he does not sense that he is successfully providing grist for the mill of the adversaries of socialist society, torpedoing the policy of restructuring? And who does that benefit?

The faster the poor excuse for a historian frees himself from the grievous legacy of G. Aliyev, one of whose apologists he was, as a secretary of the Azerbaijani Communist Party Central Committee, the more useful it will be for the common cause and the restoration of internationality peace.

8756

Monograph on History of AzSSR-International Proletariat Ties Reviewed

18300124 [Editorial Report] Baku MOLODEZH AZER-BAYDZHANA in Russian 1 October 1988 carries on page 3 a 900-word examination of a recently-published historical monograph by F.E. Feyzulayev entitled, "Under the Banner of Proletarian Solidarity: International Ties Between Workers of Soviet Azerbaijan With People of Western Capitalist Countries and the Far East (1920-1941)." The monograph addresses the problems of an international proletariat and the movement for solidarity between workers of the USSR and the people of capitalist countries. Among other topics, Feyzulayev also explores the activities of the Azerbaijan branch of the Trans-Caucasian Society for Cultural Ties with foreigners who supported the establishment and strengthening of ties between "progressive organizations" in various foreign countries. In reviewing the monograph, doctor of historical sciences Ibragimov says that "the appearance of this monograph is important because up until now, the available...works of scientists contain practically no information about the participation of Azerbaijani workers in the movement for international solidarity." Feyzulayev assembled the materials for his monograph from seven central and republic archives and used material from the press published during that period. Ibragimov praises the work and recommends author Feyzulayev for a Lenin Prize from the AzSSR Komsomol.

UD/363

Obkom Secretary Discusses Rehabilitation Question

18000019 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Sep 88 p 3

[Interview with Leningrad CPSU Obkom Secretary A. M. Fateyev by LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA special correspondent I. Lisochikin: "A Man's Good Name and Historical Truth"]

[Text] As already reported in the press, the Leningrad CPSU obkom buro has considered supplementary measures to complete the work of rehabilitating persons subjected to unjustified repression during the 1930's and 1940's and in the early 1950's. By its decision a working group was established to coordinate this difficult work. Our special correspondent I. Lisochkin asked CPSU

Obkom Secretary A. M. Fateyev, who has been appointed chairman of the working group, to respond to the following questions, which are of interest to many of the people of Leningrad.

[Lisochikin] What dictated the decision of the party obkom to create a working group? Why are supplementary measures needed to deal with rehabilitation issues? What will they consist of?

[Fateyev] Right now our society is continuing the process of purging itself of the grievous errors and crimes of the past. It has its own prehistory, which, I think, we could not do without. Following the 20th Party Congress, as everyone knows, the good names of many party and state officials, military commanders, together with scholars, artists, and cultural leaders, including communists and non-party members who had suffered blamelessly, were restored. Central and local commissions were established in 1954 to review the cases of persons who had been sentenced on political grounds during the period 1934-1953.

This enormous and painstaking work was carried out, leading to the complete rehabilitation of hundreds of thousands of persons, citizens of our country, who had been condemned without any justification. But in the course of time the decisions of the 20th and 22d party congresses began to be consigned to oblivion as this effort became restricted. Party and law enforcement organs reviewed only certain cases at the request of those who had been subjected to repressive measures or of their relatives. The commissions both at the center and locally curtailed their operations, despite the fact that a considerable number of cases were left without review.

Today it may be said that specific errors were made. For example, cases were reviewed going back to 1934, but as the documents show, unjustified repression occurred even earlier. The fact that the existence of "centers" and "blocks," allegedly engaged in harmful spying and subversive activity, was never in doubt throughout this entire period is of great significance. Materials of well-known political processes of the 1930's were not analyzed, and for this reason the existence of a good deal in our history, and in the history of our party, took the form of "blank spots."

In this connection, and in accordance with a resolution of the CPSU Central Committee plenum of October 1987, a Politburo commission was established to devote additional study to materials related to the repressions which took place during the period of the 1930's through the 1940's and in the early 1950's. I do not consider it necessary to speak further of its activities since much of the information has already been made available to a broad readership. I will emphasize only the circumstances. The Politburo commission has been working and continues to work in close contact with local party organs.

How did this come about? The Politburo commission is engaged in reviewing the records of the major events on the basis of which prominent party and state officials were condemned through false accusations. But the fact is that for each one of these events there were local occurrences in the course of which many communists and non-party members were maligned, slandered, unlawfully arrested, and unjustly sentenced.

Let us recall the so-called "Leningrad affair." The Politburo commission report stated that the memberships in the CPSU of N. A. Voznesenskiy, A. A. Kuznetsov, and A. F. Kapustin had been restored, and it cited the following names of persons subjected to repression in 1950: M. I. Rodionov, P. S. Popkov, P. G. Lazutin, I. M. Turko, T. V. Zakruzhevskiy, and F. Ye. Mikheyev. I remember that a question arose in the minds of many: "What? The entire Leningrad affair involved only the fate of these people?"

Meanwhile, attention was turned only to the so-called "central group." In May you conducted an interview with A. I. Kirsanov, chairman of the party control commission, which was published in LENINGRADS-KAYA PRAVDA, in which readers learned that the commission had reviewed the cases in Leningrad of 146 communists and 56 non-party members subjected to repression in connection with the Leningrad affair for political reasons, and the cases of 315 communists unjustly and unlawfully charged with criminal and party—or simply with party—offenses. This is a case of very different scope.

From my point of view, A. N. Kirsanov rightly underscored not only the responsibility but the complexity of this activity, entailing a thorough study of case records and other sources. At the same time, it gave rise to an entirely unavoidable experience.

Now the CPSU Central Committee confronts a new task. The USSR Procuracy and the USSR KGB are charged with the responsibility of continuing to review the cases of persons subjected to repression in the 1930's, 1940's, and early 1950's, independently of declarations and complaints lodged by citizens, and the USSR Supreme Court and its local organs are charged with reviewing these cases within the judicial system in response to the formal complaints by the appropriate procurators.

I ask you to pay attention without fail to the words "independently of declarations and complaints lodged by citizens." That is extremely important.

Local party organs are encouraged to take measures to review promptly matters related to the party membership of persons rehabilitated in the judicial system.

It was the significance of this immense task and the experience gained in Leningrad that was responsible more than anything else for the establishment of a body capable of coordinating the entire operation. Our working group will serve as such a body.

[Lisochikin] Who will be in it? What organizations will be included?

[Fateyev] The composition of the group will be quite representative. It will consist of working members of the CPSU obkom, the Party Control Commission, the executive committees of city and oblast soviets, city and oblast procuracies and courts, KGB directorates, and internal affairs main administrations. Even a branch of the Institute of Party History will be represented.

[Lisochikin] I think that many people are mindful of the words "the completion of work" and this leaves an undesirable impression. Generally, is it possible to name a time-frame for its completion?

[Fateyev] The demands now made by the party call for a complete and thorough cleanup of past mistakes and crimes so that the restoration of historical truth and justice may ultimately be restored. Until now under all conditions rehabilitation has had a selective character. Now it is acquiring global dimensions, and this means the unflinching completion of the entire effort. It was not without reason that I asked you to pay attention to the words "independently of declarations and complaints lodged by citizens." In other words, it is necessary to study and reassess all matters pertaining to the massive repressions. It would therefore be rash to speak of a specific time-frame. I think this work will take years.

[Lisochikin] Do you foresee any complications or difficulties in the course of it?

[Fateyev] Of course. They are bound to arise in view of the enormous amount of work. We must establish strong ties between the law enforcement and party organs, and resolve a whole series of organizational and purely technical matters.

Some realities we have already come up against. Many things having to do with the massive repressions are scattered throughout the vast number of the country's archives. A certain disorder is to be found in the archives themselves, which must be dealt with.

Finally, I do not want anyone to try to oversimplify the task that exists. The opinion is now fairly widespread that if a person was arrested or excluded from the party during the years of which we are speaking that it must have been done unjustly. But, of course, this is not true. There were people in those years, too, who committed crimes, and there were communists who grossly violated the party rules. Right now we are encountering instances when certain people with profiteering or mercenary

motives are pretending to be "victims of the cult of personality." The study of case proceedings therefore must be absolutely accurate to constitute an authentic act of justice.

[Lisochikin] The inclusion in the working group of party workers and law enforcement officials is understandable, but what sort of role will be played by the representatives of our soviets?

[Fateyev] Justice and humanity are not abstract concepts. The process of rehabilitation even for those who were unjustly accused and for their relatives often involves resolving urgent everyday problems. The executive committees of city and oblast soviets are charged with insuring an attentive review of applications involving the provision of housing, assignment of grants and pensions, and the return of confiscated property, strictly guided in this respect by pertinent laws and decisions of the government.

[Lisochikin] Should the necessity arise, where should one address requests for rehabilitation?

[Fateyev] With respect to the process of rehabilitation within the judicial system, applications should be submitted to the office of the procurator of the proper city or oblast. With respect to rehabilitation within the ranks of the party, applications should be sent to the CPSU obkom. The party's city and rayon committees will announce information regarding the results of the review. Nevertheless, all submissions of any kind will be reviewed by our working group.

[Lisochikin] Will the working group have any information to propose for publication?

[Fateyev] Everything to do with repression in the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's demands widespread publicity [glasnost]. This is a matter of honor and conscience as well as the intellectual trustworthiness of our party. Twice a year the working group will report on its activities to the CPSU obkom. And in connection with the results of our work and separate review proceedings we will continue to rely on the support of the press. By the way, the information will be made available to the labor collectives on a regular basis.

It is not only a matter of publicity. I have already mentioned a number of case proceedings in connection with the "Leningrad Affair," which we looked into in May. Now the numbers have undergone a change. The people of Leningrad responded to an appeal by the Party Control Commission, and new, heretofore unknown names, facts, and case proceedings have come to light. We should like to continue this collaboration with the city and oblast community.

Historian on Stalin's Relations With Military Leaders

18300019 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 23 Aug 88 p 6

[Interview with Lt Gen Nikolay Pavlenko by Edmund Iodkovskiy: "The 'Conquerer's' Heavy-Handedness: How Stalin Became a Great Military Leader"]

[Text] The interview is conducted by Journalist Edmund Iodkovskiy with military historian Lt Gen Nikolay Pavlenko, doctor of historical sciences and professor.

E.I.: In your article "In the First Phase of the War" published in the magazine *KOMMUNIST* (No. 9, 1988) I was struck by the idea that in no other area of human affairs is the quality of leadership of people as acutely important as in battle. Experience has shown what an enormous tragedy incompetence of strategic leadership is for a nation in a war.

Remember Engels' thought about the Italian War of 1859. In the battle at Solferino the young but haughty Austrian Emperor Franz Josef got the idea all of a sudden that he could make decisions and direct the armies in the battle as well as the professional military men. "The Austrian forces," Engels stressed, "were defeated not by the allies (the French and Sardinians—**E.I.**) but by the stupidity and arrogance of their own emperor."

N.P.: I sense where you are heading.... Unfortunately, I. Stalin also got the idea that he was a great military leader. He did not have the professional military expertise or the foresight, however. And there is no such thing as a military leader without these qualities.

E.I.: Stalin's biography depicts his work during the civil war this way: "Stalin's iron will and brilliant farsightedness defended Tsaritsyn and prevented the Whites from forcing their way to Moscow."

N.P.: Let us start with the fact that during the difficult years of civil war V.I. Lenin was not afraid to call up around 60,000 officers and officials of the former czarist army to serve in the Red Army. This was a bold and wise decision. P.P. Sytin, former czarist general, was named commander of the Southern Front. He went over to the side of Soviet power during the very first days of the revolution, for which the White command declared him an outlaw.

He arrived in Tsaritsyn on 29 September 1918 along with K.A. Mekhonoshin, member of the republic's Revolutionary Military Council, and 9th Army Commander A.I. Yegorov. The next morning there was a meeting of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front, in which, in addition to Sytin, his assistant K.Ye. Voroshilov, I.V. Stalin and S.K. Minin, chairman of the Tsaritsyn Soviet, took part. Sytin presented his credentials at the very first meeting of the Revolutionary

Military Council. They explicitly stated that he was granted complete authority in the conduct of the operation and that no one should interfere with the commander's operational orders.

Stalin, Minin and Voroshilov felt that the front's operations should be directed jointly (by all of them), however. Mekhonoshin went to Balashov for talks with Moscow, and Stalin convened a new meeting of the Revolutionary Military Council on 1 October. At that meeting—the third day after Sytin's arrival in Tsaritsyn!—the decision was made to relieve Sytin of the position of commander and to appoint Voroshilov to the post.

The repression of military specialists at the initiative of Stalin, who was there as director of food supply for Southern Russia, became extensive. The terroristic "barge policy" was begun: Military specialists were executed by firing on prison-barges. Even former Russian General A. Snesev, prominent military scholar and military head of the North Caucasus Military District, was listed among the enemies.

E.I.: Snesev was miraculously saved at that time, in 1918, but all of them—Sytin, Snesev and Mekhonoshin, who made a great effort to rectify the situation at Tsaritsyn—were subjected to repression in 1930, following the trial of the mythical "monarchistic organization" of military specialists....

N.P.: That is true. I had the opportunity to meet with Sytin's daughter and grandson at the beginning of the '60s. They informed me of his tragic fate. I was a third-year student at the Kiev Artillery School in 1930. All of us who had not been tested by life were greatly surprised when arrived for classes but there were no instructors. Later we learned that they had been arrested in the night. I had the same experience at the Military Academy imeni Frunze 7 or 8 years later.

Primarily instructors from among the military specialists who had gone over to the Red Army during the civil war were subjected to arrest in 1930. Such well-known scholars as Verkhovskiy, Kakurin, Lignau, Lukirskiy, Sapozhnikov, Svechin, Snesev, Sukhov... were among those subjected to repression. Svechin was a major general in the old Russian army. He served in the Red Army from March 1918. He was the author of many major works on military theory and history.

A.Ye. Snesev, a lieutenant general in the Russian army, was an even more colorful figure. He went over to the Red Army in April 1918. He served as chief of the General Staff Military Academy during the years 1919-1921. He specialized in the military geography of Asia and had a command of 14 languages.

Of all the old military specialists I have mentioned only Major General Sukhov survived all of the troubles of the prisons and camps. The others perished....

E.I.: Among the millions who died Mikhail Nikolayevich Tukhachevskiy was a true talent of the era. The vast foreign literature on the "Tukhachevskiy case" promulgates the idea that German intelligence, skilfully exploiting Stalin's mistrust and suspiciousness, played the main role in the destruction of Soviet military cadres during the period 1937-1938. Is that true?

N.P.: This is only a small part of the truth. Relations between Stalin and Voroshilov, on the one hand, and Stalin and Tukhachevskiy, on the other, deteriorated badly as early as 1920, during the Polish campaign. Stalin's dislike of Tukhachevskiy did not decrease in the '30s. It was whipped up by Voroshilov, who hated the military leader. The foreign press also inflated the lies. The bourgeois press with its penchant for the sensational depicted Tukhachevskiy as a "red Bonaparte," who, it alleged, was fated to repeat on Russian soil Napoleon's climb to the pinnacles of power. Stalin knew what was written in the foreign press about the Soviet military cadres, including Tukhachevskiy. This gave him no peace, of course. The "undermining of Tukhachevskiy" went on also in 1930, during the destruction of the military specialists, and in 1936, when Primakov, corps commander of the "scarlet Cossacks," was arrested.

A German forgery did serve as the pretext in Tukhachevskiy's case. The Gestapo had not yet begun fabricating falsifications about Tukhachevskiy and Yakir, however. According to the writer I. Dubinskiy, Yezhov's agents were already beating the needed statements against them out of military chiefs previously arrested. As early as February 1936, that is 9 months before the notorious forgery came into Stalin's hands, Yezhov agents forced Division Commander Shmidt and later, Corps Commander Primakov, to make false statements against Yakir and Tukhachevskiy.

I had the opportunity to speak with Lt Gen V.S. Golushkevich, who was present at the mock trial of Tukhachevskiy and others. Before beginning the discussion I let him read the chapter "The Tukhachevskiy Affair" from Walter Hagen's book. This is the chapter in which is concentrated all of the specific information concocted by German intelligence. After looking over the copies of the falsifications, Golushkevich said that the interrogation of the accused did not raise the issue of the letters from Tukhachevskiy, Yakir and others to German generals and did not mention the receipts for money or other "documents" of the falsification. According to him, the entire process was carried out extremely rapidly. One felt that the court did not need to bring out the truth, that it already possessed the truth. One of the accused made statements against Tukhachevskiy. Without looking at the military leader, he mumbled something about "espionage intelligence" allegedly received from Tukhachevskiy. When Tukhachevskiy asked the "witness" "Did you dream all of this?" Chairman V. Ulrich cut Tukhachevskiy off and did not return to the matter.

Stalin was not so naive as to fall for this kind of typical bait, which one can read about in any basic textbook on intelligence. Stalin would have committed his infamous deed even without the notorious forgery.

Stalin received no forgeries after the Tukhachevskiy case, but the repression continued with new vigor. During the repression the Red Army lost more of its higher command personnel than during the entire war.

E.I.: The German fascist command was delighted at the destruction of the military cadres in the USSR. Here is just one piece of evidence. After hearing a report on 5 May 1941 from Col Krebs, who was temporarily replacing the German military attache in Moscow, Chief of German General Staff Halder wrote in his diary (which we have published):

The Russian officer corps is extremely poor (it makes a pitiful impression), far worse than in 1933. Russia will need 20 years for its officer corps to reach its former level (the impression of Krebs)" (F. Halder, "Voyennyy dnevnik" [War Dairy], Moscow, Vol. 2, 1969, p. 504).

N.P.: The "case" of K.K. Rokossovskiy gives us an idea of how an investigation was conducted during the Yezhov period. In the summer of 1966 VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL, of which I was the editor, was preparing an article for his 70th birthday. I visited the marshal at his dacha. He mentioned certain gloomy aspects of his biography. In the mid-'30s he had commanded the 5th Cavalry Corps in Pskov. In 1938 he was arrested, delivered to Leningrad and thrown into the prison called Kresty. He was accused of having been recruited by a certain Polish agent named Juszkievich.

The case was examined by a "troika" in Moscow. Rokossovskiy had been delivered to the court somewhat earlier and locked up in an iron safe. He stood at attention in the safe for more than an hour, awaiting the beginning of the session. The subject of Juszkievich resurfaced during the trial. At the mention of that name, according to Rokossovskiy, he exploded and told the judges: "Try me and punish me if you take evidence even from the dead." He then stated that Adolf Kazimirovich had died the death of the brave at Perekop in 1920. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA had written about his glorious feat in the fall of 1930.

The trial was postponed, and Rokossovskiy found himself at Kresty once again. New investigators were now in charge of his "case." One of them asked Rokossovskiy what he would do if he were freed. "I shall work marble, like my father." "What else?" The corps commander exploded once again:

"I shall go to Moscow, get an audience with Stalin and tell him that there are many honorable people devoted to the Soviet State imprisoned at Kresty for nothing."

The collapse of the fabrications did not stop Yezhov's agents. They hurriedly instigated an army-wide search and found... a new Juszkievicz, who gave the "needed" testimony under certain pressure. This testimony also fell apart, however. Rokossovskiy was freed (with Beriya's assumption of power) and reinstated in the Red Army.

Rokossovskiy carried out, albeit belatedly, his intention to tell Stalin about Kresty. In September of 1949 the marshal and his family were vacationing in Sochi. One day a Stalin guard came to him and said:

"Yosif Vissarionovich invites you and your family to his place."

The conversation during the dinner was conducted in Bulganin's presence. The idea was for Rokossovskiy to respond positively to the request of President Bierut and agree to assume the post of Poland's minister of national defense. The marshal refused at first but then agreed on the condition that he would continue to be a citizen of the USSR.

When the main issue had been resolved, Stalin suddenly asked Rokossovskiy:

"Is it true that you were unjustly imprisoned?"

Yes, it is. There were many honorable people with me at Kresty who would not spare their lives to defend the homeland."

Rokossovskiy felt Bulganin, sitting next to him, tugging vigorously at his jacket.

E.I.: It should be noted that far from all of the main butchers of the Stalin era were justly convicted. Some of them succeeded in covering up their deeds or remained in the background. Others departed this world, while other "heirs of Stalin are tending roses in retirement....," as Yevtushenko wrote.

N.P.: But some of the criminals, as the folk saying goes, met with God's judgement. V.V. Ulrikh, the once terrible chairman of the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court, was a half-witted old man in his declining years. He did not hesitate to tell people that he was tormented by nightmares.

E.I.: Army Gen A.V. Khrulev, chief of rear services for the Red Army, was one of the prewar members of the Military Council under the People's Commissariat of Defense. Tell me about your meetings with him.

N.P.: This was an outstanding military leader. He held the additional position of People's Commissar of Communications. He attended almost all of the sessions of the State Defense Committee. This enabled him to see Stalin's work methods and techniques, of which we had no concept.

Incredible traffic jams developed on the railways during the first months of the war. It took an enormous effort to force the trains carrying reserves through to the front. They were delayed, which worsened the situation of the field army. Stalin and Kaganovich placed the blame for the stoppages on the railways upon the Red Army's Directorate of Military Communications. Lt Gen N.I. Trubetskoy, directorate chief, was accused of betraying the homeland and executed by fire.

Stalin's personality traits greatly harmed the organization of control of the field armies in 1941. He frequently exhibited irritation, even hysteria. According to Zhukov, a meeting with Stalin on 7 October 1941 left with him with a particularly bad feeling. The discussion took place in the presence of Beriya, who remained silent during the entire conversation.

E.I.: What was the discussion about?

N.P.: Stalin gave an extremely pessimistic assessment of the situation on the fronts and of prospects for the fighting in the fall of 1941.

E.I.: Nikolay Grigoryevich, I see that you have a lot of pictures of you next to Zhukov. Tell me more about him.

N.P.: I particularly recall one comment by Zhukov about the fascist army. After the routing of the Germans at Moscow, he said, Hitler had removed Brauchitsch, Beck and other prominent leaders of the German army and assumed command of the German ground forces himself. "He undoubtedly did us a major service with this.... The German army's previous level of independence in the resolution of operational questions was reduced. And the dismissal of Brauchitsch, with whom it had all begun, played into our hands, of course."

E.I.: But the enemy also derived considerable benefit from the unjustified shuffling of cadres at our higher command levels....

Hitler had a powerful and smoothly functioning engine of war when the war against the USSR began. "Yes, the enemy was brave—therefore the greater our glory," wrote Konstantin Simonov in a poem. I would like to cite Zhukov's amazing words which I read a year ago, also in VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL.

We need to give due credit to the German army which we encountered during the first days of the war. We were not withdrawing thousands of kilometers before a bunch of imbeciles but before the world's most powerful army. It needs to be plainly stated that at the beginning of the war the German army was more ready, better trained and armed than ours, more prepared psychologically for the war, more into it.... It should also be acknowledged that the German General Staff and the German staffs in general performed better at that time than our General Staff and our staffs in general, that the thinking of the German commanders was better and more thorough than

that of our commanders at the time. We learned during the war, learned well and began to beat the Germans. It was a long process, however. And the process began in a situation in which the Germans had the advantage in every respect."

Up to now there has not been such a candid and honest assessment of the former enemy's army in our literature, including the specialized literature. With this statement G.K. Zhukov self-critically assesses also his own performance as chief of the General Staff.

N.P.: Stalin too changed during the war. He began to understand many things which he had not understood before. Furthermore, he began to consider the objective reality to a far greater extent. The attitude of "what I have decided must be" gave way to a more sober position based on an objective assessment of the reality. One can only do what is possible; what is impossible cannot be done.

In the mid-'60s G.K. Zhukov told us, a group of military historians, in the editorial office of VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL that Stalin and Molotov had made unprecedented concessions to Hitler prior to the war. They had permitted the Germans to search on our land for "the graves of soldiers who died in World War I." Under the guise of searching for graves, however, the German "archaeologists" were scouting the area—roads, gullies and bridges in the immediate rear of the Soviet forces. Special attention was given to studying those areas later traveled by the tank armadas.

Zhukov's prestige and popularity increased greatly following the victory at Moscow. This fact apparently did not suit Stalin and Beriya. The gathering of "compromising information" on Zhukov was soon renewed. The arrest of Maj Gen V.S. Golushkevich, chief of the Western Front's operations section, in the spring of 1942 was the most conspicuous of these actions. Beriya's agents hoped to get to Zhukov with Golushkevich's help. Their hopes were not justified, however. Despite all of the tricks, the arrested general did not give any testimony detrimental to Zhukov. According to Golushkevich, a single arrest order signed by Abakumov loomed in his file for many years. Those around Zhukov were arrested in subsequent years.

During the Potsdam Conference Stalin got to see his son Vasilii, a pilot. The latter complained that our aircraft were very poor but the American planes were real aircraft. The complaint was sufficient for Stalin to arrange for the arrest of A.I. Shakhurin, people's commissar for the aircraft industry, and Chief Marshal of Aviation A.A. Novikov. When they got their hands on Novikov, Beriya's agents did everything possible to get him to testify against Zhukov.

Stalin used Novikov's statements in two ways. First, at one of the large meetings held in the Kremlin at the end of 1945, Stalin accused Zhukov of ascribing all of the

victories to himself. The second action in Zhukov's "undoing" took place at the beginning of 1946. This time leading officials in the People's Commissariat of Defense were present. The session was conducted by Stalin. The floor was turned over to Shtemenko to read the testimony of A.A. Novikov and K.F. Telegin.

E.I.: We know that Marshal I.S. Konev's recollections of that session of the Supreme Military Council have been preserved in the records of K. Simonov.

N.P.: Yes, they are being prepared for publication in the magazine ZNANIYE - SILA. This is what Konev had to say about the "historic" session:

"Stalin's speech cited statements by, among others, Chovikov, who had been arrested and was imprisoned at the time. Stalin was followed by Beriya and Kaganovich. They added fuel to the fire, saying the same things he had said and elaborating on his thoughts.

"Zhukov sat there, stunned by it all and pale. Stalin then turned to us: "What do you have to say?"

"I asked to speak. It was an oppressive atmosphere in which to speak after Stalin had spoken. I still said that Zhukov was making and had made mistakes, of course, that he was difficult to work with and was sometimes abrupt, impatient and proud, but I was profoundly convinced that Zhukov was an honorable man. What was written about what he had allegedly said about the government was not true. He was devoted to the government and to the nation. 'A person not devoted to the nation would not crawl under fire in a war, risking his life to carry out your orders,' I said to Stalin. I repeated once more in conclusion that I believed profoundly in Zhukov's integrity.

"Pavel Semenovich Rybalko spoke after me. He was in general a decisive and firm person, and he spoke positively of Zhukov in general, stressing the latter's honor and devotion to the homeland, while criticizing him for his shortcomings. Then Sokolov spoke. His statement was somewhat meeker, but to give him his due, he also spoke out overall in defense of Zhukov.

"Others spoke. Then Stalin took the floor once again....

"Yes, at the end of my address he had hurled a rejoinder at me: 'Here you are saying this.... But did you know that Zhukov tried to claim your victory at Korsun-Shevchenkovskiy for himself? He said that it was the result of his efforts.'

"I told him I did not know about this, that I had not heard it. And no matter what anyone said on the subject, history would sort it out. With that I sat down.

"Stalin spoke last. He spoke sharply once again, but in a somewhat different manner. Apparently he had planned in the beginning to arrest Zhukov after that Military

Council session. Sensing our inner—and not just inner—resistance and the solidarity of the military with respect to Zhukov and to the assessment of his performance, he apparently got his bearings and abandoned his initial intention. It seemed that way to me.”

E.I.: A wonderful example of moral resistance to Stalin! But what did Zhukov himself tell you about that session?

N.P.: He was very upset that lies and the truth were combined in Novikov’s testimony. It stated that Zhukov considered Stalin to be absolutely incompetent in military affairs. Something actually said by Zhukov about Stalin was cited: “He was and still is just a civilian (shtafirka).” (A term applied to civilians in the old Russian army). It was pointed out, however, that when Zhukov visited the troops he allegedly stayed a long way from the frontline, a hint at cowardice on the part of the military leader.... when Shtemenko finished reading the testimony, F.I. Golikov spoke out most radically. This was the prewar intelligence chief who, buttering up Stalin, considered all reports on a future war to be “provocation.” Golikov accused Zhukov of abuse of power, citing the case in which Zhukov had relieved him of command of the Voronezh Front in 1943. Stalin inserted a significant rejoinder: “In this case Zhukov was not exceeding his authority; he was carrying out my instructions.”

to Zhukov the statement by Marshal of Armored Troops P.S. Rybalko made the greatest impression on everyone. He came right out and said that it was time to stop believing “testimony extracted by force in prisons” and

rejected the slander about Zhukov’s cowardice. He told how Zhukov had flown in to his army when it had been encircled in the spring of 1944.

After that address Stalin went over to the military leader and said: “You need to leave Moscow temporarily....” And Zhukov did leave—first to Odessa and then to Sverdlovsk to assume command of the military districts. The period of disgrace had begun.

Taking advantage of the military leader’s absence, Beriya’s agents went through all of the documents at the dacha in Sosnovka, removing the most valuable ones. Even before that, however, in the fall of 1945, they had confiscated documents and personal notes stored in a safe in Zhukov’s office. Stalin knew about this. He telephoned the military leader and asked:

“Are you planning to write a history or something? Don’t. Let the historians do that after we are dead....”

Zhukov told me that he regretted the loss of the material. According to him, its absence impoverished his memoirs.

E.I.: Well it is the job of the historians to find all of those documents, to recreate the course of the Great Patriotic War without omissions.

Stalinism perverted the moral sources of our military history and undermined the unity of policy and morality. Yes, history was at times immoral. The truth can be restored only through purification and a return to the moral sources.

11499

Proceedings of History, Literature Conference
18000538 Moscow VOPROSY ISTORII in Russian
No 6, Jun 88 pp 3-114

[Report on conference of historians and writers on literature and history in Moscow on 27-28 April 1988]

[Text] A conference on current issues in the history of science and literature, organized by the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Union of Writers of the USSR, and the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, was held on 27 and 28 April this year. The conference was attended by CPSU Central Committee Secretary and Politburo member A.N. Yakovlev and CPSU Central Committee department heads Yu.P. Voronov and V.A. Grigoryev.

The conference was called to order by First Secretary V.V. Karpov of the board of the USSR Writers Union. An introductory report on "History, Literature, and Society" was presented by Academician P.N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Reports were also presented by V.I. Kasyanenko, editor-in-chief of VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and by P.A. Nikolayev, acting academic secretary of the Department of Literature and Languages of the USSR Academy of Sciences and corresponding member of the academy.

V.V. Karpov: Keynote Speech

People today frequently say: "Less talk, more action." The conference which starts today should not be regarded merely as a series of speeches, but as our professional cause, a cause of statewide dimensions. When the USSR Academy of Sciences and Union of Writers organized the conference, they realized that it was important and essential to conduct a joint discussion by historians and writers at a time when the science of history and literature are being restructured and are striving for complete authenticity, especially in view of the upcoming 19th All-Union Party Conference.

When M.S. Gorbachev addressed Uzbekistan's administrative personnel, he said: "The party must display courage and determination and free itself of some of the ideas about socialism that have resulted from a specific set of circumstances, especially the period of the cult of personality. It must free itself of old ideas about construction methods and, what is most important, it must rid itself of everything in general that has deformed socialism and paralyzed the creative potential of the people."¹ This job of restoring society's moral and spiritual health, requiring conscious and active participation by each individual in constructive processes, cannot be accomplished without the unification of all intellectual forces—science, literature, and the arts.

The great power of history to educate people is exercised through scientific work and through works of fiction. Research provides the reader with knowledge, faith, and

conviction. In works of literature, historical events, personalities, and the emotional and physical experiences of heroes are brought to life by the writer's talent. By means of emotional portrayal and perception, all of this eventually influences the moral, ethical, and psychological facets of the reader's character.

In general, we all have a common cause, and our common objectives and purpose should unite us in our work—and not only at this conference—and in a common effort to help the people reconstruct their authentic genealogy and the facts of history. We have recently had much to say and write about ways of filling in the "white" and "black spots" in our history. It would be better and more correct to paint them not one single color, but all the colors of life during the period represented by the "spot." We often have much to say about negative developments, repression, suffering, and injustice, and now we must lance these boils on the body of our history.

During the years of the perestroika we have already reconsidered, understood, and acknowledged many things, and now the time has come to give some thought not only to filling in the blank spaces, not only to patching up the holes, but also to the job of reconstructing our history in its entirety and relating it to antiquity and the Middle Ages, so that our people, especially the young, can be inspired by the herculean strength of our great-great-grandfathers, by the sacred, crystal-clear purity of our fathers, the Leninist guard, and by the selfless devotion to the motherland displayed by the victors in the Great Patriotic War and those who surmounted all obstacles to give our people strength during the difficult years of near-starvation of the first five-year plans.

Before we begin our work, let us recall the words of the great writer and historian N.M. Karamzin: "The historian must share his people's joys and sorrows. He must guard against all of the prejudices that might cause him to distort facts or exaggerate the good points and conceal the bad in his account of events; above all, he must be truthful; he can, and even must, relate all of the unpleasant and shameful events in the history of his people with regret, and all of their honorable achievements, victories, and signs of good health with pleasure and enthusiasm. Only this can make a historian an authentic portrayeur of national morals and manners."²

P.N. Fedoseyev: History, Literature, and Society

Ever since the April (1985) central committee plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress, the restructuring and revolutionary renewal of Soviet society have been the main concerns of our life and social thinking. At this turning point in our history we must reassess many of our ideas about the past and present and analyze the new aspects of our social development and spiritual life. In the social sciences this process has been slow and laborious enough to evoke justifiable criticism.

The ideology of renewal extends to all facets of life—public education, economic management, cultural development, science, and world politics. In its reorganizing activity, the USSR Academy of Sciences has concentrated on priority fields of scientific, technical, and social progress, compiling and implementing the appropriate scientific programs. Problems in the restructuring and renewal of socialism occupy a prominent place in general academy programs. Above all, these entail the theoretical support of the economic reform based on cost accounting, the expansion of democracy, glasnost, the self-sufficiency of enterprises, and the self-reliance of labor collectives. In addition, this requires long-range forecasts of comprehensive socioeconomic and cultural development. In economic substantiation, priority is assigned to the improvement of management, with special emphasis on the conservation of resources and labor, with a view to the augmentation of professional skills and labor productivity under the conditions of the increasing use of scientific and technical achievements.

The individual and the possibility of strengthening the human factor are the main concerns of our science. This presupposes the thorough study of the individual's place and role in social development, his creative potential, his abilities and ambitions, his needs and motives, his values and social goals, his mental processes, and his consciousness and self-awareness. The social and biological makeup of the human being is still a relevant issue, and the interaction of man, machine, and environment has become an important field of research. This is not simply a matter of teaching people or adapting them to a technical society, but also of humanizing the "technosphere" itself, protecting the environment, and using natural resources wisely. Heightened concern for the individual and for the human factor is apparent in all fields of academy research. The technocratic and exclusively technical-economic approaches to the assessment of economic development and scientific and technical progress are being surmounted, and a special interest in the social sphere is being displayed.

Questions of history and literature have become extremely relevant and are closely interrelated today, and the central ones are the individual and the activity of the popular masses. This close relationship between history and literature must not be regarded as something extraordinary or exceptional. We could say that history and literature are sisters by birth and by social standing. In ancient Rus, just as in other cultures, history and poetry began with the epic and legend, and, as soon as there was a written language, with tales and accounts of past and present events and people. The reproduction of real events in historical treatises and artistic images, which are of great educative value to new generations, gives history and literature a common role in the social and moral development and the patriotic and internationalist indoctrination of people.

It is probable, however, that questions of history and literature have never been of such great social significance as they are today. The general public is taking an

active and keen interest in explanations and descriptions of our past in works of history, fiction, literary history, literary criticism, and journalism. Thorough and objective accounts of past and present events are a matter of conscience as well as credibility. The dismal and distressing aspects of life resulting from flagrant violations of socialist principles must not obscure the historic achievements and unprecedented labor and military victories of the Soviet people or the guiding role of their political vanguard, the Communist Party. As V.I. Lenin said, "what we need is...a depiction of the process *in its entirety*, the consideration of all tendencies, and the determination of their consequences or overall results."³

History always was and still is a battlefield of serious ideological struggle. Today our ideological opponents are trying to make use of each important date in history as an excuse to cast suspicions on the viability and achievements of socialism and are even resorting to malicious intrigue and outright misinformation for this purpose. This is why truthful accounts of historical events and a Marxist analysis of our successes and errors in the construction of a socialist society constitute an important ideological duty of Soviet scientists and writers. Its performance will facilitate the objective disclosure of positive and negative experiences and the cogent demonstration of the colossal achievements and inexhaustible potential of socialism, its revolutionary contribution to world history, and its prospects.

As Lenin stressed, "life is propelled forward by contradictions, and living contradictions are many times richer, more varied, and more meaningful than they might seem at first to the human mind."⁴ This applies above all to revolutionary periods and, of course, to a process as complex as the restructuring and revolutionary renewal of the socialist society. Everything new is always resisted adamantly by conservative forces. An editorial in the 5 April 1988 issue of PRAVDA cogently revealed the demagogic methods and anti-perestroika biases of the advocates of a return to bureaucratic methods of administration and dogmatic conformity. The thorough comprehension and accurate reproduction of the past and present in science and literature are the dictates of our time. We must be fully aware of what we have left behind, what we inherited, what we must give up, and where we are going.

The most important function of historians and literary historians is the compilation of the true history, based on Marxist-Leninist analysis, of the Soviet society and its spiritual development, putting an end to impersonal studies of the historical process which say nothing about the biographies of specific figures in history and its dramatic contradictions. This is a difficult and highly responsible task because it is precisely the experience in the development of the Soviet society and the life and struggle of the people that can and must serve as a basis for future theoretical conclusions, the renewal of the socialist society, and the continuation and intensification of perestroika.

Although many massive works have been written and published, the history of the 20th century, especially the history of the Soviet society, has not been studied sufficiently yet, and analyses have been partial or even onesided, with serious omissions and flaws. These matters have been the subject of lively debates, especially in literary journals, but historians and literary historians, just as other social scientists, have rarely participated actively enough in them and have reacted too timidly to the processes occurring in the spiritual life of our society.

All of us are aware of the colossal scales of the ideological and emotional effects literature and the arts have on public opinion, especially the opinions of youth. It is true that works of fiction depict actual processes or different facets of reality in different and sometimes contradictory ways. Furthermore, literature and the arts transform life as well as being a reflection of it. First of all, they do not simply copy reality, but reproduce it with their own specific methods, transforming immediate perceptions and impressions into an artistic, image-laden view of the world. Second, they actively influence life and its various facets and contribute to changes of various types. This is how literature and the arts play an active role and this is why they are a moral force as well as an aesthetic one. In recent years they have dealt more frequently with historical subjects. Of course, literary and artistic works are created according to their own set of laws; the artist is not obligated to copy historical treatises or to alter his works to conform to the standards of scientific research. The functions of the science of history in this context consist not only in the principled assessment of literary works from the standpoint of their correspondence to reality but also, and above all, in laying a scientific foundation for the accurate understanding and analysis of the historical process and its artistic portrayal.

The main thing is to reveal the objective logic of history, its natural tendencies, and the connections between events, to reveal the continuity of the ideals of Great October, the revolutionary cause, and today's perestroika. It is also important to fill in the "blanks," restore historical authenticity, give credit to those who were unlawfully repressed or undeservedly forgotten, and portray both the victories of the Soviet society and its failures, both the brilliant and creative side and the tragic side of its history.

Some of us do not realize that not everything is indisputable and that there is much that requires reassessment with the aid of documents (and not just portions or fragments of documents, but all available documents, statistics, and the reliable testimony of contemporaries) and through the analysis and comparison of different accounts by native and foreign historians and writers. Acquiring a more thorough understanding of fundamental issues, particularly those connected with the history of the Soviet society, through concerted effort will not be a simple task. And we do not think of the consolidation of scientists and writers as the standardization of opinions and judgments, but as the organization of impartial

reciprocal communication and the unification of efforts for the thorough discussion and determination of objective criteria of historical authenticity and principled approaches to the analysis of events and individuals and to the assessment of works of fiction.

As we know, the arguments over these issues are not only between scientists and writers, but also between the historians themselves, writers themselves, literary historians, and literary critics. Turning points in history evoke particularly heated debates: Great October, the Civil War and intervention, the New Economic Policy, industrialization and collectivization, the cultural revolution and the establishment of a national state, the Great Patriotic War, the violations of legality which began in the 1930's, the mass repression connected with the Stalin cult of personality, the attempts to surmount this cult and restore Leninist standards in party and governmental affairs, the accumulation of signs of stagnation, and, finally, the latest turning point in the history of our society—the restructuring and revolutionary renewal of all facets of life.

Questions are constantly being asked about the period of the cult of personality. It is no secret that Stalin's achievements were discussed widely and were exaggerated greatly, even by us, the people of our generation, as K.M. Simonov admitted so frankly and honestly. As cases of arbitrary and unlawful behavior, political hypocrisy, and duplicity have come to light, the negative and sinister role Stalin played in the life of the Soviet society for many years has been revealed more and more clearly. The abuses of power and the crimes of Stalin and his circle, which caused so much grief and trouble for the Soviet people and greatly damaged the development of socialism and its prestige in the world arena, have evoked the most severe public condemnation.

The objective and subjective causes of the cult of personality and its destructive effects are now being analyzed in greater depth. The deformation of socialism, the prevalence of bureaucratic methods of administration, the suppression of democracy, and the dehumanization of social life were "founded" on Stalin's theoretical and political precepts. The main thing is that he perverted Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of proletarian dictatorship and made them weapons of crime, of revenge against colleagues, and of the mass suppression of the Soviet people.

Marx and Engels were certain that the capitalist society, with its social conflicts and wars, would be replaced by a society consisting of "an association of free and equal producers engaging in social labor in accordance with a common and efficient plan." This would be a "society with the international principle of peace, because each people would be ruled by the same master—*labor*."⁵ As we know, spontaneous uprisings by the oppressed masses turned into grim reprisals against the oppressors, and the suppression of the protesters turned into bloody massacres accompanied by ruthless terrorism. This is why

Marx and Engels believed that it would be the job of the revolutionary party to develop an organized class struggle, leading to the creation of a working-class state, which they called dictatorship by the proletariat as a counterbalance to dictatorship by the bourgeoisie. For this reason, Marx, who thought of the Paris Commune as a form of proletarian dictatorship, said that it would not immediately eliminate class struggle, but would "create the rational surroundings in which this class struggle can undergo various phases in more rational and humane ways."⁶

The historical experience of our country offered conclusive proof that the intensification of class struggle at a time of revolutionary reforms was not initiated or desired by the working class, but occurred through the fault of its class enemies. The working class naturally used coercive and violent methods to surmount their resistance. As Lenin said, however, dictatorship by the proletariat is not only violence or even mainly violence. Its fundamental purpose is the organization of new forms of life, new forms of social production and distribution. It is expected to eliminate class conflicts and create a socially unified society. The social basis of the proletarian dictatorship, according to Lenin, is the alliance of the working class with all laborers. Stalin, on the other hand, took coercive and violent measures against the laboring peasantry and was suspicious of the intelligentsia. According to Lenin, the Soviet regime, representing the governmental form of proletarian dictatorship, is a higher and broader form of democracy—democracy for the masses. Stalin, however, abolished the democratic principles of public administration and social life and thereby caused the democratic organs, the soviets, to lose their significance as organs of people's power.

According to the theory of scientific communism, the historical framework of dictatorship by the proletariat is the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. When socialism triumphs, when man's exploitation of other men is eradicated, and when exploitative elements are eliminated, the society will be distinguished by social, ideological, and political unity, all reasons for class conflicts and class struggle will disappear, and the need for proletarian dictatorship will disappear along with them. At the end of the 1930's, however, after the triumph of socialism and after the declaration of the moral and political unity of the Soviet people, Stalin postulated the need for more intense class struggle as the socialist society progressed and then continued to preach this idea in subsequent years. The Soviet Union's victory in the Great Patriotic War made the groundlessness of this thesis particularly obvious. This victory of worldwide historic significance revealed the unparalleled solidarity of the Soviet people and their social, ideological, and political unity.

Proceeding from this belief, a group of scientific workers I headed postulated in a draft of a new party program back in 1947 that the complete triumph of socialism and

the ascertainment of the moral and political unity of society had completed the great historic mission of the proletarian dictatorship and that it had now become a national government. These thoughts, however, were not pursued and were even buried for many years afterward. Furthermore, it was precisely in the late 1940's and early 1950's that the brutal repression of Soviet people of different nationalities and different regions broke out again, stronger than ever.

At the end of 1952 Stalin began discussing the need for heightened political vigilance and the complete elimination of "rotten liberalism" to recreate the menacing atmosphere of fierce class struggle against the "enemies of the people." These intimidating statements were not published, but they were reflected in part in a speech presented at a memorial gathering in Moscow on 21 January 1953 in connection with the 29th anniversary of Lenin's death: "As the successes of communist construction grow more impressive, our enemies employ more insidious, infamous, and brutal means and methods. Our increasingly successful advancement has been accompanied by increasingly fierce struggle by the enemies of our people, doomed to certain death.... These hidden enemies, supported by the imperialist world, gave us trouble in the past and will continue to do so in the future. We obtained conclusive proof of this from the case of the group of traitor physicians—the vile spies and murderers who hid behind a physician's mask and sold themselves to the cannibalistic slaveholders from the United States and England."⁷ Imagine the kind of problems and new criminal actions that might have been caused by the continued implementation of theoretical and political precepts of this kind!

It was not until the 20th CPSU Congress that N.S. Khrushchev spoke in clear and definite terms about the groundlessness and dangers of the theory of more intense class struggle after the triumph of socialism. And at the 22d party congress there was the admission that dictatorship by the proletariat had completed its historic mission with the absolute triumph of socialism and had ceased to be necessary from the standpoint of the needs of internal development. The Soviet state, which came into being as a working-class state, turned into a democratic government, an organ representing the interests and expressing the will of all the people, during this new stage of development. Of course, even then not all aspects of the class approach to questions of social development, especially international relations, had been analyzed consistently. Although there had been the definite statement that war between the two systems was not a fatal inevitability and that it could not and should not serve as a means of settling international disputes, the CPSU Program still said that peaceful coexistence was a specific form of class struggle and that it created more favorable opportunities for struggle by the working class in capitalist countries.

It goes without saying that we supported and publicized this thesis at that time. One of the reasons was that the

CPSU Program was drawn up at a time when ultra-leftists were attacking the policy of peaceful coexistence as a "deal with imperialism," and when relations between the USSR and the United States were severely aggravated by the invasion of Cuba by American mercenaries, the attack on the Bay of Pigs that started the Caribbean crisis. Our theoretical "shortcoming," however, consisted in our failure to see the distinct sociopolitical differences within the world capitalist system, our essential identification of the whole system with the imperialist camp, and our tendency to underestimate the growing democratic, peace-loving forces within this system.

The documents of the 27th CPSU Congress contain a thorough analysis of the differences and contradictions within the capitalist system itself and draw conclusions about the colossal significance of the struggle of the main driving forces of social development—world socialism, the workers and communist movement, the people of the emerging states, and mass democratic movements—against imperialism and its policy of aggression and oppression, and for peace, democracy, and social progress. This is why it was deemed impossible to leave the definition of the peaceful existence of states with different social structures as a specific form of class struggle in the new edition of the CPSU Program.

The most valuable achievement of theory and practice in recent years has been the new, genuinely dialectical thinking constituting the revolutionary method and spirit of today's perestroika. The foundation of the new thinking is a genuinely dialectical understanding of class and general human factors in social development.

The main shortcoming in the interpretation of this phenomenon was the tendency to regard opposites in social life as separate polarities without considering their reciprocal ties and interaction with general human problems and what might be called the intermediate or neutral sides and forces in social and cultural life. We are accustomed to references to well-known polar opposites: capitalism and socialism, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, bourgeois culture and socialist culture, bourgeois morality and communist morality, and so forth—as if there has never been anything between them or outside of them. This affected our understanding of the processes of economic and spiritual development in the contemporary world. For example, economic development in the capitalist world was usually viewed only from the standpoint of the social-class form of production. But after all, scientific and technical achievements are the result of human effort in general and no class has a monopoly on them, although imperialist forces are striving to monopolize them. The oversimplified view of the class nature of the capitalist economy, however, led to the underestimation of the technological revolution in this economy as part of the development of civilization. We must not forget Lenin's warning that it is impossible to build a socialist society without mastering everything mankind has achieved in technical development and scientific knowledge.

The problem of the relationship between class and general human factors also extends to the development of world culture. In the minds of some theorists the fundamental difference between the bourgeois culture and socialist culture seemed to obscure the general human cultural treasures created over thousands of years by many generations and multiplied by the creativity of contemporaries. Lenin said that in each culture of an antagonistic society, including the bourgeois society, there are two cultures—the reactionary culture and the progressive and democratic culture. In addition to spiritual poison, valuable works of culture are being created in contemporary capitalist countries. The sectarian view of socialist culture, however, has always interfered with the appreciation of general human cultural values and traditions, international cultural exchange and communication, and the use of foreign experience to raise cultural standards in production, construction, trade, and consumer services.

The metaphysical view of opposites also extended to morality. The view of communist and bourgeois morals as abstract opposites essentially obscured the centuries-old general human moral standards of behavior for which religious preachers had undeservedly and unlawfully taken credit. But after all, these simple standards and basic rules of all human forms of communal existence, as Lenin called them, are supposed to regulate the daily life of people and should become immutable moral commandments for everyone and organic elements of communist morality.

The sphere of relations between nationalities is filled with fine points and subtle distinctions, and this makes the dogmatic polarization of approaches and assessments all the more impermissible in this sphere. Here national and international factors, factors of social class and nationality, are closely interwoven and require a genuinely dialectical approach and the new way of thinking. Some historians and writers have given us one-sided portrayals of the historical development of the nationalities of the USSR; this has aroused unhealthy emotions and has been used to the detriment of our common cause. Neglect and dogmatic theories and practices are still resounding in the negative behavior and processes we can see today in several parts of the country.

History and literature should instill people with national pride but should also serve our general international interests and not work against them. Explanations of events and the role of different figures in the establishment and development of inter-ethnic relations must be objective and accurate. We must distinguish between such phenomena as a sense of nationality, national awareness or self-awareness, and national pride on the one hand, and national exclusivity, national arrogance and, last but not least, nationalism or chauvinism on the other. These must not be confused with one another because this tends to complicate matters and evoke negative reactions.

In our day it is exceptionally important to elaborate modern scientific approaches and guidelines for the study of ethnic relations and the history and culture of the nationalities of the USSR. Questions connected with the improvement of national-state construction, the further development and reinforcement of ties between Soviet republics and autonomous oblasts, and the resolution of their internal problems with a view to the multinational composition of their population are of primary significance. We must consider all economic factors as well as national culture, traditions, history, and the national mentality and view them as a single entity. It is more important than ever before to foster bilingualism and encourage people to learn their native language and the language of inter-ethnic communication.

Our attitude toward the historical heritage of our different nationalities—which elements of this heritage we accept and reject—is a matter of fundamental importance. Lenin taught us to accept everything expressing the interests of social progress and reject anything pulling us backward and interfering with our advancement. We must examine, compare, and assess various types of heritage so that we can separate the valuable and living elements from the dying and reactionary ones. We, Lenin said, are proud that the Russian people produced Radishchev, the Decembrists, and the Revolutionary Democrats of the 1870's, that the Russian working class established a powerful revolutionary party for the masses in 1905, and that the peasant began displaying the features of a democrat. By the same token, we despise the gang of Romanovs, Bobrinskiys, and Purishkeviches who defamed our national dignity and also left us their vile heritage and shameful memory.⁸ Lenin's principled statements, calling for a discerning attitude toward our heritage and questions of national pride, are of colossal importance in the assessment of historical events, individuals, and the political and cultural traditions inherited by the nationalities in our country.

A correct understanding of the interrelationship between class and general human factors from the standpoint of the new thinking is particularly important in the theory and practice of international relations in our complex nuclear age. The cardinal issue is the relationship between peaceful coexistence and class struggle and also the national liberation movement. We must have an accurate view of the struggle between the two systems in the world arena and of their internal development. The article in the 13 March 1988 issue of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA tries to substitute the dogmatic interpretation of peaceful coexistence as a form of class struggle for the new way of thinking in this context as well. We know that bourgeois propaganda used this premise for many years to exaggerate the mythical "Soviet threat" by urging the public in the capitalist countries to support confrontation between states belonging to different social systems and the preservation and reinforcement of the "enemy image" instead of the improvement and humanization of international relations. The author of

this article seems to be playing an unscrupulous game of "hide and seek." He is supposedly arguing with an academy philosopher, but it is difficult to believe that he has not read the party documents on this matter and does not know who has priority in the substantiation and elucidation of the principle of peaceful coexistence in Lenin's sense, from the standpoint of the new way of thinking. In any case, the article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA will not strengthen the foreign reader's trust in Soviet foreign policy and is more likely to do the opposite.

These tendencies are particularly intolerable now that the CPSU, the Soviet state, and the Soviet people are working actively with all progressive forces to build a strong world, a world free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Of course, the peaceful coexistence of states and the priority of general human interests in world affairs will not put an end to the class and national-liberation struggle in the non-socialist world. Peaceful coexistence has nothing in common with the theory of the convergence of the two systems differing in terms of the class nature of their sociopolitical structure. Deep-seated socioeconomic differences between the two world systems will continue to exist, and their ideological battles will not end and occasionally will become more intense. The class approach to international relations is the alpha and omega of Marxism, but we must distinguish between peaceful coexistence and "cold war," politico-military confrontation based on an arms race, intervention, and local wars.

From the standpoint of the new way of thinking, the fundamental purpose of peaceful coexistence is not the fueling of class struggle in the world arena or the escalation of international tension, but the redirection of the struggle between the two systems into the channel of peaceful economic competition and scientific and technical contests, so that ideological confrontation will not turn into "psychological warfare," sabotage, or subversive activity and so that interference in the internal affairs of other countries can be prevented. Our relations with India, Finland, and many non-aligned capitalist countries are a good example of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social structures.

Peaceful coexistence is a sphere of intergovernmental relations and presupposes the resolution of international problems by peaceful rather than military means and without any interference in internal affairs. This means that the issues of class struggle in a capitalist country are its own internal affair. Communists and all leftist forces are working independently on the resolution of problems in labor's struggle against exploitation and for the vested interests and rights of laborers and are independently determining this struggle's relationship to global problems and the general human problem of defending the peace.

Of course, artistic portrayals of the past and the present cannot ignore the need for truth and correspondence to

reality, however different the creative approaches, methods, and stylistics of various works might be. The literature of socialist realism, the current founded by M. Gorkiy, is the most accurate reflection of objective reality and historical facts. This is a road leading to inexhaustible opportunities for creativity because it is the road of innovators and pioneers, a road to the future. This does not, however, provide any grounds for a sectarian or dogmatic approach to the analysis of works of art from the standpoint of the rejection of anything contrary to the "canons" of socialist realism. The works of a single artist can display differences in style and form. In our assessment of works of art, however, we have frequently been guilty of the dogmatic and polar contrasting of some artistic currents, methods, and styles with others.

Socialist realism is not immutable. Its principles are being developed and the forms of its embodiment in the creative process and its interpretation are being enriched. Of course, the differences between realism and formalism are still present in world literature, including the literature of the socialist countries, but what lies between realism and formalism is not an abyss, but the seamless fabric of literature, and some of the works in the middle are closer to realism while others are closer to formalism. Even in the latter, various features and facets of life, specific human experiences and ideas, are reflected in unique forms.

Literary and art historians deserve more criticism. They are not doing enough to elaborate a theory of the literary process and the creative process in general. They have also been ignoring a field of science as important as aesthetics. We have no large scientific subdivision working on aesthetic theory in our country. The USSR is probably the only country in the world without a single journal on aesthetics and the theory of artistic creativity. This kind of journal would be of great value to literary and art historians, writers, literary critics, playwrights, actors, painters, composers, sculptors, and architects—and of course to readers who value, respect, and love art and are striving for more knowledge and aesthetic appreciation of artistic creativity.

The strength of socialism and its progressive and humane nature are displayed in its potential for scientific self-analysis, self-criticism, and self-improvement. The role of fiction, art, history, and literary history in this process of self-expression is exceptionally important. We hope that our meeting today will promote businesslike and close cooperation by scientists, writers, and artists.

V.I. Kasyanenko: *Basic Trends and Relevant Issues in the History of Soviet Society*

Perestroika has tied all of the problems of economic reform, the development of democracy, the moral regeneration of society, and the establishment of the new political thinking in world affairs into a single tight knot.

The February party central committee plenum played an important role in amplifying the idea of perestroika and substantiating the ideology of renewal by raising fundamental questions about the restoration of the Leninist concept of socialism and the Marxist-Leninist methodology of research and announcing the objective of updating the historical consciousness of the Soviet people. In his speech at the plenum, M.S. Gorbachev commended sociopolitical and literary journals for aiding in the creation of a new atmosphere, liberating minds, and awakening a common interest in history and in the processes of today's perestroika.

Our party's central committee is continuing its vigorous support of bold and pointed statements in newspapers and journals which promote perestroika and criticize conservative and dogmatic forces and anti-perestroika attitudes. One example was the editorial in the 5 April 1988 issue of PRAVDA, "Principles of Perestroika: Revolutionary Thinking and Action." The report of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo commission on the additional study of information about the repression of the 1930's, 1940's, and early 1950's aroused colossal interest. Incidentally, the commission is asking a group of historians for assistance in its difficult and complex work.

Today history has become something like a magnetic field of common emotions and is having a perceptible effect on the processes involved in updating our people's historical memory. An important role in this was played by writers and journalists, who still, objectively speaking, take the initiative in the discussion and assessment of many facts, events, and individuals. At a time of democratization and glasnost, the active participation of writers, journalists, and members of patriotic historical associations in the study of history is a completely natural and healthy process. And in spite of the shortcomings that were discussed at the February CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the meeting in the party central committee with the administrative personnel of the news media, these writers have shown us how to write concise, pointed, lively, and interesting accounts of previously concealed aspects of our society's past and present. These publications have stirred up public opinion and aroused a common interest in our country's history and its heroes and anti-heroes. This is a good school for historians, especially for the young historians and young writers who are just beginning to speak and write about historical subjects.

Many of the issues which are now being debated in the press disturbed writers, literary historians, and us historians for a long time. It is probable that only now do we realize and feel the pain of how much we have lost in the elucidation of all the truth about our life and our true history and in the patriotic and internationalist indoctrination of the Soviet people. Creative forces must be consolidated in a struggle for the truth, for the renewal of

the people's historical consciousness, and for the restoration of the best traditions of the Soviet intelligentsia and its civic views and actions, because this is a matter of fateful decisions and the future of our socialist motherland!

We have been living and working in an atmosphere of perestroika, debate, and artistic freedom for 3 years now. Let us speak frankly. Some historians are somewhat confused by the unprecedented glasnost, frankness, and self-critical attitudes toward our past, not to mention what we wrote during all of the years after Lenin. This is understandable. After all, there has been nothing of this kind in our country, frankly speaking, since Lenin's time! Historians, especially those of the older generation, are now experiencing great difficulty in changing their way of thinking and their mental attitudes, in surmounting the elements of their own inhibiting mechanism, and in giving up earlier research practices. The transfer from the old to the new state of mind and way of thinking is always a difficult, contradictory, and painful process, and it is much more difficult under the conditions of perestroika, now that the revolutionary shattering of old beliefs, methods, approaches, and mental attitudes is being accomplished. Some are afraid of "rocking the boat" and undermining the foundations of socialism.

We have already faced fears and even threats of this kind in our history. In the past they were tragic for some social scientists and some writers. Outstanding historians died or suffered severe emotional and psychological trauma because of slander and repression: academicians N.M. Lukin, Ye.V. Tarle, S.F. Platonov, S.V. Bakhrushin, S.F. Piontkovskiy, and L.V. Cherepnin, party historians V.I. Nevskiy, V.G. Knorin, M.N. Lyadov, and N.N. Popov, and other talented historians whose full potential our historical science was unable to use. Unfortunately, historians today are not active enough in reminding people of the dreadful experience of authoritarian and arbitrary practices in science and defending the complete truth and the lessons of history. From the 1950's through the 1970's historians were just as likely as writers to have their works declared unpublishable if they did not accord with the spirit of "unanimity" and conformity.

Historians still have too few documents, new theories, ideas, and assessments of periods and events for a truthful and complete account of the state of the society and the party, constructive accomplishments, social tension, and the rise of some administrators or the fall of others. Without belittling all that has been done in past years in the study of all periods and aspects of the history of the Soviet society, we must admit that the atmosphere of dogmatism and stagnation and the total lack of technical equipment to simplify the work of researchers had an adverse effect on the theoretical level, documentary basis, and ideological indoctrinational functions of historical research and publications. Many historians were influenced by the general atmosphere of rivalry and intolerance for opponents, including writers and journalists.

Oversimplification, depersonalization, the avoidance of dramatic situations and conflicts between truth and lies, good and evil, and the controlled and spontaneous in social life, and the justification of many specific types of behavior with references to general and objective tendencies—all of this made works on the history of the CPSU and USSR dull and they were frequently unpopular, especially among youth. It is also apparent that many of us have lost sight of the traditions and experience of the historians of the 1920's. The present generation of historians has forgotten how to perform in the role of journalist and cannot respond quickly and professionally to readers' requests for discussions of historical issues. Historians are still being criticized with some justification for not completing the multi-volume works on the history of the USSR and CPSU and for the shortage of monographs, brochures, and even magazine articles on relevant historical topics and current events. The unprecedented interest in the works of N.M. Karamzin, S.M. Solovyev, and V.O. Klyuchevskiy is one reaction to this. The higher demand for these works is the envy of many contemporary writers and historians.

Perestroika is disrupting the passive frame of mind in which every social process was described in terms of constant ascent, uninterrupted and smooth development, and "wise" direction. Contradictions, difficulties, and conflicts were called "unlawful" or "anomalous." With good reason, these kinds of statements have been blamed on reformism and dogmatism. Perestroika has assigned priority to the theoretical and practical restoration of Lenin's concept of socialism in its entirety and the elimination of the later additions and deformities which kept socialism from realizing its full potential.

The party has resolutely rejected the dogmatic and canonized distortions of the ideas of V.I. Lenin, who never set himself up as the final authority on the specific methods, deadlines, or frontiers of the construction of socialism and communism in our country. We believe that the riches of Lenin's ideas are far from depleted and that these ideas were crudely distorted during the course of socialist construction. Consequently, many of the works we wrote after Lenin's death about the history of the construction of socialism in the USSR require strict and discerning reassessment, reconsideration, and renovation in accordance with Lenin's concept of socialism and the facts and lessons of history, including the lessons of the development of our own science.

Today it is in a state of crisis. Perestroika and the need to restore Lenin's concept of socialism have revealed a preposterous paradox. It appears that we know much more about the history of our motherland in the Middle Ages and the capitalist period than we know about the history of the 70 years since the October Revolution! For more than half a century, ever since the first All-Union Conference of Marxist Historians (28 December 1928—4 January 1929), we have been advised to study contemporary history and summarize current experience in the construction of socialism. Social scientists have written

mountains of literature, but this good advice and the sincere desire of social scientists to analyze and summarize the experiences of contemporaries were naturally inhibited at that time by Stalin's cult of personality, his ideology, and his authoritarian and repressive methods of controlling our science. The social functions of history and the mental processes of historians were deformed, and this is still having an adverse effect on the efforts to restructure them.

The debates by historians from the 1950's through the 1970's, at a time of stagnation and dogmatism, tenacious old ways of thinking, and intellectual conformity, on the exact division of the history of the USSR and CPSU into specific periods, on Bolshevism's predecessors, on the transfer of the international revolutionary center to Russia, on the New Economic Policy, on nationalities and national culture, and, last but not least, on developed socialism, the salient features, criteria, and chronological framework of which were never analyzed in full, had little impact and did not accomplish the anticipated augmentation of knowledge and advancement of analytical thinking.

The revolutionary transition to a new qualitative state of the science of history and the historical consciousness of the people is an extraordinarily difficult task in the methodological, psychological, and organizational respects. In conjunction with philosophers, economists, writers, and literary historians, we must study much of our history anew and tell the whole truth about all periods, events, facts, and party and government leaders. We must complete an unprejudiced critical analysis of our literature and rid ourselves of everything contrary to the principle of historical authenticity and Marxist-Leninist methodology. Today, just as 30 years ago, after the 20th CPSU Congress, we are being given another chance to compile a complete and truthful history of the Soviet society and thoroughly analyze the fundamental values of socialism, the natural tendencies, driving forces, contradictions, and difficulties of our society's sequential development, and the objective and subjective causes of the deformation of true socialism.

The correct use of the broad opportunities for updating both our science and our historical consciousness and surmounting the marked tendency toward a preoccupation with sensationalism and biased descriptions of events, facts, turning points, and dramatic situations in the 70 years of our society's development will require, it seems to us, the unity and cooperation of writers and historians and the professional exchange of their knowledge, experience, and information. The coinciding interests of historical science and artistic creativity in specific areas of subject matter, the presence of common difficulties, and the common goal of renewal logically make this kind of cooperation and unity essential, but on the condition, it goes without saying, of the preservation and enrichment of specific differences in approaches, assessments, and methods of conveying historical and artistic images.

Unfortunately, there has been some "alienation" in recent years between historical science and historical fiction. During the last few decades of dogmatism, stagnation, and conservatism, we lost some experience in this kind of cooperation by artists and scientists. In the past, however, there were many examples of this. Today we are reading and discussing the beliefs, ideas, judgments, and principles used in the choice of historical material in books and magazine articles by B. Mozhayev, V. Belov, A. Rybakov, M. Shatrov, V. Dudintsev, and many other writers with great curiosity and, of course, with professional interest. The efforts of writers and magazine editors to quickly satisfy the public interest in previously confidential spheres of life and historical incidents is understandable. But let us speak frankly. Not all of the assessments of historical reality in these works agree with the facts, and the choice and portrayal of material are still controversial in many respects.

Our history is part of world history and it is just as changeable and dramatic. After all, it was no coincidence that both Marx and Lenin warned about socialism's "protracted labor pains." We must look at Soviet history on the grand scale to see it as it really was—with all of the people's constructive labor, the alternating rise and fall of the labor and social creativity of the masses, the alienation and deformation of Lenin's ideas and the true values of socialism. We must reproduce it with a view to the genuine flourishing of millions of different personalities, the appearance of cases of moral degeneration and crime, the struggle between new and old and between democracy and the arrogance born of complacency. Finally, we must disclose the contradiction between the driving forces of progress and the mechanism of inhibition, conservatism, and stagnation and assess our past from the standpoint of dialectical materialism.

The reproduction of our true history has become an extremely urgent task. It is our common task, and no one has a monopoly on the search for the truth and the assessment of the lessons of history, no one has any privileges, everyone is equal before criticism, documents, and arguments! A colossal role in this work will have to be played by historiography and scientific and literary criticism, which regrettably have performed mainly informational and bibliographic functions in the majority of cases to date. The need for a correct understanding of the dialectics of the historical-cognitive process, however, is stronger now than ever before. This kind of understanding is incompatible with stagnation, premature conclusions, and sensational "discoveries."

This is closely related to the issue of the so-called white spots or gaps in our history. For several objective and subjective reasons they have always existed in the historical consciousness and science. Their existence is largely due to the presence of forbidden zones, low professional standards, the inadequate mastery of research methodology, the general sociopolitical atmosphere in the country, the incomplete and nearly inaccessible nature of many sources, and their "prejudicial"

and selective nature. The "white spots" will reappear. Whatever seems indisputable today could be questioned later. New hypotheses and "gaps" might appear in what seem to be thoroughly examined periods or problems. The process of cognition, the process of comprehending the truth of history, is endless.

Social scientists are now gradually becoming involved in the work of updating the theories, approaches, and assessments connected with many developments and processes in social life, concentrating mainly on restoring Lenin's concept of socialism, studying the natural tendencies, contradictions, and "zigzags" in the historical process, and filling in the "gaps" in history. Party historians, for example, have assigned priority to certain fields and topics whose investigation will perceptibly update the study of Lenin's life and work and elucidate the history of the USSR, the CPSU, and the international communist movement. New books are being written about party history and the history of the USSR, philosophy, and scientific communism. The Military History Institute is working vigorously on a new, 10-volume history of the Soviet people's Great Patriotic War. Publishing houses and journal editorial offices are receiving many manuscripts on little-researched aspects of national and world history, and a series of articles and brochures on outstanding party and state leaders is being prepared for publication.

The atmosphere of perestroika is promoting the objective assessment of the experience, achievements, lessons, and errors of the 3 years since the April (1985) party central committee plenum. This has heightened the need for the complete investigation of many aspects of our history which were either controversial or semi-forbidden topics for a long time. These are the nature of driving forces and the "majority" in the October Revolution; some aspects of the New Economic Policy and the establishment of the socialist method of production; Lenin's ideas about the socialist nature of the cooperative movement and the methods and results of the collectivization of agriculture; the achievements, shortcomings, and contradictions in the industrialization of the country and scientific and technical progress; the "alternative patterns" of national development at the end of the 1920's; some aspects of the history of World War II and international relations, especially on the eve of the war; the dialectics of class and general human factors in our history, and many other topics. The strength and resources of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism and the institutes of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences have been mobilized for the investigation of these topics.

All of the problems which were given an oversimplified and routine explanation in the atmosphere of dogmatism and stagnation must be reinvestigated. These are the problems of the politico-ideological unity of the Soviet society; the principles and bases of the alliance of the working class and peasantry; the realities of the Soviet way of life and socialist values; the natural tendencies,

distinctive features, and contradictions in the development of the spiritual sphere, including losses in the development of the arts, literature, and science. Historians have not discussed these matters productively in many years, and it is understandable that the press is now raising questions about the most acute problems that were either concealed in the past or were mentioned only in terms of generalizations or references to official documents. Ethnic relations, the ethnic paradoxes of the present, and the internationalist indoctrination of the Soviet people warrant the closest attention.

It is probable that Stalin's cult of personality, its causes, and its severe consequences will remain the central topics of debate. The issue of the cult of personality as a negative social development and an indication of Stalin's role in perverting Lenin's concept of socialism, in the far from complete use of the material and spiritual potential of the new order and the human factor, in the infliction of still festering wounds on the soul of the people and the fate of many individuals, and in the damages incurred by the multinational culture and science will continue to occupy our minds for a long time and stimulate outbursts of creativity in writers and historians for the sake of the complete and truthful portrayal of this complex phenomenon. In spite of all the positive significance of the well-known CPSU Central Committee decree of 30 June 1956 "On Surmounting the Cult of Personality and Its Effects" (and it did play a genuinely positive role), it can no longer satisfy public opinion, researchers, writers, or literary historians.

If we take an objective look at public opinion and the differences in human mental and behavioral processes, one fact is absolutely obvious: There is no unanimity on many aspects of perestroika and renewal in the society at large or among social scientists and writers. It does not exist among historians either. We have been advised not to wait, as we did in the past, for instructions and directives from superiors, we have been advised to take action—creative and responsible action—and to use our common sense in realizing and foreseeing the consequences of this action.

How can history be "cleared of mines"? What part of our "heritage" should we reject? Which parts of historical science should be reassessed and how? We can only find the correct answers to these questions and perform these tasks with the aid of the method of dialectical materialism, constantly referring back to Lenin, to Lenin's concept of socialism, and, of course, with the aid of the real truth and with a view to the creative experience in the struggle against the time-serving, pseudo-ingenuity, and demagoguery which were sometimes characteristic of us and of writers. Historians must do this work in close contact with writers and literary historians.

Just think how many complex and acute historical, moral, and ethical issues perestroika has raised! Some problems are now being surmounted through concerted

effort. Other issues are still controversial and will continue to be so for a long time. And although M.S. Gorbachev's report on the 70th anniversary of Great October contained principled assessments of certain periods and leaders and appealed for creative inquiry and for the more thorough investigation of the history of the Soviet society, the comprehensive, truthful, and complete examination of historical events is still an extremely slow process, and historians are still working too slowly on major publications, especially those dealing with priority topics.

Colossal difficulties in connection with the renewal efforts will be encountered by historians in krais, oblasts, and republics—researchers and instructors in local VUZes. The information we have received from them testifies that there has been almost no change at all in creative teams, research institutes, and departments of USSR history and CPSU history in higher academic institutions. In most schools and VUZes the history of the Soviet society and the history of the CPSU are being taught according to an obsolete curriculum and with obsolete textbooks.

We hope that this conference, which historians have awaited for a long time, will mark the beginning of productive and regular working meetings with writers and literary historians united by a common desire for the whole truth in the history of the Soviet society and the Leninist renewal of the people's historical consciousness. For the sake of more extensive cooperation, historians should work with writers on the publication of documents, and not only archival documents; special sections or pages on the history of the USSR and the CPSU could be included in literary journals, and regular meetings of historians and writers should be organized for the discussion of current issues and, if necessary, manuscripts prior to their publication. Finally, the issuance of a series of brochures on the history of the USSR and CPSU history could be organized jointly for the quick dissemination of information about the latest historical findings on the most relevant aspects of our history.

At the February central committee plenum M.S. Gorbachev asked social scientists to restore Lenin's concept of socialism and surmount the myths contributing to the falsification of our history. "The main thing today," he said, "is to establish the necessary conditions for calm and objective work and make this work known to the public. In addition to everything else, this will promote active public participation in the discussion of aspects of our history and will consequently help in educating the public and developing the proper historical consciousness."⁹ Historians and writers are pleased with the atmosphere of glasnost and creative freedom and with the updating of the historical consciousness on the basis of the socialist plurality of opinions and views through the artistic portrayal of the historical process and through logical arguments. We must not miss the remarkable opportunities perestroika is offering us for the achievement of a new qualitative state of historical

science, the reinforcement of its social functions, and the transformation of historical experience and the lessons of history into a powerful factor of social progress.

P.A. Nikolayev: *The Portrayal of the History of the Soviet Society in Fiction and Problems in Literary History*

The problems mentioned in the reports seem extremely difficult, and not only because the artistic process today is too contradictory and complex or because we do not know enough about the history of our society, but because of what might be called in-shop causes: We are experiencing difficulties connected with differences in scientific and artistic thinking. Our disagreements and our conflicts, which are revealed in the periodical press, occur because we do not always acknowledge these differences.

There are certain historical periods in which the exaggeration of specific details and excessive reliance on one's own interpretation complicate the comprehensive and collective resolution of major problems. I think that this is one of those periods. The difficulty of interpreting what is happening today stems from this exaggeration of specific details. This is precisely one of the times when we must move aside from this preoccupation with specifics.

Critics have recently taken great pleasure in citing Turgenev's famous statement that the Venus de Milo dates back authentically to 1789. This implies that we are interested primarily in art for art's sake, in the level of artistry. It was explained long ago, however, that the authenticity of the Venus de Milo stemmed from the principles of 1789 or similar developments. The very level of artistry and its perfection depend on historical circumstances. Unfortunately, the critics who frequently repeat Turgenev's words today are forgetting this side of the matter.

We must think about what might unite us today. In the 20th century we have suffered enough from specialization. Of course, we will not return to classical universalism. Then literature would be policy, the national code of ethics, and philosophy. In the 20th century this would be impossible. Nevertheless, there must be some attempt to find points in common, common features in the artistic and scientific interpretations of history.

There are topics whose discussion could unite the scientific and creative efforts of historians, writers, literary historians, critics, and linguists. Historical authenticity is one topic of common interest. It cannot be alien even to artists working with contemporary themes, because our life today is also part of the historical life of the people. The mere acknowledgement of this axiom, however, is not enough.

Judging by literary history, the complexity of this topic is underestimated. Both the European and our own national science of artistic culture began from the historical standpoint. Pushkin was already calling the principle of historical authenticity the highest and best point of view on life and on spiritual culture. But how many alterations did this point of view undergo before the genuinely scientific historical authenticity we call concrete was firmly established? The acknowledgement of scientific truth is one thing and adherence to this truth in art or literary criticism is another and is connected with the reinterpretation of historical and artistic facts.

The reassessments are sometimes amazingly radical. Everyone remembers the recent interpretations of M. Sholokhov's "Virgin Soil Upturned" and some of the themes in A. Fadeyev's "Rout" which went completely against tradition. This certainly was not an experiment in the use of updated historical information to correct the artistic portrayal of, for example, collectivization, which became an established practice in our literature around a quarter of a century ago (S. Zalygin's novella "On the Irtysh" and the works of F. Abramov and B. Mozhayev), but an arbitrary, extra-historical approach to the subject matter in Sholokhov's novel, in which the relations between the working class and the peasantry were depicted objectively and dramatically, and to the characters in Fadeyev's novel (this practice has been extended even to Pushkin by the critics who feel that Pugachev and his circle are portrayed as villains and robbers in "The Captain's Daughter").

Prejudice and "misupdating" are the only possible reasons for the unanimous reaction of some artists and art historians to certain lines in Mayakovskiy's poems in recent months. What is the reason for all of the commotion? We must acknowledge the lack of correspondence between the earlier popularity of many books and writers and the "calm" response they evoke from today's publishers and readers. It is precisely in these books, however, that we find the most precise and complete accounts of the revolution and the creation of the Soviet society.

The 20th century is coming to an end and it will soon be time to sum up the results of our social and artistic development. We cannot do this, however, without a thorough understanding of the experience of the writers whose works were influenced by the Russian classics of the 19th century, grew out of the art of the era of three revolutions, determined the mainstream of the development of Soviet prose for decades in advance, and reflected the basic tendencies and complex dialectics of 20th century culture.

Why did this literature become such an integral part of the spiritual life of the people and influence thinking, including historical thinking? Above all, it happened because it was art in the direct sense of the term, lived according to its own laws, refuted the implausible ideas that occasionally entered the author's mind (let us recall

Fadeyev's work on the characterization of Mechik in "The Rout"), and therefore was not "normative," but was realistic literature portraying the "self-propulsion" and logic of life. In the second place, it happened because its artistic truth was simultaneously the historical truth.

This is the literature we call socialist realism. We must assign equal importance to the two elements of the term "socialist realism." We ceased to do this long ago, and this is the reason for many errors in the assessment of contemporary works, including works dealing with historical subject matter. Some people are losing sight of the line between art and journalism and are inclined to confuse the choice of relevant themes and subjects with artistry. This is how dilettantism pervades literary scholarship and criticism.

The historical authenticity of art is not simply a matter of exact literary portrayals of a historical event or all of its details, but an expression of the contemporary point of view of the author and an attempt to corroborate its accuracy with historical material. This is our national tradition, dating back to the works of Pushkin and Tolstoy, where historical themes were "subordinate" to discussions of larger issues. The epic "War and Peace" is full of historical inaccuracies, but it deals with an important social and moral issue of the 1860's ("populist thinking"). This is historically authentic art of the realistic school.

It goes without saying, however, that historically authentic art cannot be analyzed without a general methodological understanding of historical authenticity, and when we discuss portrayals of the past in our literature, we should recall V.I. Lenin's advice "not to forget the basic historical connection, and to look at each specific issue from the standpoint of how a certain historical phenomenon came into being and which main phases it underwent in its development, and then, from the standpoint of this development, to see what the given phenomenon has become today."¹⁰ Before we can analyze this aspect of literary phenomena, we must also remember that artistic realism has to deal with what F. Engels called the "stream of history,"¹¹ and that this has certain describable features.

If we approach the matter chronologically—that is, if we start with the first decade after the revolution—we must give B. Mozhayev and V. Belov credit for their astute chronicles of historical events and contemporary morals, representing a continuation of the artistic studies of peasant life of the late 1920's, but we must still, in my opinion, give preference to S. Zalygin's novel "After the Storm." It deals with the New Economic Policy (NEP), a phenomenon which served as an infinite source of intriguing plot lines in many literary and cinematic interpretations.

It was Lenin's belief that NEP was a strategic line of socialism and not an incidental tactic. This was a strategy of remarkable social breadth. In the planning stage

and, what is most important, in the stage of implementation, the policy was not merely an economic undertaking. The NEP experience revealed opportunities for the social and spiritual transformation of the individual in the post-revolutionary era. Within the context of all of the social changes of that time, NEP served as sound evidence of the life-giving properties of the revolution. People who once faced one another in mortal combat were able to find common interests in the new stage of their lives and unite their spiritual efforts. They were separated by the revolution but it also united them. This is the social dialectic of the first decade after the revolution, and NEP was the powerful "mechanism" of this dialectic.

In the heroics and dramas of the past the writer saw what must be remembered forever: The socialist revolution was carried out for the establishment of new relations between people, for fraternity, and for the transformation of the individual in an atmosphere of spiritual freedom. It is possible that there is too much rationalism in Zalygin's novel, but I feel that this book is one of the most objective epics of recent years. It ends on a note of concern. This is concern about the fate of Lenin's program of socialist construction and about the state of the world today.

This is a natural note, as everyone knows, for today's ideological and artistic inquiries. For several years it has permeated artistic accounts of the post-revolutionary decades and the first years after the revolution. In general, the serious contradictions attracting the attention of our writers, scientists, journalists, and critics came into being in those years. Objective descriptions of this exceptional time were impeded greatly by the shortage of historical information, the odd juxtaposition of the ideals of "destructive" and "constructive" patriotism discovered in the social movements of the last century and during the pre-revolutionary period of our century, and the abstract use of governmental, moral, national, and social terms.

All of this complicated the disclosure of the qualitative uniqueness of the October Revolution. This, in turn, was the reason for the incompetent assessments of many details of the revolutionary period, utopian ideas about some kind of communal socialism, and forecasts predicting rural rather than urban predominance in the future. Hasty conclusions of this type have been stubbornly defended in some literary journals for the last 20 years. This lack of agreement and awareness gave rise to all types of extremes in the artistic interpretation of people and events in our history, and these impassioned accounts naturally gave rise to contradictory critical assessments, frequently with emotional implications. This occurred when works dealing with people and events challenged common beliefs held for decades.

This explains the reaction to the scripts and staging of M. Shatrov's plays. Because of the unique nature of their subject matter, the author's point of view, and his stage

directions, their critical assessment demands the coordinated efforts of historians and literary historians, efforts in which representatives of both fields trust one another's methods. Literary history acknowledges the artistic conditionality of works and could therefore insist that the shifts in time in Shatrov's plays or the preoccupation with certain moral characteristics of historical figures are natural, but the complete description of all elements of the content of the plays is not part of its functions, especially since the author does not ignore the illustrative function of the statements of Lenin and his supporters and opponents but makes active use of them as an artistic device.

How could this be done without historians? Has every detail of this period been elucidated? No. I can say with the utmost certainty that even we do not know everything about, for example, Lenin's opinions of Gorkiy and other writers. I am basing my judgment on some archival documents which have not been published yet.

The 1930's have recently been the focus of attention in the arts and in journalism. Their reconsideration did not begin yesterday. The fate of the novels "New Appointment" by A. Bek and "Children of the Arbat" by A. Rybakov testifies that it began long ago and was one of the spiritual processes that became evident after 1956.

The dramatic "nakedness" of this kind of prose was sensed long before these publications. Because of the popularity of works of fiction dealing with the countryside, "rural" subject matter was used in the first attempts to change our ideas about the 1930's. In this context, two books warrant special consideration: I. Stadnyuk's "People Are Not Angels" and M. Alekseyev's "Brawlers." Their portrayal of the problems of the peasantry in the early 1930's was openly sympathetic. It is true that many of the subplots in these books were not dramatic and that dramatic tension was not one of the underlying themes, but this was a salient feature of these books rather than a flaw.

When A. Tvardovskiy's poem "By Right of Memory" appeared, however, we saw that a different kind of pathos, a new level of dramatic tension, had found its way into our literary re-examinations of the 1930's. Of course, it was already apparent in the characterization of Stalin in the poem "Distance Beyond Distance," but it was no longer a matter of ironic phrases ("Kalinin had already stopped treating the peasant spokesmen to tea in the Kremlin"). The folk drama Tvardovskiy recreated in his posthumously published poem "prohibited" all ironic nuances, although "strict literature" existed even before this time—after all, F. Abramov and V. Bykov began writing in line with these precepts long ago.

Bek's "New Appointment" and Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat," along with several equally symptomatic works (B. Vasilyev's "The War Was Tomorrow," S. Antonov's "Vaska," and others), reflected the need for the more detailed elucidation of the pre-war decade from

the standpoint of artistic and historical truth. There is no question that these works can be discussed from different standpoints and that their authors might be criticized on many counts, but one thing is absolutely clear: Their style and structure show no signs of haste, superficial affectations, or deliberate emotional manipulation, although the material would seem to foster these.

The characterization of Stalin and the protagonist in Bek's novel is restrained in style and objective in narration. And it is not even Stalin who is analyzed in detail here. Onisimov, who is known to represent an industrial administrator, is described in line with the realistic tradition. We could argue about the details, but the explanatory structure of the novel is obvious because the behavior of the character is clearly motivated and his actions follow a logical pattern, fully in line with the requirements of artistic realism. The motives and the logic are social and are justifiably used to perform a generalizing function. The doctor of social sciences, according to the well-known definition, is a realist. The fact that the very status of Onisimov, who once pleased the leader, is the source of the drama of a great man is easily discerned in the text of the novel.

This is a book which refutes the hasty conclusions of the kind of literary criticism that is displeased by the general ideological category of social realism and the aesthetic concept of realism. It is not surprising that the efforts of representatives of various currents of social thought seem to have been united in the analysis of the novel. This immediately gave rise to the kind of hypocritical "realistic criticism" that many of us are vainly trying to excuse—although, of course, in a modified form. I am referring to economist G. Popov's article about Bek's novel in *NAUKA I ZHIZN* (1987, No 4), where the fictional characters are examined from the standpoint of their determination by the administrative system formed during the years of the cult of personality.

Rybakov's novel has not evoked an appropriate reaction from our neighbors in the humanities, although there is no question that philosophers and historians have their own opinion, and it was expressed fully by G.L. Smirnov, who is responsible for the most objective and penetrating assessment of this novel in neighboring fields of science.¹² This novel concentrates on what might be called the internal or moral side of the era of the cult of personality: It depicts the process by which the subjective idea of power over people takes shape in one man and reveals the psychological "mechanism" employed in controlling the masses, who were later called "cogs."

The novel has evoked conflicting reactions in the literary and artistic community, ranging from unreserved delight to skepticism and outright rejection. It is the job of critics to summarize the conflicting opinions, but this

novel and its public reception will give literary historians a reason to enlist the aid of historians in joint discussions of the methods of researching historical and artistic material.

It is precisely in connection with works of this kind that the roots of the cult of personality have recently been debated by critics and journalists. The question was raised long ago, at least as far back as 1917, but now few people know the answer to the question at that time. I remembered this in connection with a factual error in a play by M. Shatrov, recently pointed out by historians: It concerned what Savinkov wanted from Plekhanov in 1917 (to be the premier or a member of the provisional government). We do not know what others wanted from Plekhanov, but in the published interrogation of Kolchak, before his execution he tells how he went to Plekhanov at Rodzyanko's request.

Plekhanov was a great thinker, but as a politician and revolutionary he was a tragic figure. He did not agree with Lenin's revolutionary strategy and doubted that Russia was ready for a socialist future. In essence, he felt that Russia was predestined to be governed by an individual rather than a proletarian dictatorship. There was no confirmation of this gloomy prophecy, however, in the entire decade after the revolution. Later, after NEP, this government by a single individual began to take shape. This, however, was not a corroboration of Plekhanov's ideas, but of Lenin's warning about Stalin's negative personality traits, traits which would be dangerous on the governmental level. Contemporary artistic portrayals of Stalin are more and more likely to be based on Lenin's remark.

Of course, another point of view is possible, and it was expressed recently in a literary journal.¹³ In essence, this is the idea that Stalin and the tragedies of the 1930's were natural results of world history and the world revolutionary movement. This is something like a variation on Plekhanov's prophecy, but one that transcends national boundaries. It is understandable that no contemporary interpretation of Stalin from this theoretical standpoint would stand up to criticism. The comparison of our socialist revolution to earlier bourgeois revolutions seems impermissible to me, and an analysis of their social and national differences would be more productive. This would provide the grounds for the corresponding methods of analyzing artistic portrayals of these subjects.

In any case, our research in this field can only succeed if representatives of all forms of social thinking unite their efforts. In this respect, we also have great hopes for our philosophical thinking, which, in spite of its now well-known weaknesses, displayed considerable theoretical potential even in past years and certainly does not deserve the unfounded accusations of "amorality" it was subjected to in a literary journal just recently.¹⁴

Moving on to contemporary literature dealing with the 1940's and subsequent years, I must point out the specific difficulties involved in literary scholarship here, because the problem of the "credibility of details" (F. Engels) in the historical context is certainly present in this field as well. This is a matter of verifying information. The most prominent works dealing with the war and postwar years are A. Pristavkin's novella "The Golden Cloud Stayed Overnight," V. Dudintsev's novel "White Clothes," and D. Granin's novella "The Diehard."

As far as moral and aesthetic references are concerned, I prefer A. Pristavkin's novel. Many of the pages of this hymn to suffering are quite emotionally infectious. The fascinating twin orphans with their ineradicable—despite their unchildish experiences and the brutality of subhuman adults—need and potential for purely human interaction and the birth of genuine internationalist feelings in the adolescents are described in the novella with the greatest psychological authenticity, combined with the bitter social truths revealed in the fratricidal conflict between people of different nationalities. This is a realistic portrayal which can fill one of the "gaps" in our knowledge of the ordeals of the war years.

The full scope of human capabilities is revealed in a completely different context by V. Dudintsev. The notorious 1948 VASKHNIL session exposed a serious conflict in social life, with a variety of social and moral ramifications. The consistency of this writer, who began investigating the causes and nature of the social errors that caused so much trouble for our science in his novel "Not By Bread Alone" 30 years ago, deserves the greatest respect. Critics have justifiably remarked that the recreation of the tragedy which befell our science of genetics is another "brush stroke in the portrait" of the cult of personality, one of the dramas of a time when it seems that the festive atmosphere of the great victory should have prevailed and should have united the people devoted to the Soviet state instead of dividing them. This was a situation which divided them and gave rise to violent conflicts without any historical justification, shattering people's careers, causing their untimely death, and reducing society's reserves of intellectual strength.

The portrayal of Lysenkoism in D. Granin's novella is equally merciless. The journalistic fervor here, however, was not reinforced by a detailed analysis of the historical and moral causes of the development of destructive methods in science. The author's aesthetic task was also complicated by his specific goal of a historically authentic recreation of the life of one of the opponents of Lysenkoism, a man whose biography is still not completely clear to science historians. Popular accounts of the life of prominent geneticist N.V. Timofeyev are still contradictory, and it would be easier to assess the realistic nature of the novella if the real person had not been identified as closely with the fictional character.

Examples of this kind attest to the need to integrate methods in the humanities and to the difficulties of the "autonomous" literary historian's approach to works.

Science dealing with the arts can and should demonstrate its ability to analyze the creative process and its specific manifestations with the aid of its fundamental concepts. In contemporary literary criticism this problem is frequently solved in a new way—with an air of disdain. Skepticism is particularly apparent in statements about the concepts of realism and socialist realism and about the terminology used in the humanities in general. Discussions of "rural prose," for example, offer the vague terms "nature" and "spirituality," and in the works of V. Rasputin and V. Astafyev, for example, critics cannot see that the heroes' internal world is influenced objectively by social circumstances, by the specific conditions of life in Siberia—in other words, the stories are not examined with a view to the laws of realism.

A recent work of literary criticism says that our literature was "infected" by Lysenkoism. The author sees the source of this "illness"—in accordance with the now popular assessment of aesthetic thinking in the 1920's—in the theoretical programs of that time: "Proletkult and RAPP. This was the initial romantic era of the persecution of 'suspicious elements' for the sake of an allegedly proletarian, allegedly class-pure culture. This was followed by the dogma of 'socialist realism' with the demand for 'life-affirming' plots and a 'positive' hero. This age-old requirement of provincial tastes was passed off as a Marxist-Leninist requirement." Later, the author who refers to conceptual definitions in such uncomplimentary terms resorts to the use of "categories" himself. This is what he says: "The current which could be called 'bureaucratic romanticism' might be regarded as a variety of Lysenkoism in art in the era of stagnation."¹⁵

All of this is indicative, and it is no coincidence that this article was published after the recent statement in VOPROSY LITERATURY about the total obscurity of the very concept of the Marxist theory of literature.¹⁶ This is less likely to make us take offense on behalf of our science, the concepts of which are subjected to harsh and unqualified criticism and are then immediately used by the critic, than to remind us to assert its rights and potential for the most objective assessments of the creative process and to consider its sovereignty and the historically demonstrated efficacy of many of its methods. But science also needs new serious ideas, and it also requires new advances in our ideas about realism, especially socialist realism, which can no longer—this is particularly obvious today—be regarded as an autonomous, almost sectarian phenomenon in the artistic culture.

According to D. Markov, the discussions of socialist realism became abstract and ceased to have any impact after the middle of the 1970's. He is right. In a discussion of new works of art (including those mentioned above),

this researcher, who investigates the problem of the "openness" (but not boundlessness) of socialist realism as an aesthetic system, correctly points to prerequisites for a skeptical and negative attitude toward the main method of Soviet art. Ideological opponents have an interest in confining socialist realism within a rigid framework. This provides a good excuse to discredit the method. Other critics, on the other hand, insist that socialist realism is boundless and "speak of the need for the plurality of philosophical-aesthetic methods in the belief that Marxism is alien to humanism and is therefore incapable of explaining the full range of artistic culture."¹⁷

This is the crux of the matter. Marxist doctrine on art has not realized its full potential yet, but as the youngest and most authentic cultural doctrine, it has the appropriate theoretical principles and analytical methods for the assessment of the degree of artistic truth in contemporary literature. The current difficulties in the development of literary theory might be the greatest in the entire history of our literary scholarship, but this theory could produce the most meaningful conclusions with regard to fundamental changes in the portrayal of the individual in contemporary art and the relative importance of personality and its sociopsychological determinants, explain the causes and consequences of the evolution we are witnessing in the artistic consciousness of those who create art and those who perceive it, and aid in the performance of science's cultural forecasting functions. The potential of theory, however, is being realized too slowly, because its development is still less than vigorous.

Our party's theoretical experience can provide the stimulus and methodological guidelines for changes in literary scholarship. It advises us to "rid ourselves of existing ideas about socialism that have been influenced by specific conditions."¹⁸ This is an appeal for a new, more complete, and genuinely scientific understanding of our sociohistorical reality. Under these conditions, theoretical knowledge in all spheres of spiritual activity and, consequently, in ours as well, will play an exceptionally important role.

Finally, historical experience has shown us that many different opinions are preferable to the opinion of a single individual. The diversity of opinions which is now being elevated almost to the position of a standard, however, cannot guarantee fundamental scientific successes if it is preserved untouched, so to speak, and is not systematized. Of course, a theoretical "amalgam" is permissible, but only on the condition that our dissimilar individual methods bring us closer to a common methodology, scientific dialectic, and concrete historical authenticity. The desire for this closeness will play an important part in uniting scientists in their search for objective facts in contemporary artistic development and in the spiritual movement of our day. All of us have a great need for this today.

F.F. Kuznetsov (Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and Director of the World Literature Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences):
Our Literature Requires New Interpretations

The figure I will cite is probably common knowledge. Do you know that Russian journals which ruled men's minds in the past, such as SOVREMENNİK or RUSSKOYE SLOVO, were published in editions of from 3,000 to 5,000 copies? Or that journals such as VREMYA, EPOKHA, and RUSSKIY VESTNIK, which published the works of Dostoyevskiy, Turgenev, and Tolstoy, had approximately the same circulation? Today the circulation figures of NOVYY MIR, the flagship of the literary press in the era of perestroika, exceed a million. And several other journals are close to this astronomical figure.

What are the implications of this? Above all, circulation figures reflect the position of the public, the position of the reader, and the reader's feelings about the current revolutionary process of the renewal of life. This also indicates something else: It is possible that our literature today has reached more distant frontiers and acquired more value and importance in spiritual and social processes than ever before in its history.

What is the secret? What is the reason? In an article entitled "Lev Tolstoy as a Mirror of the Russian Revolution," V.I. Lenin was the first in our country to conclude that a truly great artist's works will necessarily reflect at least some of the most significant aspects of the revolution. As you can see, Lenin saw one of the first criteria of the significance and merits of an artist—and this came as a surprise to many at that time—in his ability to portray important aspects of the revolutionary process as the main determinant of reality.

If the literature of our country is genuinely great, and the facts provide irrefutable proof of this, it must also be an accurate mirror of our revolution and reflect at least some of the main aspects of the revolutionary renewal of reality which began some time ago and matured in the depths of our society, in the minds of people, for a long time. In addition, it should not only reflect the processes of revolutionary renewal but also encourage these processes.

I have a question I would like to ask: Does our literature reflect any of the significant aspects of the process of renewal which underwent its formative period in our society long before the 27th party congress and promoted it directly? I think this could be called a rhetorical question. The influence, strength, and authority literature has today as a veritable pillar of society are a result of its past and present ability to express the deepest past and present needs for social renewal and development.

Here it would be wise to recall Marx' thesis of the unequal development of material progress and artistic progress. "As far as art is concerned," Marx wrote, "we

know that specific periods in its development do not coincide with the periods in the overall development of society or, consequently, the development of society's material base."¹⁹ This is of fundamental importance to us, and this is why. There is no doubt whatsoever that the era of stagnation affected literature and art. This was reflected above all in the scope provided for "gray," irrelevant, and merely illustrative or descriptive literature and in the pervasive bureaucratic and dogmatic thinking that precluded honest, conscientious, and genuinely artistic literature.

We spend a great deal of time discussing this today, and with good reason, but it would be the greatest crime and injustice (and we sometimes forget this) to cast stones at the huge volume of true literature which rode the crest of the wave created by the 20th party congress in the 1960's and 1970's and to describe it as literary stagnation, implying that literature insisting on the renewal of our society began with Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat" or with Pristavkin's novella "The Golden Cloud Stayed Overnight." Unfortunately, this point of view does exist and is being defended. This point of view is absolutely wrong because it minimizes the social and spiritual base of perestroika. It indicates a lack of awareness of the fact that perestroika did not fall from above, but was the logical result of deep-seated, strong, and profoundly objective processes in the social and spiritual spheres of society, and of the needs of public life, which were reflected in our literature.

This idea is corroborated by an amazing phenomenon. Let us take a closer look at the pattern of coincidence (in historical terms), at the fact that the bell the 27th party congress tolled was heard at the same time as an alarm was sounded just before and immediately after the party congress in such works as Rasputin's "Fire," Astafyev's "Sad Detective," Aytmatov's "Chopping Block," Bondarev's "Game," and Belov's "Everything in the Future." These works evoked arguments, disagreements, criticism, and debate. Nevertheless, I must say that they emerged from the depths of our life, a life impatiently awaiting changes. These were works appealing for revolutionary changes in society.

These works would seem to be a result of the period of stagnation, but they were actually engendered by the mounting protests against stagnation in the depths of society. These protests prepared public opinion, public thinking, and the social framework for today's profound, extensive, and comprehensive changes in several areas. It is the function of literary scholarship to examine the areas in which public opinion was prepared for the need for change. These are still the main areas in today's Soviet literature, which views itself as one of the most important spiritual instruments of perestroika and the revolutionary renewal of our society.

This literature broke through all existing difficulties and complexities to reach the reader. It was precisely literature—let us recall Nilin's "Cruelty," Aytmatov's "White

Ship," and Trifonov's short stories—that was one of the forerunners in inspiring detailed discussions of the significance of the general human values of the spiritual, moral, and human factors in social life. Its discussions of eternal values and the social factors of human consciousness gave it global status.

In the cycle of works by Abramov, Belov, Zalygin, Nosov, Mozhayev, and Shukshin, this literature was one of the first to bring conditions in rural areas to the attention of society, to ask why we buy grain from the West, to analyze moral attitudes toward labor, and to tell how the peasant ceased to be a master of labor and became a hireling. It informed the public of the perverse methods used in the accomplishment of collectivization. If we recall such works as Zalygin's "On the Irtysh," Belov's "Eves," and Mozhayev's "Peasant Men and Women," we can see that they grew out of that time, just as Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat" and Dudintsev's "White Clothes" also grew out of that time. If we look up the dates they were written, we will see that the work on these books began at the time when society was preparing for change.

There is also another, extremely important area in which literature promoted changes and is now affirming them: It has consistently underscored the anti-humanism of the cult of Stalin in several works, beginning with Tvardovskiy's poems and Akhmatova's verses. Beginning with Yashin's "Levers" or Granin's "A Personal Opinion," literature offered pointed discussions of the dangerous and harmful effects of dogmatic authoritarianism. Finally, another fundamental topic—the relationship between revolution and humanism and between socialism and humanism—is at the center of the works of Bulgakov and Platonov.

The current period in our history is unique because all of the literature which was accumulating for years and decades and was reaching readers only in fragmented form suddenly became available to readers in the last year and a half or two as a result of the affirmation of freedom of speech and creative freedom, and it is now performing a dual function. On the one hand, these books, which were written throughout the history of Soviet literature and reflect the Leninist traditions of this literature, are establishing a contemporary code of morality, molding the human spirit, and serving as an active factor in the current literary process. On the other hand, these books are simultaneously part of the history of our literature and demand a qualitatively new vantage point for the examination of this history.

And this is where we find the drama I wanted to discuss. Today's literature is prominent in our development and is exposing the most complex, contradictory, and enigmatic aspects of the human spirit to the reader and requires theoretical literary thinking of the same caliber. The problem is (and this is one of the serious consequences of stagnation) that our theoretical thinking,

including academic thinking, in the sphere of Soviet literature is of extremely low caliber, and I would even say that it is in a difficult or catastrophic position.

We know that the spiritual sphere of social life and the liberal arts in particular were underestimated for a long time during the period of stagnation and cult principles. Funding for the liberal arts was allocated according to what is often called the remainder principle, and the allocations for literary history and literary theory could have been described as the dregs of this funding. If we want to find a way out of this situation, out of this dramatic incongruity, we must first scrutinize the state of our philological science, especially in connection with Soviet literature. It is pitiful and requires immediate attention.

We have drawn up a long-range program for the development of research in the field of Soviet literature. It can only be carried out, however, if new and young forces can be involved in this interesting and important work, if we win the necessary support, and, what is most important, if there is the realization that whenever literature is on the cutting edge of ideological, social, and spiritual cognition, the state of theoretical literary thinking in the country cannot be ignored.

A.P. Lanshchikov (Literary Critic): *Was the Rightwing Deviation Imaginary?*

I am very happy about this long-awaited meeting with the historians whom we have not seen since the last day the school bell rang for us. A year and a half ago I wrote in a LITERATURNAYA GAZETA article that philological training without a background in historical education is meaningless.

I would like to discuss a topic of vital importance to me, and certainly to others as well—the era we call the period of the cult of personality, or the “Stalinist era.” I have not found any balanced and convincing theory of this period in our literary history or our works of history and philosophy. For this reason, I would like to offer my own theory, even though I am only an amateur.

In an article entitled “Truth Is the Main Thing in History” last year, Academician A.M. Samsonov discussed the unpublished work by K. Simonov in which an extremely important idea was expressed in 1965: “If it had not been for 1937, the summer of 1941 would not have been possible, and this is the root of the problem.” It was particularly painful for me to learn about the mass repression of prominent military commanders in 1937 and 1938, but this logically and naturally gives rise to a question: Why did the government of France, where the military command did not suffer from repression, fall apart in just the 2 weeks following the enemy invasion of its territory? Obviously, no one would argue that the mass repression of the late 1930’s did not undermine the defensive capabilities of our country, but the root of the matter still should be sought, in my opinion, in the

events of 1929, which led so logically and irrevocably to the events of 1937. It would be more precise to say that if it had not been for 1929—that is, if collectivization had not entailed the forms and methods involved in its accomplishment—the summer of 1941 would not have been possible.

I think that everyone was happy to hear the news of the vindication of Bukharin and Rykov—the men who headed the “rightwing deviation.” But did it really exist? At the October (1927) combined party central committee plenum, Stalin said: “Several measures were taken at the 14th party conference in the nature of a few concessions to benefit the middle peasant.... At the 14th congress of our party, the opposition, headed by Zinovyev and Kamenev, tried to undermine this party policy by suggesting that it be replaced essentially by a policy of dispossessing the kulaks and restoring the poor peasant committees. In essence, this was a policy of restoring civil war in the countryside.”²⁰ At the 16th Moscow Province party conference Stalin railed against Preobrazhenskiy, calling him the “chief economist of the opposition” and accusing him of regarding the “peasantry as a ‘colony’ for our industry, as a target of maximum exploitation.”²¹

As we know, the Trotskyist opposition was smashed at the end of 1927, at the 15th party congress. The next January Stalin went to Siberia in connection with the non-fulfillment of the national grain procurement plan. During this trip he “beat” another 270 million poods “out of the kulaks.” In reality, however, this would have been impossible because the kulaks produced only 13 percent of the gross product, with a 20 percent ratio of commodity output to total output. He may have been referring to the middle peasants, who produced 4.05 billion poods of the gross product, with 11 percent marketability. It was at this time that the term “prosperous” was used, although there was no political or legal basis for it. And how was grain to be taken away from the “prosperous”—that is, from the middle peasants? A directive of 6 January 1928 said: “25 percent of the surplus grain confiscated by law from speculators and speculative elements among the kulaks should be turned over to the poor in the form of long-term credit for the satisfaction of their family needs and, if necessary, consumer needs.”

This was the kind of “pressure” that Stalin had just recently described as the start of civil war in rural areas.²² Nevertheless, in February 1928 he continued to adhere verbally to the previous policy, which was announced at the 15th party congress: “All of the rumors that we are supposedly abolishing NEP, instituting a surplus-appropriation system, dispossessing the kulaks, and so forth are nothing but counterrevolutionary chatter and deserve to be stamped out as resolutely as possible. NEP is the basis of our economic policy and will remain so over the long range.”²³

Therefore, Stalin was waging a struggle against the idea of "over-industrialization" and was criticizing those who regarded the countryside as a "colony." Stalin favored the gradual and voluntary establishment of cooperatives. He even asserted that NEP would remain the basis of our economic policy for a long time and that the talk about the appropriation of surpluses and the dispossession of the kulaks was counterrevolutionary chatter. Nevertheless, on 19 November 1928, at a party central committee plenum, Stalin said that the rightwing menace was the main threat to our party at that time. "For this reason, we must concentrate our main attack on rightwing deviation." He railed against Frumkin and defended Bukharin, the author of "Notes of an Economist," but within 2 months he declared: "We, or the majority of Politburo members in any case, had no doubt whatsoever that 'Notes of an Economist' was an anti-party eclectic article...in line with the well-known Frumkin letter."²⁴

In essence, the "rightwing deviation" was invented by Stalin himself after he had moved sharply to the left of the position he occupied at the 15th party congress. The campaign against "rightwing deviation" was a campaign against NEP, against the principle of voluntary cooperatives, and against most of the peasantry. Stalin certainly knew that most of the people would be more likely to support the policy line of Bukharin and Rykov than his own new line, which employed earlier slogans only as camouflage. It is therefore no coincidence that the ferocious mass repression began at the same time that Stalin launched his struggle against "rightwing deviation."

Another question also comes to mind. Some say that if collectivization had not been carried out so quickly, industrialization would have been a failure. They use the need for money as justification. But was this goal achieved? Industrialization does not seem to have benefited much at that time from Stalin's collectivization. Our historians and economists could probably calculate the economic impact of collectivization and its effects on industrialization and the defensive capabilities of our country.

At the 17th party congress Stalin said: "We are speaking, therefore, of 204,000 tractors...for the kolkhozes and sovkhoses (this many tractors represented 3.1 million horsepower—A.L.).... As you can see, this is power of considerable magnitude, capable of uprooting any and all vestiges of capitalism in rural areas. It is twice the number of tractors Lenin once mentioned in discussions of the distant future." The same report, however, also contained other figures. In 1929 there had been 34 million horses, but in 1933 there were only 16.6 million. Lenin never could have imagined that someone could manage to reduce the supply of horses by more than half in just 4 years. It would have taken around a million additional tractors to compensate for these losses.²⁵

At the 16th party congress during the summer of 1930 Stalin said that "the annual increase in our population is around 3 million."²⁶ At the 17th party congress he

reported that the population in 1930 was 160 million. This means that we should have had a population of 190 million by the beginning of World War II, but the figure recorded in the 1939 census was only 170 million. In this way, as a result of eviction, migration, exile, the terrible hunger of the period of collectivization, the subsequent repression, and other "measures," we were short 20 million people by the beginning of the Great Patriotic War.

At the party central committee plenum in July 1928 Stalin announced that "the comrades who spoke today were absolutely right when they said that today's peasant is not the man he was 6 years ago, when he was afraid of losing his land to the landlord. The peasant is already forgetting about the landlord. Now he is demanding new and better living conditions. In the event of an enemy invasion, can we fight a war with the external enemy on the front and with the peasant in the rear for emergency grain supplies for the army? No, we cannot and we should not have to. For the sake of our national defense, we must have reserve army supplies, at least for the first 6 months. Why do we need this 6-month respite? To give the peasant time to get his bearings, cope with the dangers of war, understand ongoing events, and brace himself for his contribution to the common cause of national defense."²⁷

This is what Stalin said, emphasizing that "the peasant is already forgetting about the landlord," but he made approximately the same announcement in 1918, at the 8th party congress, when the peasant certainly could not have forgotten about the landlord. "I must say," Stalin said at that time, "that the elements, the non-worker elements constituting the majority of our army, the peasants, will not fight voluntarily for socialism.... This tells us what we must do—we must re-educate these elements in the spirit of iron discipline...and force them to fight for our common socialist cause."²⁸ Because our army continued to remain predominantly peasant, Stalin was overcome by suspicion and fear: At first he took ruthless measures against the so-called rightwing deviation in the party and then began inveighing against the army with the same ruthlessness. The year of 1929 filled Stalin with a permanent fear of the people, and all of his subsequent actions were marked by this fear.

V.P. Astafyev (Writer): *Tormented by Half-Truths*

Here I can see that we do have a history of literature. When I was studying literature in Moscow, I heard nothing at all about the history of literature for 2 years. These words were not used in our lecture halls. I would like to know exactly what it is. What does the history of literature look like today, and what was it like during other periods?

In some speeches the same name—Stalin, Stalin, Stalin—was repeated over and over again, just as it is in today's newspapers. Obviously, I have my own opinion of that period and of that individual. I once lived in

Kureyka, where Stalin had lived in exile. I think that not everything is as simple and obvious as it is made out to be today. This is a situation involving the use of another lightning rod in our history, including the history of literature, to blame all of our problems on one individual, possibly for the purpose of skipping a particularly complex part of our journey. This might make us look cleaner. In any case, I know of nothing more terrible and harmful for our history, for you and me, than the Brezhnev period. Information about this period and about Brezhnev's personality, in my opinion, makes our society and us look simply indecent! This also applies to history, because, after all, any period of time is part of history; Khrushchev is already history, and Brezhnev, however much we might want to forget him, is also history. Furthermore, I think this is an extremely disgraceful history. And it is particularly disgraceful for us, the frontline soldiers who behaved honorably in most cases during the war and not very honorably during the "Brezhnevist" period. I once visited a fellow soldier at the time when Brezhnev was awarded the Medal of Victory. My friend, who had been a member of an amphibious landing force and then an artilleryman, a man of great courage and integrity who started out working as a coupler on the railroad after the war and worked his way up to a high managerial position in metallurgy, a man who served as a raykom secretary, asked me: "When will they stop insulting us?" I answered: "They will keep on insulting us as long as we let them." I think that what people call the "history of literature" today is an insult to our literature, to our thinking, and to our not very smooth development, including the development of our literature.

I would like to discuss the history of the Great Patriotic War. Today everyone is talking about collectivization and the extremes to which it was carried. This is a very complicated and tragic subject, but there is almost no talk about how we managed to invent "a different war," and not without the aid of historical science. In any case, as a soldier I had no connection whatsoever with what has been written about the war, with the exception of a few books. I was in a completely different war. But after all, whole echelons of literature on the war were created. Take the 12 volumes of "Istoriya vtoroy mirovoy voyny" [The History of World War II] as an example. There has never been a more distorted, concocted, and invented publication in our history, including the history of our literature. This was done in volume after volume by extremely skilled and high-paid people who knew what they were doing. Two historians, Morozov and Samsenov, recently got into a fight over the details of this history. I wrote a letter to the editor of the newspaper, saying that most historians, especially those involved in inventing the history of the Great Patriotic War, had no right to even approach a word as sacred as "truth." They lost this right with their unscrupulous actions and duplicity. They must repent and cleanse themselves.

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA recently printed a magnificent section on the millennium of the christening of Rus. Foreign public spokesmen and foreign philosophers

were given an opportunity to express their views. And there they declared, in black and white: "We know these things, and you do not!" This is true. We still do not know how many people we lost in the Great Patriotic War. I have heard a multitude of different figures, but as a soldier I would like to know how much of our population we actually lost. The latest edition of "Istoriya Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny" [History of the Great Patriotic War] says "over 20 million." I can imagine how much effort it took to insert the word "over"! And just think of the obstacles that had to be surmounted by the few people, representing the healthy nucleus of those who worked on this absolutely dreadful book, who managed to insert this word. People wonder what this "over" is concealing. When will we, the people who are already nearing the end of our days, stop being spoken to in half-hints and half-truths? Half-truths have tormented us and have driven us to the point of nervous exhaustion.

If Russian literature was able at some point to get back on the right track and create the entire current of what is known as "village prose" and produce several remarkable books, I think that this was accomplished not because of the science of history but in spite of it. It is horrifying to look into whole periods, extremely complex and extremely tragic periods, of history and then to learn from an impartial source that more than 3 million of our 5 million soldiers were taken prisoner in 1941. How can we deal with these figures? I still have trouble believing them. I was completely stunned by this news. But if you remember that the maps in that book about the Great Patriotic War were not redrawn, and if you take a close look at these maps and the accompanying text, you will see the complete lack of correspondence between them. We simply did not know how to fight; we simply covered the fascists with our blood and our corpses. Take a look at any map of 1941 or even 1944: All of them show 10 red arrows against 2 blue ones, representing the enemy. This is how things were throughout the war. The Black Sea Fleet saw how one army, Manstein's 11th Army, destroyed all of our armies in the Crimea, marched through Sivash, leaving part of its troop strength near besieged Sevastopol, and then surrounded Kerch with two tank corps and pushed three of our armies into the sea! I realize how hard it is to write about this, and it is much better, of course, to proclaim with a drum roll that we won! But how did we win?

Perhaps we should consider Chesterton's remark that all victors eventually became the vanquished. If we look today at the center of "rural" Russia, which was the soldiers' chief source of supplies, it appears, at least to me, that we were the vanquished. We are having so much difficulty now in just getting started, not to mention making repairs, which are still a long way off! Look at what is being done, for instance, in the provinces, and look at the reaction there to the word "perestroyka." The society is not being restructured right away. It is changing slowly because it is numb. The people who were in administrative positions on the local level are still there

and are calmly waiting to see what happens: Maybe all of this will come to an end and everything will be as it was before.

It is wrong, however, for the history of the Great Patriotic War, the history of collectivization, and literature itself to be confined to a specific group of topics or works. For example, *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* publishes a list of works and then begins examining them, but many remarkable books and writers are ignored, and for no good reason whatsoever. This is what happened to Konstantin Vorobyev. There is no mention today of Ivan Akulov's novels "The Christening" and "Kasyan Ostudnyy"—the best book about the period of collectivization. Tvardovskiy's poem "By Right of Memory" was ignored for a long time. It was finally published, and this was followed by the publication—regrettably, in abridged form—of the memoirs of the poet's brother, Ivan Trifonovich, extremely bitter and extremely honest memoirs. In this way, a history is being compiled in spite of the Academy of Sciences, and most of our writers do not even know that academy researchers are studying the history of literature.

All of our statements are frequently accepted as spiritual precepts in the provinces, and all of us must assume the responsibility of boldly conveying these spiritual messages to the people. The people feel that we must tell them the truth and cover up the hole into which our culture plunged. In the provinces we have been engulfed by the murky wave of mass culture. And is this happening only in the provinces? Some young people today know nothing about genuine literature or art. They spend most of their time watching television programs like "Viewpoint" or "The Midnight Hour." I cannot say anything against them; they are good programs, although they are frequently littered with pseudo-culture, especially in the case of music and singing groups.

Once again, we are hearing many words—pretty words, official words, all kinds of words—but we are seeing very little action. We must take care not to drown in the words about perestroika and democracy, as we drowned so many times in the past. There have been almost no changes on the local level, in the provinces. There are some external signs of perestroika. All of us, all of the people, must wake up, gather our strength and courage, and act with enough composure not to waver in our efforts to correct the situation. Someone contributed to everything that happened: Stalin contributed, Brezhnev contributed, but you and I also contributed. There were people, however, who behaved with decency in Stalin's time and in Brezhnev's time: They had the courage at least to keep quiet and not join in the blasphemy. We must atone in some way for our shame and our guilt and live up to what our people, fate, and history expect of us.

D.M. Urnov (Editor-in-Chief of VOPROSY LITERATURY): *More Historical Authenticity*

Reassessment naturally accompanies perestroika and is analogous to perestroika in the sphere of ideology and culture. But how and when do we plan to conduct this

reassessment? The easiest way would be to meet the requirements of the moment—to quickly rewrite accounts of the past to conform to the apparent dictates of today's immediate objectives. The past will then be modernized. But we can be certain that later, in the not so distant future, the same "history" would have to be rewritten again and we would be overwhelmed again by various "concessions to the moment."

We have a methodology, worked out by the founders of our philosophical outlook, for approaching history, and it is applicable to the social sciences and to the creative arts. Schillerization and Shakespearization—these principles of historical depiction mentioned by Marx and Engels—presuppose either the relocation of past events to the present day, entailing their portrayal as we see them today, or a concrete-historical, thorough, and detailed penetration of the essence of what happened in the past and how it happened.

Our literature has defined our historical science, has given it certain suggestions, and has taken the lead in examining the "gaps" in history, the forgotten or, more precisely, unpronounceable names. We must give our writers credit for this, but we must also analyze our literature's treatment of history.

During one of the lectures on contemporary literature, lectures which always gather a large crowd because people want to hear opinions of contemporary literary developments, I was handed a note: "Why are they not banned?!" The note referred to M. Shatrov's plays, especially "Farther...Farther...Farther!" The days when developments could be "assessed" by banning and concealing them are over. On the other hand, the days of the frank, impartial, and strictly objective assessment of literary developments are just starting.

Yes, there is no question that Shatrov played the role of a literary and social leader when he depicted people and events that did not seem to exist in our memory, in the memory of my generation in any case. But I must say that there are modernizing nuances in the aforementioned play, "Farther...Farther...Farther!" The speeches of the character with Lenin's name sometimes sound like the idle talk of the very same utopians in the revolution with whom V.I. Lenin had constant arguments. It seems to me that this very line of reasoning is sometimes present in remarks and whole monologues written for the character with Lenin's name.

We sometimes see discrepancies between what the character says and what we read in Lenin's works, and these are stylistic discrepancies as well as a discrepancy in the fundamental point of view.

For example, the character with Lenin's name in "Farther...Farther...Farther!" cites R. Luxemburg's opinions with approval—the same opinions Lenin always disputed. Here is another example. "How obtuse these petty bourgeois democrats are, these Chernovs, Tseretelis, and

Martovs with their chatter about democratic unity, democratic dictatorship...and other such nonsense"—these are Lenin's words, but in the play the character with his name exclaims, with a voice full of emotion, to no one other than Martov: "We certainly have not had enough of you."

Lenin did not suffer from the intellectual wavering ascribed to him in the play or the fears we are now being threatened with in his name.

These remarks are not intended to belittle the innovative features I immediately appreciated in Shatrov's plays, his audacity, and the need for the kind of creative work he is doing.

People sometimes ask whether nuances are worth the bother. Today, they say, the important thing is to eliminate old dogmas and stereotypes, but we know that if we simply eliminate some dogmas and stereotypes without carefully considering what we are doing, new dogmas and stereotypes will take their place. No, a concrete historical understanding must serve as the key, an understanding of the weapons issued to us by the founders of our philosophical outlook.

M.F. Shatrov (Dramatist): *Cooperation by Writers and Historians Is Essential*

I have no wish to respond to the previous speaker's remarks, because when he said that the words "happiness of the people" and "democracy" sounded like nonsense to Lenin, he defined his own method of reading Lenin's works: pulling certain phrases out of context and passing them off as policy statements. I am disturbed by something else. I am wondering what our conference would have been like if it had been convened, for example, on 20 March, just 7 days after the famous article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. The thought of this, it seems to me, should deprive all of us of our emotional tranquility. I assure you that the conference would not have been the same!

In the middle of March a drama—there is no other way of describing it—took place in our country when the CPSU Central Committee organ received not a mere letter from a reader, but a serious policy paper attacking perestroika. Each of us with a healthy memory and a healthy mind who read this "work" should have chosen a line of behavior on the basis of our understanding of Lenin's ideas and the ideals of the 27th party congress: We could give it our tacit approval or loudly and vehemently protest it. Dozens and hundreds of letters were written by average citizens who could not agree! Dozens, hundreds, and possibly even more indignant voices were raised in protest—but there was total silence in the press! Some strong and powerful hand made a silencing gesture. No other point of view could be read in a single newspaper—they did not print any! Glasnost turned out to be restricted.

I had several speaking engagements in those days, and my speech in Tallin on 2 April, in which I said that this article was contrary to the ideals of the 27th CPSU Congress, was published (SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 8 April 1988). But I am not trying to take credit for this. I know of only one creative union—the Union of Cinematographers—to immediately protest what we read in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. The rest kept quiet. Why? Where were the historians and social scientists who are expressing such friendly agreement today with the article in PRAVDA? Is it possible that you historians of the Soviet society and the whole Academy of Social Sciences could not convene a conference or party meeting to give this article the response it deserved? What was lacking—knowledge or a precise ideological position? Was it really necessary to wait until 5 April?

Let us consider how brittle the ice is, how much we are inclined to find out what people in different offices are saying and to then behave accordingly.... This was a genuine drama in spring 1988! Why do we not think that our discussions and our vigorous defense of certain views might be of some help to those in the offices? Why must we wait for a cue from the upper stories of the building in the Old Square? Why are we so afraid to think for ourselves? This was a serious indictment of all of us and it proved that the old and familiar still hold us firmly in their grasp. The future of each individual was at stake, but we were still waiting for authorization from our superiors!

The people of yesterday who "stood at attention" when they faced their superiors, took a subservient position, and always seemed to be saying "Your wish is my command" are still displaying the same attitude as they inch their way toward the flagpole of perestroika, in the front rows as usual. The main element of the drama is that we accept this. When M.S. Gorbachev remarked in his speech in Leningrad in 1985 that each person must be given a chance to comprehend the purpose of perestroika, comprehend the purpose of the revolutionary changes, and define his own position, he was being fair. It is now 3 years later—certainly enough time for this kind of definition—but these 20 days have shown that the willingness with which many ideological frontline personnel almost threw themselves into the arms of the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA author should worry all of us: Behind the vows of loyalty to perestroika we can hear nostalgia for a different time, a time when everything was so clear and comprehensible.

P.A. Nikolayev pronounced some wonderful words in his speech here—"artistic thinking," "historical authenticity," and so forth. It would give me great pleasure to discuss these terms also, but something is in my way. I am one of the few living heroes of the article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, an article which represented the high point of the campaign organized in the press against my play "Farther...Farther...Farther!" This was a case of convulsive reactions instead of analysis, of labels and verdicts instead of criticism.

Some critics, including Academician V.G. Afanasyev, were ready to accuse me of everything! Of antisocialism, of emigrantism, of menshevism, and, of course, of opinions contrary to the 27th congress party line. And they did all of this without giving me the right to respond. I am open to criticism and I dream of a time when we will be able to argue with the critics on an equal basis about the "alpha and omega of Marxism": Does the course of history depend on the individual or is everything predetermined and beyond the individual's control, just as the movement of the stars is beyond his control? Why did all of these labels reappear and where did they come from? All of them came from those days, that period when there was no room for authentic party history, authentic social studies, and authentic historical literature. Here it would be good to recall the part M.A. Suslov played in getting our social sciences back into the old rut after the advances inspired by the 20th party congress. In the beginning of the 1970's I was so naive that I sent him a letter about the "anti-Leniniana" being created in the West—movies, plays, and television programs—and said that all of our historians and writers should unite their efforts in finding a proper response, but no one even considered answering my letter.

In the last 30 years I have written only six political plays about the revolution, although I could have written many more. Each play—every single one!—was banned or was published only with the greatest difficulty. The story of the publication of each play could be the subject of a new drama, but this is not important. What is important is that all of the melodies that have haunted me throughout my career are being heard again in 1988. Here is an eloquent example. On 27 January 1982 Academician A.G. Yegorov, former director of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, sent Chairman Yu.V. Andropov of the State Security Committee a letter about my play "This Is How We Will Win!" after its premiere in the Moscow Academic Art Theatre imeni M. Gorkiy (MKhAT).

After listing the serious ideological flaws of the play and its author's deviations from historical facts, Yegorov directed attention to Lenin's political isolation and his confrontation with the central committee and underscored the agreement of Lenin's and Trotskiy's views on the alleged "mortal danger" of the military-bureaucratic degeneration of the party and state. He wrote that the play did not depict creative construction by the masses under the leadership of the party. "Faceless peasants, soldiers, and workers come on stage to complain about their hard life and disagree with party policy." In spite of the title "This Is How We Will Win!" the play does not answer the question of how we will win. "The real problem of the possibility of building socialism in our country...is supplanted by another, invented problem in the play: What kind of socialism should be built." In Yegorov's opinion, the relationship between spontaneous and deliberate actions is given a unique interpretation in the play: It was precisely the general dissatisfaction of the peasants that supposedly forced Lenin to institute NEP. NEP itself is idealized in the play.

What suggestions did Academician Yegorov make? The play "should be excluded from the MKhAT repertoire quietly, without any noise or fuss." "The appropriate ministries and departments...should erect solid barriers to block all possible channels for works of this kind." "Newspaper and journal editors should be made aware of incidents involving the publication of hasty, superficial, and favorable...reviews.... Those who lean too far in either direction should be put back on the right track in a timely and efficient manner in line with the instructions L.I. Brezhnev issued at the 26th CPSU Congress, and those who defame our socialist reality should not be tolerated. The CPSU Central Committee decision on the responsibility of newspaper and journal editors...must be implemented unconditionally."

This is what our literature and history suffered from—the actions of such experts on aesthetics as Academician Yegorov, who headed the science of party history until recently and propagated his own ethics and his own methodology there, bringing about the flourishing of the same kind of falsified history that was discussed so honestly here today by Viktor Astafyev and many others.

I would like to take advantage of this huge audience to counter some of PRAVDA's arguments. I am not a historian, but I was criticized for making the following mistake in my play: Savinkov offered Plekhanov the post of minister, and not of prime minister, as I said. But only one document was available to me—a letter written by Plekhanov's wife, published in IZVESTIYA in 1924, where she says that Savinkov came to her husband and asked him to "put a ministry together." All of the specialists I spoke with said that at the beginning of the century this meant becoming the premier. This is apparently why M. Iovchuk and I. Kurbatova said that Savinkov offered Plekhanov the post of premier in their book "Plekhanov," which was published as part of the "Lives of Famous People" series. Maybe this is also a mistake. Which version should we believe? Let the three doctors of historical sciences argue with Plekhanov's widow instead of with me or admit that they interpreted the phrase "put a ministry together" as "head one of the ministries." And let us remember that if Savinkov wanted to create some kind of alternative to the Soviet of People's Commissars headed by Lenin, he naturally needed Plekhanov as the head of state. Therefore, I am still inclined to trust R. Plekhanova instead of our contemporaries, the doctors of sciences from the Academy of Social Sciences.

I will be responding to all of the specific complaints about the play in the press soon. It seems to me that we have something more important to do today: We must realize that if perestroika should fail, we will not be able to blame the Andreyevas and others like them, but will have to blame ourselves, all of us who are swearing allegiance to perestroika today but were silent yesterday. The fault will be ours, and no one else's! And I am certain that as far as the development of our literature is

concerned, each of us certainly needs the friendly assistance of the historian, but it must be a real historian, and not a defender of the canons of stagnation. I believe that we writers are extending our hands here today and that the historians will probably hold out their hands to us. The most important thing is that these hands should meet and should not be left hanging in midair.

A.Ya. Markov (Poet): *To Print the Whole Truth*

We poets find it easier to speak in verse, and this is why it is difficult for us to compete with the prose writers who address gatherings of this kind. I think I would prefer to discuss today's topic, because some of the speakers have digressed. I would like to support Astafyev for his truly brilliant exposition of the writer's point of view. Some of you may remember that LITERATURNAYA GAZETA recently published my poem "The Portrait." Not one newspaper wanted to publish it because it said that we created Stalin ourselves, but LITERATURNAYA GAZETA had the courage to print it as one of the "Verses Found in a Desk." After all, it was written in Stalin's time. I will remind you of eight lines:

Each holiday the housing administration,
Without asking for my permission,
Has hung a huge portrait
Over my window for the last 30 years.
It is a portrait of a man with a moustache.
We painted it ourselves.
It looks fine from a distance,
But it blocks the light and my view of the outside world.

The statement that "we painted it ourselves" was what upset everyone.

Do you not feel that the assignment of so much importance to a single individual, relieving us of all responsibility, is an anti-Marxist approach? It seems to me that our intelligentsia is largely to blame for this. Yes, it was disintegrated; yes, it is only a fraction of what it was; nevertheless, it is to blame. If the people represent the nursery on a ship, the intelligentsia is the educator and captain; it has to do the thinking. We were guilty of cowardice, duplicity, and callousness. First Brezhnev appeared on the scene, then Chernenko appeared, but did anything change? This means that they could not have been the root of the problem.

I come from a peasant family myself, and I remember the terrible hunger in Stavropol Kray in 1932 and 1933. Eleven members of my family committed suicide. My father heated up the stove, plugged up the pipe, and suffocated the whole family. As the youngest, I was sent to my godmother (in our communities our godmothers were like our second mothers). I survived, but I could not even write about this later. I do have a poem about it. Tvardovskiy (he discovered me and gave me my start in literature) typed up my first poem and showed it to Khrushchev (it was autobiographical and was called

"The Boarded-Up House"). Nikita Sergeyevich said: "It is too horrible to be published." While we starved and while the village children wallowed in the mud, a private kitchen, the damned thing, was operating in the center of the village, and served meals to the rural soviet and kolkhoz board members. Breezes carried the aroma of butter and meat to us. This was the worst thing of all. After all, there was hunger during the blockade of Leningrad too, but it was a social disaster. Ours, however, was a case of social inequality and a crime. Children were dying.... I would have closed down all of the private kitchens and stores. As you can see, I have my own special feelings about them. But my poem is still unpublished. I do not feel offended, because a two-volume set of my works has been published. But three volumes are still in my desk, and they tell the whole truth. We, on the other hand, can tell only half the truth.

We are facing a terrible danger: Our words are being deformed and restructured. They are undergoing the restructuring instead of us. Many of those who lived off the fat of the land before perestroika, before the 27th party congress, are now carrying the banner, but they grabbed it so quickly that they do not even notice they are holding the pole in the air and dragging the flag through the mud. Others are hoisting the carrying-case instead of the banner. As long as we do not carry the banner ourselves, there will be no change for the better. This change will take place when they begin printing the whole truth. Decisions on whose works can be printed are still being made in advance. Because of this, many of those whose works are not being printed in journals feel envious of the dead—Nabokov and others. Instead of increasing the number of journals, they are increasing the circulation of existing journals. In Blagoveshchensk there were around 20 journals before the revolution. Voronezh vied with St. Petersburg in the number of journals. Now there are only around 10 journals in the capital. More copies, for example, of NOVYY MIR are being printed. Its staff is in a quandary because there is no room in this journal for the living; it is hard enough to keep up with the publication of works by the offended dead. This means that if we are really taking charge and if we are truly decent people, we must increase the number of journals. And as far as perestroika is concerned, there will be no progress in our literature without three or four satirical journals. We should at least catch up with pre-revolutionary Russia, which had SEVERNYYE TSVETY, PCHELA, and other journals of this kind.

I was in Chechnya once when I was a boy. We had to weed a field full of quack grass. We children were working for a corn fritter. We cut the quack grass at ground level and left the roots. When the proprietor arrived, he whipped us and not only refused to pay us, but drove us off the field and said that there would be no way of pulling the weeds now that the tops were gone. Some of the people here today know that quack grass is an extremely nasty weed with roots a meter or a meter and a half long. We are seeing the same thing today in

perestroika: We are chopping off the tops and leaving a meter and a half of roots. They will grow more vigorously in revenge for their lost tops. We must think about the roots!

I went to a village cemetery in Kalinin Oblast once. A plaster marker listed the names of dead officers, sergeants, and soldiers: 12 names. These were followed by the words "and others." (Just as our press puts you in the "and others" category if you make a pointed statement. Sometimes you are the only one in the "and others" category. I think my speech today will end up in the "and others" category too, to discourage people from telling the truth.) I asked the chairman: "Excuse me, my friend, what does this 'others' mean?" He replied: "What is there to understand? There was no room on the marker, so we wrote 'and others.'" It turned out that there were just as many of these "others"—12 people. Therefore, the "over 20 million" who died in the war remind me of this village cemetery. Can this kind of thing be done? We must calculate the exact number, get rid of this "over" so that the whole world does not make fun of us, and publish the precise figures, however frightening this may have seemed at one time. Military commanders believe that if one army loses five times as many soldiers in a battle, this army has lost the battle. We, however, were on the defensive. I was also a soldier and marched into Berlin. If we were only defending ourselves, we should have had only one-fifth the casualties. But we had "over" five times as many as the enemy. How were we fighting? How many did we lose?

I would also like to say something about our difficulty getting along with academics. I personally believe that the USSR Academy of Sciences would be quite happy if there were no historical artistic works. My poem "Lomonosov" was published in 1953, is now in its 18th edition in the USSR, and has been translated into other languages. When scholars were asked to review it, one academician wrote that Lomonosov had five, and not four, buttons on his shirt; in essence, he was saying that the poet has no business poking his nose into history when he does not know anything about it. Another historian tried to teach me that Lomonosov did not eat cod, but something else. On this basis, my poem was "slashed to pieces." The editors wondered what to do. Correct the number of buttons, they told me, and leave the rest alone. Then there was the story of my poem "Yermak." So many academics attacked the manuscript instead of helping me. But after all, historians are not water, and we writers are not fire. We must find a common meeting-ground. They discarded my epigraph to my poem "Pugachev," although it was a quotation from Lenin: A slave who knows he is a slave ceases to be a slave and becomes a revolutionary (I am quoting from memory). Incidentally, I recently found out that we have published fewer of Lenin's works than anyone else: His works have been published in their entirety in all of the bourgeois countries. And they publish Marx "down to the last crumb." The Institute of Marxism-Leninism should think about finally publishing the works of Lenin and Marx in the form they deserve.

I would also like to say a few words about my poem "Platov." You know who Platov was—he was the one Kutuzov was writing about when he said that Russia would have lost the war if it had not been for Platov's cavalry. Lev Tolstoy once said that Russian history was definitely responsible for the creation of the Cossacks (I am also quoting this from memory). And believe it or not, Tolstoy was taken out of my poem. This is not right! In the poem "Lomonosov" there is a line about a dying man: "The drop dripped mournfully." When I read the published version, it said "the drop fell merrily." I asked: "What have you done?" Publishing Editor B.I. Solov'yev replied: "Have you gone mad? You are talking about the Thaw, this is an allusion to the Thaw." They brazenly change some lines and take others out, and they do not even bother to tell you.

I think that if we really want to return to Leninism, to the purity of Lenin, we must remember that there are only 12 years left before the end of the century, and we will be responsible for our century in the same way that builders must present a finished building for inspection. Will this "building" be like the 20th century? What will the "building" look like in its final form? Sometimes builders are in such a hurry that they forget to install the toilet. It seems to me that the greatest danger is that the building might have a toilet but will be devoid of memories. We must build monuments for all those who were unjustly repressed and all those who starved to death if we want to be good fathers and good sons. And we must build a monument (this is still only in the planning stage) to Ataman Platov. He does not even have a single alley or back street named after him. There was a monument in Novocherkassk, but it was torn down because people thought he was just another tsarist general.... Then we can feel proud that we accomplished something and did not live in vain.

V.D. Oskotskiy (Literary Critic): *The Stereotypes of the Old Way of Thinking*

I would like to be known as a gentleman and not even mention N. Andreyeva, but chivalry is a luxury after you read the academics' letter in the 22 April issue of LENINGRADSKIY RABOCHIY under the heading "But Are They the Same Principles?"—the first critical response in Leningrad to the article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. The letter says that N. Andreyeva is upset by the process of democratization and is stubbornly opposing it both verbally and in print. This is, in addition to everything else, graphic confirmation of how history, historical knowledge, the careful consideration of the past, and the ability to learn lessons from the past are becoming the principal and leading bridgehead in the clashes between the new and old ways of thinking. As the PRAVDA editorial of 5 April and many of M.S. Gorbachev's statements have stressed, the restructuring of mental attitudes has turned out to be much more difficult and complicated than it originally seemed to be. This is why, to use M.S. Gorbachev's words, our primary

objective is the ideological reinforcement of perestroika. And what can reinforce it better than the lessons of history, which will serve as its fundamental justification?

Historical science and literature and art, scientific and artistic thinking, have common goals and duties in this process. The line dividing the old and new ways of thinking does not lie between historical science and literature but within both. Historical science and literature are equally responsible for the consciousness of today's readers. For example, they are responsible for the reader of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA who said that Stalin had supposedly made him a real person. This, according to Yu. Burtin's accurate definition (OKTYABR, 1987, No 12), is an example of Stalinism working from the bottom up. But Stalinism from the bottom up, as the publication of N. Andreyeva's article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA demonstrated, is connected with Stalinism from the top down, and the latter seeks support from the former.

The old way of thinking is trying to counteract the new way with offensive and sometimes aggressive methods. Many sections of newspapers and journals attest to this. If fact, was it not the old way of thinking that was apparent in the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA article about N. Bukharin, the errors in which were acknowledged even by the editors themselves? Was it not the old way of thinking that was apparent at the Leningrad conference on the 70th anniversary of October in the speech by A. Ivanov, editor-in-chief of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA: Do any other people in the world slander their own history as much as we do? At the same conference his question was answered by V. Kaverin, the elder statesman of Soviet Russian prose. By publishing their speeches side by side, OGONEK provided a more than graphic illustration of the confrontation between the old and new ways of thinking. The same kind of dramatic contrast in views was seen in the responses to Yu. Afanasyev's article "From the Standpoint of Truth and Realism" and other articles of his. It is precisely because of the strong opposition of the old way of thinking to the new way that we still, he stressed in one of his latest articles, have been unable to make any fundamental progress in molding a realistic historical consciousness. On the contrary, more diverse and subtle methods are being used to keep the discredited but still existent realities of the past alive in social practices and human minds. Certain standard models for the defense of the past have taken shape. I will list a few of these models.

The first stereotype is the idea that our ideological opponents involve us in discussions of our society's historical past in order to divert us from current issues. But it is not our ideological opponents that are provocatively forcing us to do this. We have an organic spiritual need to know more about our own past. The second is the stereotype of prohibition. It gave rise to what D.S. Likhachev called the monstrous word "necrophilia." Another example of this kind of prohibitory practice is

P. Proskurin's recent statement that Stalin was such a complex and contradictory man that it would take someone with as much talent as Shakespeare or Dostoyevsky to analyze his character. Since we have no one of this caliber, there is no need to hurry. If we take the writer's advice and postpone our investigations of the dramas of national history indefinitely, will we not be creating new prohibitive barriers to block the people's historical memory, which needs to be embodied in the writer's words?

Finally, there is another common stereotype. I would call it the belief in historical fatalism, the insistence that choices and developments other than those which took place never existed, that everything that ever happened in our history was historically inevitable. This idea pervades many of A. Prokhanov's journalistic articles, especially his article "Then I Understand!" in LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, V. Ruslyakov's article "Revenge?" (ibid.), or I. Klyamkin's article in NOVYY MIR (1987, No 11), which is interesting and astute but also sinks into fatalism at the end. This applies specifically to his remark that the collectivization plan, carried out under the slogan of annihilating the kulak class, was the only construction plan we had.

I think that the problem of historical choice, which is, incidentally, the subject of P. Volobuyev's important book "Vybor putey obshchestvennogo razvitiya: teoriya, istoriya, sovremennost'" [The Choice of Patterns of Social Development: Theory, History, and the Present Day] (Moscow, 1987), the problem of different patterns of historical development, is one of the most acute problems warranting equal attention from science and art. In this connection, I would like to remind you of the opinion historian V. Danilov expressed during the VOPROSY ISTORII roundtable discussion (1988, No 3) on "Historical Science at a Time of Perestroika."

How do these stereotypes influence concrete assessments of various developments in contemporary poetry, prose, and drama?

I will not join the debate proposed here by F. Kuznetsov: When did the current updating of literature begin and what position do A. Rybakov's novel "Children of the Arbat" or A. Pristavkin's story "The Golden Cloud Stayed Overnight" occupy in this process? I will agree, however, with D. Granin, who said in one of his articles that the publication of A. Akhmatova's "Requiem," the prose of A. Platonov and M. Bulgakov, and several other works offers impressive proof that some people were not afraid even in the most frightening times. Nevertheless, as he correctly added, all of these are isolated examples. When push came to shove, many people did not even have anything hidden away in their desks.

This makes it all the more important to treat what we have with care and concern. For instance, when A. Akhmatova's "Requiem" was published, we heard the blasphemous statement that this was an expression of poetic egocentrism and a monument to oneself. As soon

as V. Dudintsev's novel "White Clothes" made its appearance, we heard sounds of grumbling from MOLODAYA GWARDIYA: Of course, the exposure of Lysenkoism is necessary and useful, but it does not enrich the national culture. But is our national culture so indifferent to the fate of our science, as it is portrayed by the writer, or to the defense of its honor and dignity? Ever since D. Granin's story "The Diehard" was published, people have angrily called the hero of the story a "deserter" and have criticized the writer for describing the "deserter" in poetic terms. This "ugly" word, as the author defines it, was used again just recently by historian A. Kuzmin (NASH SOVREMENNİK, 1988, No 3), who kept condemning the story even after LITERATURNAYA GAZETA printed a letter from some respected academics to confirm that the charges brought against N.V. Timofeyev-Resovskiy had no connection with the academic's real fate.

Finally, there is M. Shatrov's play "Farther...Farther...Farther!" In N. Andreyeva's article, we read that the writer is violating the "accepted principles" of socialist realism. What kind of art can place the immutability of principles above everything else and prefer the known to the unknown? "Only the Truth is Above Suspicion"—this was the title of an article by some historians who also condemned this play (PRAVDA, 15 January 1988). But where, pray tell, were these fighters for the truth when history was being falsified in line with Stalin's wishes before their very eyes? A lengthy section on the Prague conference in a recent issue of PRAVDA reminded us of one example of this falsification. This makes us wonder if they tolerated this because they were falsifying history themselves. The authors of this article must recall the simple fact that works of art dealing with historical subjects are not illustrations in textbooks. The dramatist who adheres to the laws of artistic portrayal has the right to bring Lenin and Stalin together on stage after their death or to leave Stalin on stage, no matter how much we want him to go away....

In conclusion, I would like to say something about V. Kozhinov's attempt to discredit Anatoliy Rybakov's novel "Children of the Arbat" in issue No 4 of NASH SOVREMENNİK. The author proceeds from the totally false premise that it does not take much heroism or courage to write the truth about something everyone is discussing today. Is it really necessary to take the critic by the hand and remind him that Rybakov was already writing the novel in the 1960's and finished it in the middle of the 1970's, when the truth the writer perceives and portrays was illicit and forbidden, and when any approximations of the truth were doomed in advance to lengthy interment in a desk drawer.

I would like to discuss only one thing in this article which tells me something about NASH SOVREMENNİK and its frequent contributor: the use of quotations from Lenin's article "Words of Prophecy" to support the thesis that calculations of the number of victims of violence had to begin with October 1917. The critic says

that V.I. Lenin predicted "many years of labor pains" with "merciless frankness." Using this phrase as a point of departure, a phrase arbitrarily taken out of the historical context of the times and the semantic context of Lenin's article, the critic goes on to calculate the number of victims of the Civil War, the hunger caused by collectivization in the early 1930's, and the events of 1937 with astounding indifference instead of mourning each of these national tragedies. Furthermore, the events of 1937 are not even categorized as a tragedy. This illustrates the effects of another stereotype, which essentially implies that whereas B. Mozhayev's "Peasant Men and Women" is a novel about a national tragedy, A. Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat" and, to an even greater extent, Yu. Trifonov's "The Disappearance" are portrayals of nothing other than intellectual worrywarts locked away in their "seaside cottages."

But let us take a first-hand look at Lenin's article, dated July 1918. When Vladimir Ilyich discussed the lengthy period of labor pains unavoidably connected with the transition from capitalism to socialism, he said that these pains were just as unavoidably connected with the obvious and indisputable fact that "a revolution following a war is connected with the war (and this is even more true...of one which breaks out during a war and has to grow and remain strong when surrounded by world war), that this kind of revolution represents a case of a particularly difficult birth."²⁹ He was referring to the imperialist war, World War I, and the basic purpose and pathos of the article do not consist in an apology for cruelty and violence, as Kozhinov suggests, but in an appeal not to blame the October Revolution for what was engendered by the social order it overthrew. In other words, when cruelty and violence represent a natural trend in history, they are not a continuation of the revolution, but a departure from it, and could even be called, in the final analysis, counterrevolution. I have cited this example of the willful misinterpretation of Lenin's words as a graphic demonstration of the way in which facts are juggled so that the old way of thinking can involve custom-made versions of history in the struggle against the restructuring of today's social consciousness and, by the same token, the scientific and artistic consciousness.

N.Ye. Shundik (Writer)—*We Must Move Ahead*

We are now fully determined to make sober assessments of the injuries Stalin inflicted on the socialist cause. We already understand much about Stalinism, but I would like to direct your attention to another facet which has not been analyzed in the necessary depth yet.

It appears that people wholly devoted to the cause of socialism, genuine communists who personally took on the burden of 10 men, people with their own opinions and with a heightened sense of responsibility, were essentially beheaded in Stalin's time precisely because they did not want to hide their faces. Their place was later taken by those who were able to do this, who not

only did not carry the burden of 10 but easily put their own, single load on the shoulders of others. It was from this group that so-called administrators who were disciplined and politically trustworthy were selected for years. But they were actually not very trustworthy. In fact, they were absolutely untrustworthy because they made a mess of things, and they should have paid for this with their heads. They were also able, however, to blame their own failures on others and then to punish the innocent for these failures. What could be more horrifying?

Incidentally, it is too early to speak of them in the past tense. They were the ones who drove the country to its pre-crisis state, and anyone who believes that people like this appeared long after the Stalinist era is sadly mistaken. Some people say that embezzlers and frauds could not have thrived in the strict atmosphere of those days. But no, it was precisely then that the baneful process of the natural selection of these mediocre but extremely dangerous people began. This was an offspring of Stalinism, and the fact that Stalin began pulling those who were able to carry the burden of 10, people with the gift of statesmanship, out of prison during the terrible years of the Great Patriotic War does not change anything. Out of sheer necessity, he released individuals, but he ruined millions. We must be fully aware of this if we want to change our society on the molecular level, so to speak, while preserving the spiritual genetic code of Leninism in its entirety.

Today we often say that we must move back to Lenin. On the strength of dialectics, however, we should be saying that we must move ahead to Lenin, because Leninism is at a great height, and movement toward this height is always forward movement. The dialectic Lenin bequeathed to us is always necessary, like air, and it is particularly necessary at a time of radical, revolutionary restructuring and the reassessment of many values, because there is nothing darker than the light of metaphysical unidimensionality.

Today we frequently hear people say that the entire Stalinist period was a period of primitive people, automatons, "infusoria," and absolute soullessness. Yes, that was the start of the natural selection of those I describe as people who buried their heads in their shoulders. They were not the makers of victories, one of which was the victory over fascism, they were not the ones whom history elevated to the status of saviors of the human race. These great feats were accomplished not because of Stalinism, but in spite of it. If the millions of men who fell on the battlefields could arise from the dead, they would have something to say to those who call them "infusoria" today. It is not the fault of the dead or even of the living who took part in those events that they did not know the bitter truth that Stalin was far from another Lenin, that he was essentially his organic adversary. Leninism, however, continued to exist as a tangible

force. It was this spiritual force that moved millions of Soviet people even in those days. The ineradicability of Leninism is a fundamental fact of contemporary history.

If we do not acknowledge this fact, if we agree with the theory about the "infusoria," then how do we deal with the historical fact, acknowledged by progressive humanity, that we defeated fascism not only with weapons but also with the strength of our spirit and our ideals? How should we then assess our literature, painting and music, all of the Soviet classics which became classics precisely because their creators were moved by this fundamental fact? Shall we cross it out and pretend that nothing happened? This is precisely what all of the "voices" of our ideological opponents are howling about. But are they right, even if they have a chance to juggle a multitude of facts relating to our tragedy? No, and no again. Although our opponents are armed with facts, they are lying when they say that we never had a foundation and that the "infusoria" swarmed around in the sand and were suffocated. This is the biggest and most brazen lie, and it has far-reaching strategic aims.

Public speakers and articles in the press have recently made insistent demands that all of those who once signed the letter expressing disagreement with certain tendencies in NOVYY MIR repent. But why should I repent? Should I be sorry that I once expressed disagreement with those who branded the historic cruise "Avrora" a fiction, should I confess that I expressed disagreement with those who also called the great feats of Panfilov's men fictitious? Or should I repent because I did not agree with the position taken in the journal by A. Sinyavskiy and others like him? With a position exactly the same as the one they are occupying now over there, in the West? Or should I forget that Sinyavskiy and his colleagues used this journal to ridicule, ruin, and crush a writer as talented as V. Zakrutkin? And he was not the only one. I could go on with the list of things that made me angry, in spite of my deep respect for Tvardovskiy. Besides, I knew that it was Sinyavskiy and his circle, and not Tvardovskiy, who were responsible for everything I deplored and will continue to deplore. This is why I cannot keep silent any longer, because it is already causing a loss of honor and dignity.

Therefore, the acceptance or non-acceptance of the fact that the foundation of ineradicable Leninism is a historical reality could essentially be described as a universal watershed. Only this acceptance can strengthen the platform of our unanimity and our consolidation. After all, all of the decisions of our party's central committee plenums and 27th congress are based on these premises, but are we displaying enough persistence, ability, talent, and conviction in our fulfillment of major party appeals and decisions? The failure to assign priority to these is tantamount to allowing the dubious theories about "infusoria" and sand to gain a more or less firm foothold in our society, risking the loss of much of our younger generation by infecting it with disbelief, and seriously offending the people who have their own heroic destiny.

Enter any building and you will find a person who has had enough of the statements about "infusoria" and will ask in bewilderment: "I was defamed occasionally in the past; does this mean it is happening again?" The following words in the PRAVDA editorial of 5 April were quite timely: "No, the veterans of the party, war, and labor did not live in vain! All subsequent generations are indebted to them.... And only an immoral person would cast aspersions on the labor and heroism of our people." But we do occasionally cast them when we try to pass ourselves off as the only consistent and resolute fighters against Stalinism. Is this borne out by a dialectical approach to the situation?

One of my good friends, D.N. Bochkov, a frontline soldier from Ryazan, recently told me: "Some of the members of the vanguard who are saying that we were spiritually worthless should know that Stalin was incontrovertibly opposed by us, even those of us who went to their death with his name on their lips. Is this a paradox? Possibly. But the dialectic of truth is present in this paradox. The fact is that we were essentially carrying the spirit of Lenin inside ourselves, while Stalin, as we now know, was trying to destroy it. And the people who do not realize this, who are insulting my whole generation, and who are calling our ideals a fiction which left no mark on the history of the Soviet society, are not fighters against Stalinism but are closer to being his unwitting accomplices today. Is this a paradox? Possibly. But it should be investigated as thoroughly and quickly as possible."

This line of reasoning might come as a surprise to some, but is it not suggested by the very logic of life? Here I would like to quote Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev: "I think we cannot and should not ever excuse or justify what happened in 1937 and 1938. Not ever. Those who were in power then are responsible. But Comrades, this does not denigrate all that we have today, all that the party and people did when they were undergoing these ordeals." He also said: "We must realize the colossal strength of socialism and our order, which was able to survive even this and to fight against Nazism and win. This is why we must feel proud of our great people, their history, and their accomplishments on our 70th anniversary."³⁰ This should answer all of our questions, and this will be the basis for our genuine unanimity.

V.A. Kostrov (Poet)—*Do Not Make Extra Enemies*

The fate of perestroika will depend on prevailing processes in our social life. If processes of consolidation, connected with national unity, with cultural consolidation, and with the consideration of the interests of different social groups, should triumph, perestroika will produce quicker and more tangible results. If prevailing processes could best be described as the casting of stones in all directions, perestroika will be a slower process and will eventually be halted.

We are now facing, strictly speaking, the same two damned questions the Russian intelligentsia always faced (it answered them, even if only on the level of theory): Who is to blame? What is to be done? The party has formulated its proposals, and it is unlikely that there is any serious opposition to them in large social groups or the masses at large. Most people realize that there is no alternative to democratization and changes in the economic mechanism. Chess players know that pieces can be moved correctly and the game can be played accurately in the strategic sense but then be lost on the tactical level. It is not enough to formulate the right precepts and set guidelines; the wrong tactics could cause heavy losses.

I recently visited my father in the country. He is a war veteran. I asked how he felt about what is happening in our country today. My father looked at me and, on the accurate assumption that he was addressing a person who supports all of today's changes, said: "It will be hard for you, because you sometimes do not think of us as people." I winced and felt my gorge rising, but then I thought about what he had said. When we wage a struggle against bureaucrats in the party, we must realize that some ideas which may be conservative are cherished by the masses and that they take these ideas quite seriously. We must realize this and take it into account and then change these people's minds by setting personal examples.

We should remember the old rule of revolution: Do not make extra enemies, seek compromises wherever possible, and try to win as much support as possible for your own side. This is especially relevant because we do not even have any enemies in the strict sense of the term. What we have are people whom you and I, in our capacity as writers, scientists, and politicians, must convince of the necessity for today's changes. We must start doing this now, and it seems to me that this is a job for writers and historians.

Our society today is displaying a strong interest in the history of culture, the history of literature, and history in general. If we can make use of this interest the right way, we can set an example by consolidating the people around their history, because this history was made by people with different views and different aims. All of this entailed struggle and conflicts, but if we look into all of the details of our history, we can be certain that the history of our culture and our literature is working for us. I am annoyed, for example, by the tendency of various publications to create what seems to be two different groups of Soviet classics. This kind of division is absolutely wrong, no matter what kind of arguments we might hear from the people constituting the pride of our literature. The Soviet classics have the same cultural approach and we must seek common features, and this is also a job for historians and writers. This is something that can unite our efforts for a worthwhile cause. I agree

with those who say that the failure of perestroika would mean the failure of everything. This would be absolutely intolerable, it would be impossible to take.

I do not think that we either have to accept every aspect of our past or adhere to our own position even if we should lose something in the process, and in this context I am prepared to dispute P.A. Nikolayev's ideas about the method of socialist realism. This has been a matter of great interest to me for a long time, and I have discussed it with many writers. After all, any theory (or definition) at all is only right if it works. A mathematical model which does not reflect physical reality is counterproductive. I have discussed this with writers, and virtually none could say that the method of socialist realism was of any help in the creative process. Well, fine, I thought, these are writers, and perhaps readers could help me learn the true value of the method of socialist realism and thereby help me understand what is happening in our literature. I assure you, I spoke with readers, and they did not understand any of it. Then I thought it might be necessary to academics. But I was wrong. And after all, this is not a specialized term, but a fairly common one.

I acquired the firm conviction that the term "socialist realism" has "worked" whenever it has been necessary to condemn or insult several of our great writers. This is my opinion. Our friends abroad do not understand us either. I always suspect that we are restraining creative freedom by using this term. Would it be bad, for example, to call our literature the literature of socialist humanism? Why do we need a term that has been sullied by the imprint of the cult of personality? If we are keeping it simply because it once won the approval of academic science, we should remember that this science also gave its approval to, for example, Lysenko and others like him. I am not saying that the term should be eliminated right away, but this is a serious matter and deserves our collective consideration.

It seems to me that an alliance of historians and writers could produce magnificent results—above all, it could aid in enlisting the support of various social, ethnic, and other groups in our population, through the history of culture and through the history of literature, for the remarkable and serious but extremely arduous (and this must also be said) process we call perestroika.

A.O. Chubaryan (Director of World History Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences)—*Seeking Unity in Diversity*

In my opinion, the purpose of interaction by historians and writers is not only a search for specific forms of cooperation but also the exchange of ideological precepts and approaches to history and literature. Of course, there are specific features and substantial differences in the professional perception and portrayal of the world by writers and historians. This could be a longer process for historians because it is connected with the compilation

of more basic works. Another difference is that journalistic tastes are regrettably underdeveloped in our country, but this kind of writing is quite popular today. Another difference is that dogmatism, the elimination of which now constitutes almost the main objective of the social sciences, took deeper root, so to speak, in the minds of historians than of writers, and the elimination of the dogmatic way of thinking will therefore entail more time and effort.

Our attention has naturally been focused recently on the history of our country, the elimination of "gaps," and the heated arguments over various interpretations of our own history. It seems to me, however, that this should not obscure the historian's view of the world around us and the writer's portrayal of it in literature. I am not trying to criticize our colleagues in literature, but the recent natural interest in life in our country has relegated the interest in the surrounding world to a secondary place in journalism and especially in fiction.

Historians, however, are far in arrears in elucidating that world and what is justifiably called its integrity today. Historians turned out to be unprepared to respond to the party leadership's appeal and approach the world as an integral system. We have been preoccupied for too long with one side of the correct Marxist formula of the world as the unity and struggle of opposites. We have spent too much time studying only the struggle and have not noticed the components and elements of world unity that took shape over many centuries of human history. We have paid too little attention to the theory of the historical process, alternatives, and diversity.

We have also paid too little attention to the problem of progress and the price of progress. This is what is being discussed so extensively today, especially by journalists, by authors, and even by historians. I think that we are greatly in debt to society as a whole in our approach to the assessment of humanism. We have paid too little attention to the humanistic elements of history but have frequently employed the concepts of abstract humanism. Let us remember, for example, how vehemently we derided pacifism, calling it incompatible with the outlook we were cultivating!

A correct theoretical analysis of these issues would be useful to historians and social scientists and would aid in molding our people's view of history. The picture of an integral, contradictory, and interrelated world is much more complex than the world we describe in our books. Let us consider our works on the state of affairs in many countries and on the situation of various people: If the subject is the situation of the laboring masses, it is always and constantly taking a turn for the worse, and if the subject is 20th-century capitalism, the works represent a constant search for signs of crisis. We need a new approach to the chronological framework and salient

features of the general crisis of capitalism and its different phases. Economists have already come close to finding this approach, but historians are still making an obviously inadequate contribution to this process.

Until recently we tended to treat the term "Europeanism" with disdain. An article in ZVEZDA several years ago said that this was a bourgeois term anyway. Now, however, we are not only discussing the concept of a "common European home" but have even unearthed the historical roots and preconditions of this concept.

We must change our opinion and our treatment of world historical science. Yesterday I attended a conference of experts on world history in Kiev. One of the speakers asked whether Marxist historical science is now part of world historical science and speculated that this might lead to the "erosion" of Marxism and the disparagement of its role. This is a serious question, and we must have a clear view of our historical science as part of world historical science.

It appears that we have recently lost our taste for historical novels about other countries and peoples. Schoolchildren have no good books to read about the history of France and England, the ancient world, and the Middle Ages. This could be another form of cooperation by writers and historians.

Finally, some writers here today said that historians do this and that, that historians assume this and that, etc.

In our society, however, there is a broad range of views and beliefs, and individual historians also have different views and opinions. This plurality, which should not divide us from writers in principle, exists even among historians. For this reason, we must seek unity in diversity. We often diluted the historical process in the past by equating the concept of categorization with uniformity, and the concept of natural progression with standardization. It is the contrasting views and different opinions of historians and writers that will lead to success in their professional work and to their unity.

A.A. Iskenderov (Corresponding Member of USSR Academy of Sciences and Editor-in-Chief of VOPROSY ISTORII)—*There Can Be No Advancement Without Self-Criticism*

For more than 3 years our society has been living in an atmosphere of perestroika, glasnost, and democracy. Of course, this is not a long time, even if we consider the tangible results of the implementation of the truly revolutionary line of social renewal and moral purification. It is long enough, however, to define our position, analyze our own feelings about current events, and express them frankly and unequivocally. Unfortunately, historians have been almost the last of all the many segments of the

creative intelligentsia to begin taking part in the restructuring process. They spent too much time temporizing. Even today, we still cannot say that perestroika is proceeding at full speed in historical science.

Why did the historians turn out to be so extraordinarily conservative in their views and actions? Today we are trying to cope with the discrepancy between the public's much greater interest in history and the declining prestige and authority of historical research, and perhaps of historical science in general. It is painful for us to admit that in spite of their sincere intentions, historians have been unable to present the public with works and ideas as concrete and as capable of molding public opinion as the works and ideas of writers, who were in the lead at the time of the revolutionary turning-point and have become something like beacons directing the development of public thinking.

Judging by letters to the editors of VOPROSY ISTORII, historical thinking in our country has been severely deformed. The low level of historical consciousness in our society testifies that historians have a serious responsibility to society. They must assume much of the responsibility for our people's essential lack of opportunities for a long time to learn the whole objective truth about our history. Attitudes are changing dramatically today, although there are still many difficulties and obstructions to be surmounted and removed. Today writer V. Astafyev angrily said that historians had foisted a distorted history of the last war on the people.

Unfortunately, we have accumulated a multitude of vague accounts and even misinterpretations of various periods in our history, but the most acute problems are naturally those connected with the period we call the period of the cult of personality. Academy researchers have been writing and publishing a work on the history of the USSR since the middle of the 1960's, but the final, 12th volume of this work has still not made its appearance and we do not know if it ever will. In view of this, is it any wonder that readers have displayed such a great interest in the works of Karamzin, Klyuchevskiy, and Solovyev, which I personally see as, among other things, a clear lack of trust in the works of Soviet historians.

When we speak of the stagnant, or, as one speaker put it, critical state of historical science, I think we must conduct an honest and objective analysis of the real causes of its retardation and of the so-called gaps in our history. This kind of analysis will be of direct importance and will aid indirectly in the correct choice of patterns, forms, methods, and the very guidelines of the development of historical science. Unfortunately, this kind of work is often confined to a search for objective causes, so that everything can be blamed on the prevailing atmosphere in the society during the years of stagnation and its adverse effects on science and inhibition of its creative development. Obviously, it would be wrong to ignore the actual conditions in which the historians lived and worked, but conditions were the same for everyone.

Why is it that in the difficult years we now call the period of stagnation historians produced none or pitifully few of the kind of works that our literature has to its credit and that could promote perestroika?

I think we should also look for the causes of the present situation in historical science itself, in its system of organization, and in the style and methods of its management, including the moral bases of its work. This is all the more important now that history, just as literature, has acquired special social significance in this time of the revolutionary renewal of socialist society. The social functions of history and the civic duties of historians are much greater now that history and the policy of perestroika are closely interrelated and our relationship to the past and the truthful and complete disclosure of recent and distant history have become a constituent part of the ideological and political life of our society.

This is why an accurate view of history is one of the central points of the policy of perestroika and, consequently, why historical authenticity, as the principle governing the approach to reality and the method of its analysis, is becoming an important instrument in the study of the concrete experience of the past and present and the prediction of the future. Our attitude toward our history, especially the history of the 1920's and 1930's, and our correct interpretation of it not only represent a scientific problem but are also connected with the policy of perestroika and its current and future success. Our present and our future will depend largely on a correct assessment of our past.

It is no secret that even today we can meet people who say there is no need to look back into our history, that it is useless to dwell on the mistakes of the past and remember the repression, the tragic events in our history, and even the crimes, and that this cannot help the cause of perestroika. This actually signifies not only a departure from historical truth but also from reality. It signifies the creation of new myths and legends which might sound pretty but cannot serve as the basis of a new way of political thinking. Honest and truthful accounts of the past will reveal the objective need for the successful attainment of the goals of perestroika. There can be no advancement without self-criticism. This is particularly true in historical science, where profound, thorough, honest, and frank self-criticism is as necessary as the air we breathe. We can hardly expect to succeed without this.

We are living through an extremely interesting but complex and crucial period in our history. Now each of us is expected to clearly understand the importance of this turning point in the life of our country and to make a real effort to carry out the policy line of perestroika. Historical science and historians are expected to take an active part in the revolutionary transformation of society and the creation of an accurate historical consciousness in the Soviet people with works presenting a truthful and complete account of our history.

D.M. Balashov (Writer)—*We Must Love Our Land and Our People*

I began my career as a scholar, specializing in folklore, and then became a writer. I write novels about the 14th century. In general, both are noble occupations. They are two ways of perceiving reality and are fundamentally different. Roughly speaking, science is based on regularity, on the accumulation and classification of facts, while the artist chooses a single fact and contemplates it at length. Is there a guarantee that the artist has chosen an indisputable fact and has derived the truth from it? Talent is the only guarantee. When artists make plans in advance, however brilliant they might be (Sholokhov decided to write "Virgin Soil Upturned" in advance), frustration is unavoidable, even in the presence of undeniable talent. And the matter is not even worth discussing in all other cases.

Some of today's speakers have said that literature illustrates. But it does not illustrate even our life. This is a very grave mistake. Some of today's speaker also said that realism is the most accurate reflection of the truth or reality. We all learned this in school and at the institute. A good definition came out of the discussions of the 1960's: Realism is the art form in which the individual's character is analyzed as a result of social influences. But there cannot be realistic architecture, frescoes, applied arts, decorative arts, or images on the grand scale as in the epic. And this must not be ignored. The art of the renaissance created other images. Hamlet and Lear were men who stood above these common phenomena. They were shattered by them and they were killed by them, but they continued to resist.

Why is it necessary to discuss this today? The historical fatalism which was already discussed here today is closely related to our realism. I support the belief in the individual's free will. Historians study historical trends on the basis of what has already happened. There is no other way. But what has already happened was done by you and me. It is true that it was done collectively. And this is the line of our conscious life, short as it is, this is when we can remake everything and change reality, and then someone else will write that this was a natural trend when we are already in our graves.

As far as science is concerned, as a historian I have a few words to say. When we were taught about the populists' dispute with the Marxists in school, what was bothering the populists? They were defending the community, but no one was fertilizing the fields in the community where the land had been redistributed. I gained some insight from S.B. Veselovskiy's book "Village and Community." You know how he writes: A few words of his own and then a list of inescapable facts. Suddenly I learned that agriculture in Muscovite Rus was comprised of separate farmsteads and it would have been virtually impossible to redistribute this land. I wondered when all of the commotion over agriculture had started. I was tormented by this question until a writer, V. Maslov,

suggested that it may have started with Peter I's poll tax. It turned out that our agriculture had been declining since that time. The terracing plow had turned half of Russia into ravines in 80 years. And this tells us what historians have to do. Our leading writers have already dealt with collectivization, but we must write about this so that all of the people will understand what happened. The writers have handed down their verdict on the annihilation of millions and on the terrible humiliations the Russian peasants had to endure. Now historians must write about this.

As far as the economy is concerned, I have seen statistical reports on the development of our countryside, a process which began after Stolypin's reform. Why is no one using this information? What does it tell us? As long as the Russian peasant sat on his own plot of land, he fertilized it: It was his land. There was a form of property ownership in Russia—it was not unconditional but was based on the principle of possession. And the gentry took care of its land in accordance with the same principle: Those who were awarded land performed the appropriate services. It is interesting to learn what happened to our agriculture as a result of Stolypin's reform. In 1918 all peasants were awarded land. In 1921 Lenin instituted NEP. We must look at the level of our agriculture in 1929, when everyone had land. Historians, give us statistics, give us figures to dispel the fog, because emotional assessments should be backed up with historical ones. We must think, we must look and think, and we must love our land and our people. Some data in my possession indicate that there was a gigantic advance during that period. The number of livestock increased 1.5-fold. Multiple-field crop rotation, fertilizer, and other improvements were introduced. In 1929 there were dairy farms in Altay Kray with 200 dairy cows each—the same number as on American farms today. In other words, there was colossal progress in agriculture. All of this needs explanation. Historians must investigate statistical records and elucidate these facts.

Questions of nationality are cultural questions. People have been intermarrying for a long time, and there are now many more nationalities than there were, and new ones are being engendered by the increasing complexity of the structure, the culture, and the different forms of human adaptation to the environment. We are not better or worse, we are different, and on this basis there can be friendship between us precisely because we are different. A farmer does not belong where cattle graze, and a livestock breeder does not belong where crops are grown. In the Karelian ASSR, for example, Russians were to blame for all of the fires, because the natives never built campfires in peat bogs. They had been adapting for centuries and had known how to live on this land for centuries.

Besides this, there are extremely subtle spiritual matters and subtle feelings which must also be understood. Yes, all of us are non-believers, but we live in a society where

a specific religion was predominant for a long time. The result is a moral code which took shape over many centuries, and all of us have a specific set of behavioral stereotypes.

When the French culture first became popular in Russia, the Russians forgot that they were living in another country and had a different ecological environment. I think that the question of nationality is related to ecology. There is only one principle here: Humans living on the earth have the right to take only as much from nature in a year as nature produces that year, and no more. We must give this some thought because we are already picking our ancestor's pockets.

O.A. Rzhesheskiy (World History Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences)—*We Need a New Approach in the Compilation of Collective Works*

Many historians have certainly sensed the mistrust writers and literary scholars harbor against their works. There are serious grounds for this. We now wonder how this can be avoided in the future and how trust in the works of historians can be restored not only among writers but also among all of our people, to whom we are far in arrears.

This will be difficult because everyone—from the worker to the intellectual—is setting extremely strict standards for the new works coming out today. Metaphorically speaking, they are weighing them on the most sensitive scales: Is all of this accurate, is it objective, does it tell the whole truth? The public scrutiny of all of the new works that have been published or will be published soon on, for instance, the academy level, gives historians a special responsibility. In the absence of certain conditions, however, we will be unable to perform this task, no matter how hard we try, no matter how much we perfect our methodology, and no matter how deeply we delve into various events. The first and most essential condition is access to documents.

Unfortunately, there are still some confidential documents which should be accessible or at least semi-accessible. Let us take the history of Soviet foreign policy as an example. The World History Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the Military History Institute of the USSR Ministry of Defense recently completed a rough draft of a joint work by historians from seven socialist countries, "The Causes of World War II. Annotated Documents." We turned out to be the only country involved in the project to be unable to include a single new document on the history of Soviet foreign policy in 1938 and 1939 in this work. The matter was discussed at various levels, and chapters containing some documents which had never been published in the USSR were planned, but to no avail, because they simply were not released by the people who have custody of these documents.

There is another difficult problem connected with the events of the last 3 years and with the restructuring efforts we historians have made and those we should have made. The Great Patriotic War was mentioned in several speeches today. The hearts and minds of all generations will always be affected by dramatic episodes from its history. And we naturally accepted the CPSU Central Committee Politburo decision on the compilation of a 10-volume "History of the Soviet People's Great Patriotic War" not only as a matter of crucial importance but also as a tremendous creative opportunity to present a more objective account of the tragedy and triumph of the Soviet people, who saved their own country and all mankind from the threat of fascist enslavement.

The participating institutes have been chosen: the Military History Institute, the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, and the USSR History Institute and World History Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The initial stage of the work, however, has been done according to old canons and a strictly centralized system. If this system retains its present form, nothing good can come out of it. Have any specific decisions been made? The military department will control and direct the major elements of the organization and compilation of the basic work: the elaboration of a theory, the compilation of a structural plan, and the choice of members of the main editorial commission, the editors-in-chief of the different volumes, their editorial boards, and the team of authors.

The History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences conducted a detailed investigation of the matter and expressed the opinion that the theory has not been elaborated yet, that the structural plan is essentially the same as the plans for the 6-volume "History of the Great Patriotic War" and the 12-volume "History of World War II," and that the main editorial commission was set up by means of authoritarian directives and commands. Furthermore, most of its 36 members have no direct connection with the study of the history of the Great Patriotic War. All of the chief editors are researchers from the Military History Institute and many are not ready to perform the functions of the main scholar in charge of shaping the image of the volume. This is no secret to anyone.

The history department made several extremely valuable suggestions which should at least be discussed by the main editorial commission. In particular, the World History Institute proposed an alternative structural plan based on the principle of chronology and subject matter and suggested the publication of contending structural plans in, for instance, *IZVESTIYA*, to direct attention to these problems, encourage their discussion, and learn the opinion of the public. But the history department's proposals were not even given any serious consideration. Another problem is that the number of prominent historians in the Military History Institute is extremely limited at this time. In this context, the appointment of

D.A. Volkogonov, a renowned authority, as the head of the institute was an accurate and fortunate decision. But by the time he was appointed, the main documents on the new project had already been approved.

What we need is the genuine and equitable unification of the scientific forces of the Military History Institute, the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, and the academy institutes in the performance of this extremely difficult task. We specifically proposed the creation of a board of directors, but this suggestion did not evoke an enthusiastic response either. It seems to me that the new large-scale collective works by historians will also necessitate new methods of preparation, maximum democratization, and the recruitment of the most highly qualified scientific personnel in Moscow, Leningrad, and the union republics.

I.F. Stadnyuk (Writer)—*Drawing the Proper Conclusions from Earlier Errors*

The Western radio stations broadcasting programs to the Soviet Union call me Stalin's official biographer without any good reason whatsoever. But the gentlemen in the Voice of America station have forgotten that they read my novel "People Are Not Angels" on the radio, chapter by chapter, for several weeks in the beginning of 1963, after making, it goes without saying, certain cuts in their own interest. The novel was published in issue No 12 of *NEVA* in 1962. P.A. Nikolayev mentioned this old ache of mine in his speech. In 1963 "People Are Not Angels" was published in London by two publishing firms at once. The Barker firm added the following inscription to the title of the book on the jacket: "The first novel in Russia to tell the truth about Stalin's cruel treatment of the Ukrainian peasants." In 1964 the novel was published in Munich and Zurich by the Dromer Knaur firm and was accompanied by a preface, which said, in part: "Ivan Stadnyuk, the author of 'People Are Not Angels,' is a communist. There is no doubt about this. This makes his first-hand account of these inhumane practices, described with blinding clarity, all the more amazing. He describes the coercive and brutal collectivization of the peasantry, the terrible hunger, the barbarous interrogations, the deportations under cover of night and fog, the system of denunciation and 'exposure'..., etc."

The novel was published in many editions in our country and abroad and was nominated for all kinds of prizes. They were not awarded. Meanwhile, the literary critics who had directed attention to the novel at first, later forgot about it during the years of stagnation and, with their silence, excluded it from the group of works describing those difficult years in our history. Now other books are named as the first depictions in our literature of the hunger, repression, and grave injustices accompanying the dispossession of the kulaks and collectivization. I began to think that it would be inconvenient for someone to remind readers that the novel "People Are Not Angels" and my later novels were written by the same author. In fact, a volume of my works, including

the novel "People Are Not Angels" and the story "Man Will Not Surrender," published last year in a DRUZHBA NARODOV supplement, was entitled "Man Will Not Surrender" without my knowledge or consent. What is the reason for this?

Here is the reason. My novels about the war are now under attack, and I, weak as I am, am trying to repulse the attacks because I believe that I did not commit any sins against historical truth and the documented facts of these events. For example, in issue No 15 of NEDELYA this year, I.V. Bestuzhev-Lada discusses many aspects of our history quite intelligently but then repeats the false story that Stalin isolated himself "in the dacha in Kuntsevo during the first 10 days of the war, when the front was breaking up." Stalin is now the target of so many justified accusations (just think of A. Vaksberg's article "The Secret of October '41" in the 20 April 1988 issue of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, which makes your hair stand on end), that I cannot understand why lies are also necessary.

I can briefly tell you how Moscow learned the war had started. This is not one of the many versions of the story, but the truth. Between two and three in the morning on 22 June 1941 the telephone in the dacha of People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs V.M. Molotov rang. The call was from German Ambassador Schulenberg, who asked if he could immediately deliver a memorandum on Germany's declaration of war on the Soviet Union. Molotov replied that he would meet the ambassador in the people's commissariat and then immediately telephoned Stalin's dacha, woke him up, and reported his conversation with Schulenberg. Stalin replied: "Go ahead, but do not let the German ambassador in until the military informs us that the aggression has begun. I will go call a meeting of the Politburo. We will wait for you there." From that moment on, Stalin stayed in the Kremlin permanently, making decisions whose accuracy or inaccuracy can best be judged by historians.

After the scandalous comments of 29 June between the state-political and military leaders of the country in the People's Commissariat of Defense, Beriia warned Stalin of an alleged military conspiracy. In my opinion, this was the reason for the subsequent new decisions which went into effect on 30 June, when the State Committee of Defense was formed, S.K. Timoshenko was appointed commander of the western front, and N.F. Vatutin was sent to the northwestern front. G.K. Zhukov was left in Moscow so that Beriia could "keep an eye on him." On 2 July Mekhlis was sent to the western front to keep an eye on Timoshenko.

I would also like to respond to O. Timushkin's article in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA (19 March 1988). He accuses me of portraying the fate and guilt of Army General D. Pavlov and his comrades-in-arms inaccurately in my novel "War." Timushkin says that he was a member of the commission which reviewed Pavlov's case after the 20th CPSU Congress in the Military Cases

Collegium of the USSR Supreme Court and which vindicated him along with all of the generals and officers executed in 1941. I agree completely with Timushkin that there was no need to take such extreme measures against the leadership of the western front. Pavlov, Klimovskikh, Klych, Grigoryev, Korotkov, and others could have been extremely useful as commanders of corps, divisions, and even companies. But after all, I was not writing about the vindication of the commanders of the western front, but about the earlier interrogation, before they were put on trial, and I based my account on the documents of the collegium of the military court, left there after the commission's investigation. I even read the record of the interrogation, in which Pavlov "confesses" to his alleged conspiracy with the fascists. One of the interrogators added this note: "Signed in an incapacitated state." I also know about the tragic ordeal of the families of the executed men: They were repressed, although the charges on which the men were convicted provided no grounds for this. Mekhlis was obviously over-reacting to the situation.

I also read how the rehabilitation commission of which Timushkin was a member tried to prove that Khrushchev's son, a pilot who was condemned during the war after he had committed an act of heroism, was completely innocent. But the Military Cases Collegium of the Supreme Court did not feel it was possible to withdraw the charges.

Was Pavlov really guilty? Timushkin says he was not.... Unfortunately, he was guilty of informing Stalin 2 weeks before the war started that the reports of the concentration of German troops along our borders were a provocation. This was witnessed by A.Ye. Golovanov, who later became chief marshal of aviation and published his memoirs in OKTYABR. I spoke with many commanders later. All of them agreed that a commander who did not even concern himself about his command point in advance and who lost control of his armies in the first days of the war could not have been innocent. A commander who allowed himself the luxury of taking Division Commissar Fominykh, a member of the military council, and their families to the district officers' club to watch a performance of "Anna Karenina" by an MKhAT touring company in Minsk on the evening of 21 June, when the atmosphere was so tense, could not have been innocent. It is true that Pavlov installed a portable telephone in the hall and answered two phone calls from Moscow during the play, obviously without telling anyone that he was at the theatre instead of at district headquarters and in contact with the armies under his command. All of this was noted in the memoirs Lt Gen Fominykh, former member of the Western Front Military Council, gave me. It is also corroborated by A.N. Kolesov, a former officer in the culture division of the Political Administration of the Special Western Military District who now lives in Moscow. He was the one who was on duty by Pavlov's portable phone that evening and who had to ask him to leave his balcony seat to take the calls.

But what does Pavlov himself say about his guilt or innocence? I will read the testimony of former Captain of State Security I.G. Boyko, a retired colonel now living in Odessa. He was one of the members of the operational group who arrested Pavlov on 4 July 1941. What happened after the arrest? "At approximately 16:00 we were in Smolensk in the office of the chief of the People's Commissariat of State Security. Mekhlis walked into the office shortly afterward and immediately began shouting and swearing at Pavlov in his usual rough and violent manner, even going so far as to call him 'a felon, an outlaw, a traitor, an informer who opened up the front to Moscow for the Germans,' and so on and so forth. Pavlov, who was sitting in a chair, tried to contradict Mekhlis, but he could not compete with the hail of words pouring out of the extremely enraged Mekhlis' mouth. After about 10 or 15 minutes Mekhlis and the rest left the office, and I was ordered to search Pavlov and fill out the necessary report, which I then did. After Mekhlis and the others had gone, Pavlov, who remained in the room with me, began expressing his indignation with Mekhlis for calling him a traitor and an informer, although he did admit that it was his fault that the district troops were unprepared to repulse the attack by the German fascists despite the people's commissar of defense's warning of the day before, that almost all of the aircraft on airfields near the border were lost as soon as the war started, and that the loss of communication between district headquarters and armies and companies in the first days of the war led to the loss of control of these troops and their ignorance of the situation on the border.

"During our conversation he kept saying: 'I am guilty and I must take the responsibility for my guilt, but I am not an informer or a traitor.' After a while Pavlov calmed down and asked permission to eat something and drink a little brandy (he had a chicken, some bread, and a bottle of brandy in his suitcase). I told him he could eat but that he could not have any brandy. When he heard this, Pavlov said: 'Well, that is a fine thing, they arrest me and do not let me have a drink.' After a while I gave in to his insistent pleas and allowed him to have a small drink. Preoccupied with the search report I had to fill out, I did not notice Pavlov drink almost half the bottle of brandy in just a few minutes. When I did notice, I took the rest of the brandy away from him, and Pavlov then said: 'Well, that was the last drink I will ever have.' When I asked why it would be the last, he replied: 'They will shoot me. I know Stalin. He will never forgive me for what happened.'"

Now judge for yourselves how historians, jurists, and writers should act when they find out the truth about a specific situation. We must not drive each other into a corner. Perestroika in literature will involve more than just making up a list of our faulty judgments in the past or of past offenses and injustices. This is exactly what some writers want perestroika to be today. Let us instead draw the necessary and proper conclusions from our earlier errors and examine them closely to see which were genuine errors and which were productive inquiries. After all, we made all of this happen!

V.A. Kumaney (Corresponding Member of USSR Academy of Sciences)—*We Need Truthful Elucidations of the Past*

Absolutely honest historical thinking is an organic part of dialectics. This is one of the axioms of Marxism-Leninism. It is not until we have analyzed our history truthfully that we can and should discard all flagrant misinterpretations and correct unwarranted silences or their opposite—inordinate praise.

In an article entitled "A Sense of Historical Authenticity," writer S. Shurtakov made the apt remark that neither chemistry nor cybernetics can produce a citizen; the study of history, literature, and the native language is what produces a citizen. Perhaps the time has come, as people within the USSR Academy of Sciences are constantly saying, to include our national history among the main required subjects in our schools along with literature. After we start teaching children history as soon as they take their first steps, it is wrong to confine their learning to courses in school. Even in the "Children's Encyclopedia," however, history ranks only eighth or ninth among the topics of the greatest importance. Is this a coincidence?

Today we are witnessing the impatient efforts of some people who call themselves historians to discuss a broad range of historical issues and present everything in a dismal light, as if Soviet historical science did not exist. At international conferences even our enemies acknowledge the priority of Soviet historians in many fields of scientific research. It is true that professional historians are facing many problems and difficulties. Their responsibility has grown immeasurably, but the correction of the situation will require patience, and it is our civic and party duty to make every effort to correct the situation on the historical front. In the present atmosphere of glasnost, which our people achieved through genuine suffering, no social scientist or writer has a monopoly on the truth or the right to impose his view of the truth on others, but we all do have the obligation to make a painstaking search for the truth with a view, it goes without saying, to the conditions of those years, and we do have a burning need to know the whole truth.

Today everyone has the right to discuss our history, but a certain degree of competence is still necessary to clear up matters instead of obscuring the facts even more. The advocates of biased and sensationalized accounts, however, are pleased to make what Russian historian S.B. Veselovskiy termed "devastating raids" on our national historiography, stopping at times to juggle facts, to deride the past in its entirety, and to make suggestions, which are obvious even without their imperative judgments and which are too general besides, with regard to the country's entire history—from ancient Rus to the present day.

The works of historians cannot be judged in isolation from the conditions in which they had to work. This leads unavoidably to the illusion that historians could write truthful and profound works in the 1930's and 1940's and in the 1970's and early 1980's, but were too lazy and "professionally incompetent" to do so. But who, pray tell, would have published the works of these daredevils in those difficult years? What would have been the penalty for writing the real history of, for example, the Stalinist period or the period of stagnation? Who would have let them look through the files in the archives—the foundation of serious research? Therefore, we must neither oversimplify the situation nor whitewash the historians: their timidity, their dogmatic tendencies, their complacency, their false optimism, their pomposity, etc.

Today historians are also active fighters for the improvement of society, participants in the creation of a new spiritual atmosphere, and efficient publicists of perestroika. Never in recent decades have they made so many public statements, participated in so many roundtable discussions and debates, and made so many appearances on television, in the press, and in other news media. Articles by historians on the glorious group of Leninist Bolsheviks, military commanders, scientists, and cultural figures who became the victims of the lawlessness and terror Stalin propagated and rare documents and memoirs began appearing in OGONEK, NOVYY MIR, central newspapers, and historical journals almost at the same time as A. Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat," V. Dudintsev's "White Clothes," D. Granin's "Diehard," and the essays by F. Burlatskiy, A. Vaksberg, I. Rudenko, V. Sokolov, Al. Afanasyev, and many other writers.

There is a truly nationwide interest in our history and in the history of national and world culture. Some speakers have already discussed the public reaction to the deeply meaningful article in the 5 April issue of PRAVDA, "Principles of Perestroika: Revolutionary Thinking and Action," which rebuked anti-perestroika forces. Some of them have donned the toga of glasnost and have criticized perestroika, hoping to draw attention to themselves, without proposing anything constructive or productive. They are tormented by the syndrome of revenge. Statements about history in the press include obviously dubious opinions (apparently, in the heat of the struggle for the triumph of the truth). For example, M. Goncharov announced that Stalin had "driven our country away from socialism and destroyed the best of our breed." He tried to drive us away from it, but he did not succeed. This is the crux of the matter. Leninism and the people's ideals and faith in socialism turned out to be stronger. The hasty rewriting of history is deliberate forgery. Each new generation enriches history and re-examines it from its own vantage point. We need dialectics, and not the alternation of black and white or the replacement of some half-truths with others. "Pre-cooked facts," half-truths about the 1920's, the 1930's, and the 1940's, and the avoidance of analyses of the

1970's, a decade rooted in the period of the Stalinist cult, can confuse even the most determined individual if he is not fully competent. It is obviously wrong to trample and denigrate our entire past history or disregard the achievements of our people, including achievements in different fields of science, one of which is historical science.

Historians and writers work together in centers for the study of local lore, in museums, in societies for the preservation of monuments (although it is true that these organizations are almost powerless), and in the Soviet Cultural Foundation. The restoration of the historical names of streets and cities must be continued through vigorous concerted effort. Why does Mariupol still bear Zhdanov's name? Regardless of how much we respect M.I. Kalinin, do we need two Kaliningrads and a Kalinin (formerly Tver)? A monument to Terkin is being built, but should we not start with a monument to the great patriotic poet A.T. Tvardovskiy? There are no monuments to Razin, Bolotnikov, Pugachev, Radishchev, the Decembrists, and several prominent Bolsheviks from Moscow in Moscow. We spend 2 million rubles a year on propaganda posters but we do not have a few hundred rubles for memorial plaques (for example, for the building where Marshal G.K. Zhukov lived and worked).

It is almost impossible to come up with quick answers to many questions connected with our history, especially the Soviet period. It takes an average of 3 years to publish a book. Archives are just now becoming completely accessible. Documented information must be revealed and reassessed. The public, however, will be angry if we "take our time." This is also clear.

It is a terrible thing when people pretend to be authorities in fields of learning other than their own. We know that Stalin was an "authority" on almost all of the sciences and frequently tried to present his own interpretations of Leninism. We know what happened when he supported such pseudo-scientists as Lysenko. This reminds me of an incident related by Academician I.I. Meshchaninov, the well-known linguist. When Stalin thought of conducting a debate on linguistics, he decided in advance to support the ideas of Academician N.Ya. Marr. He called Meshchaninov in for consultations. When Meshchaninov had his second meeting with Stalin, Beriia and the obscure philologist Chikobava were there. Everything was rehearsed. Later the "scientific leader" declared: "If I did not know Meshchaninov personally, I would describe his actions as sabotage."

The last plenum of writers of the USSR aroused considerable public interest. Many educative, bold, and patriotic statements were made there. This makes the incorrect observations seem even more disappointing. For example, writer R. Ovanesyan called the bleak years of the Great Patriotic War "the happiest period in the friendship of our peoples." It is true that the family of Soviet nationalities fought together in friendship during the struggle against the fascist plague, but let us not

forget what this "happy" time was like for the Ingush, Balkars, Volga Germans, Kalmyks, Chechens, and other peoples who were exiled to remote snow-covered lands by the "father of the people." Another plenum speaker said: "Unfortunately, we destroyed shrines and then built prisons in the 1930's."³¹ The prisons were built by Stalin and his henchmen. Yagoda, Yezhov, Vyshinskiy, Ulrikh, Beriia, Abakumov, and Merkulov were not we, not the party, and not the Soviet people. Furthermore, it is no secret that the cathedral of Christ the Savior, which was built with private donations to commemorate the victory over Napoleon, was demolished because of the "master's" arrogance, and this is also true of Sukharev Tower and many other shrines.

We have a great deal of general history which must not be buried along with the lawlessness and repression. As Ye. Yevtushenko once said, in the absence of truth, its place is taken by lies and dangerous idealization. Any concealment of a past tragedy or misrepresentation of the years of numbness and complacency will give the younger generation false points of reference. The film industry is particularly guilty of deviations of this kind. Script writers (followed by directors and actors) frequently try to idealize everything connected with the personality of the "great commander of all eras and peoples." How can we change our young people's minds after they have seen so many movies portraying him as a magnificent but unpretentious "public benefactor" and a wise humanitarian? After all, in reality he was the man who destroyed a horrifying number of fighters for Leninism—from people's commissars and marshals to the unfortunate rank and file, whom he referred to as "cogs" in such a contemptuous tone.

Historians and writers must work together to find all of the underlying causes and roots of the cult of personality without confining their inquiries to Stalin's own personality or concentrating on 1937 and 1938. After they have learned the bitter and painful truth, young historians will be able to assess the facts as well as we can, but we must help them.

The "accepted procedures" of the period of stagnation, the somber blossoms of which flourished throughout our society, are vivid in our memory. Most of them were cultivated by Brezhnev, who put an end to Khrushchev's line, however inconsistent it may have been, of democratization. Why is so little being written about the man chiefly responsible for these "accepted procedures," who eventually lost all of his modesty and decency? This failure to provide all of the details is giving rise to confusion and all types of inferences. The discrepancies between his words and actions were particularly striking. "We spoke of the communist's lack of pretensions," poetess S. Kaputikyan remarked, "but we decorated ourselves with a huge shield of beribboned medals and lofty titles. We spoke of high morals, sacrifices for the sake of society, and a struggle against graft and corruption, but we collected automobiles and publicly, in full view of the nation, accepted priceless rings." During the

period of Brezhnevist vanity and demagoguery, socialist democracy was constantly being derided and millions of citizens were becoming alarmed by the mounting leniency and extortion that gave birth to the Medunovs, Adylov, Shchelokovs, Rashidovs, Sushkovs, and Churbanovs. The disorders of the period of stagnation are completely the fault of specific individuals, their excessive self-confidence, their departure from Leninist standards, their personal indiscretions and incompetence, and their hypocrisy and arrogance. Our studies of this period, however, are woefully inadequate.

In a review of A. Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat," literary critic A. Turkov recently said that its publication certainly does not mean that the "case is closed": All of the complexities of that time need further investigation, particularly by historians. We would welcome this. It is our moral duty to convey all of the valuable aspects of our past to future generations. Lenin's party has always appreciated the educative role of national history, seeing it as a guarantee of continuity and a spiritual connection between generations. People who know little about their own history, the history of other nations, and the history of all human development cannot have a real sense or understanding of life in the present. "Our strength lies in our declarations of the truth!"—V.I. Lenin stressed.³²

The increasing significance of historical thinking in our society dictates higher standards in the teaching and study of history. Today everyone knows that there can be no serious historical research without a correct view of the world and without reliable facts—the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The more often we—the creative segments of the intellectual labor force—look into this rich science, the more clearly we will understand what we must do today, in the atmosphere of perestroika.

S.P. Zalygin (Editor-in-Chief of NOVYY MIR)—
History and Literature Came From the Same Cradle

It is possible that there are no two fields of endeavor more alike than history and literature. Strictly speaking, if a work of literature is of serious value today, it is already historical because it has enough impact to eventually become part of history. This does not mean, however, that history can impose its own rules on literature and the artist. We have already gone to such extremes, subordinating works of art wholly to the theory of history and ending up with neither—neither literature nor history. We must acknowledge the literary work's relative freedom from history as well as history's right to verify a work of art from the standpoint of documented facts.

In this context, I would like to discuss a work which is known to all of us and which we just recently printed in NOVYY MIR—the novel "Doctor Zhivago." This is an interesting work but it is not historical; it does not tell us what the civil war was or how it was fought. This novel does not contain much factual information. What is it? It

is a lyricist's discussion of, first of all, prose, in those passages when the lyricist or poet lapses into prose; and, second, of historical facts as he sees them. It seems to me that when we read this work, as Academician D.S. Likhachev said in the preface (perhaps the most astute commentary on the book), it highlights Pasternak's "Tolstoyan qualities," and perhaps this is how we should approach it. We must never use the same criteria to judge the merits of completely different works about the civil war, such as, for example, M. Sholokhov's "Quiet Flows the Don" and Pasternak's "Doctor Zhivago."

We must use completely different methods to examine these works if we wish to find the most important and salient features of each. Pasternak was not striving to disclose any kind of facts or information in his work and he takes the liberty of simply disregarding the facts in some cases. Here is what might be regarded as a minor example but it is completely indicative of his work. You remember that Doctor Zhivago rides 40 kilometers a day on horseback from the farm to the city on bad roads. But a horse cannot travel 40 kilometers each day through slush. This would take 10 or 12 hours. And where does he leave his horse when he gets to the city? What does it eat there? This is of no concern whatsoever to the author because he does not know anything about horses and does not have any interest at all in the details of everyday life in general, and I, as a reader, do not expect details of this kind from him, but I am interested in finding out how the lyricist or poet views reality and views an event of such tremendous magnitude as the civil war.

Wherever the historian sees one fact, the fact of war, the artist sees two: the fact he describes and the fact of his attitude toward this fact. It is the writer's attitude that arouses my curiosity and interest. I am also extremely interested in the language of Pasternak's prose, the language of the Russian intelligentsia of that time, which, incidentally, we could lose entirely, if we have not already lost it. But after all, language is also a method of thinking and a mark of the character (personal and social) of the heroes of the novel, and I feel that this is another of the novel's merits: It gives the reader a sense of this inimitable language and, along with it, a method of thinking which no longer exists but which we simply do not have the right to lose.

Some people say that "Doctor Zhivago" is another portrayal of a character once common in life and in literature—the "corrupted" or, at best, "doubt-ridden" Russian intellectual of the era of revolution and civil war. "Klim Samgin" is usually cited as an example. According to these people, Yuriy Zhivago is just another Klim Samgin. Again, I must disagree. This is a matter of details, of what I would call personal or even intimate details. Samgin is an indisputable intellectual, he is an astute observer and a skeptic, and his skepticism and observations display a complete lack of spirituality. Furthermore, it is contrasted with the traditional spirituality of Russia, the Russian Revolution, and, when it comes right down to it, the entire world.

This is the unyielding logic of history, which Gorkiy grasped so brilliantly: A character like Klim Samgin had to exist at that time; good or bad, he was an inevitable part of the situation, if only because spirituality cannot be developed or displayed without the anti-spirituality it engenders, not from the outside, but within the person, as a result of the very essence of spiritual inquiry. There can be no spiritual optimism without spiritual skepticism, which is precisely what Klim Samgin embodies. But Yuriy Zhivago opposes it, and however naive, clumsy, and unrealistic this opposition might seem, it is still opposition. This is another indication of his true role and significance. The fact is that during the civil war we grew accustomed to dividing people into Whites and Reds; unfortunately, this tendency to see people only in these terms—White or Red, wrong or right, them or us—went on too long and was too radical. Pasternak was horrified by the radical aspects of this tendency, and that explains his approach.

And after all, this radical tendency also horrified Sholokhov: This is easy to believe if we remember what happened to Grigoriy Melekhov. From Grigoriy Melekhov to Levinson and Mechik, to Klim Samgin, to Yuriy Zhivago—this is the lineage produced by the tragedies and historical realities of the civil war. It created an abyss between people, separating and dividing them, while Pasternak tried to find what they had in common. He also showed us that in contrast to the abysses and chasms in nature, which become more difficult to surmount as they grow wider, the chasms between people become more insurmountable as they grow deeper: People, even the members of a single family, can be divided by differences in character and viewpoint which seem to be minor distinctions but can be deep enough to be truly insurmountable.

Here again, the historian and the artist play their own specific roles: The historian determines the width of the separation created by a historical event, but the artist determines the depth of differences. Both, however, then seek methods of building bridges between the divided sides and bringing them together. To conclude this line of reasoning, I must repeat that there are such works about the civil war in Soviet literature as "Quiet Flows the Don." It is an example of the highest level of artistry but could also be called history or even a history textbook; this is the pathos of reality. Whatever other writers might do, Sholokhov never makes a mistake. He knows how many kilometers of slush a horse can traverse in a day. And this does not preclude works like "Doctor Zhivago," but is more likely to encourage such works.

Of course, history and literature are inseparable because they came from the same cradle: After all, in ancient Greece each historian was a writer and each writer was a historian, even the writers of myths. Writing is culture, and culture begins with the written language—or, in other words, with recorded history.

Why are we so close to historians? There are several other fields close to us, such as philosophy or psychology, but why are we nevertheless closest of all to history? I think it is because literature always deals with the human being and history deals with humankind, and we are constantly trying to take a closer look at both. Millions and billions of people are just as real as a single individual, but we who create literary images in our works have not learned how to write about humankind as a whole yet and we do not understand what it is. History must help us in this endeavor. We, by the same token, must help history see the individual behind the event and become a science dealing more closely with the individual. I know I am only fantasizing, but what if we suddenly returned to the method of the ancient Greeks, who were able to unite both in a single entity—or, more precisely, were unable to divide the whole into parts?

D.A. Volkogonov (Director of Military History Institute of the USSR Ministry of Defense)—*Stalinism Is a Perversion of the Theory and Practice of Socialism*

A past event, whether it is the French Revolution, Great October, or the Great Patriotic War, remains unchanged after it becomes part of the past. Our views of these events cannot be changed as the facts come to light. Facts are of supreme and immutable value in history and literature, but because these facts, especially those in the recent past, influence the interests of many people directly, they are sometimes treated badly. In ancient Rome there was the law of "condemnation of memory," for example, in accordance with which the actions of bad emperors were consigned to oblivion. But the pygmies' efforts were futile. Memory lives (or dies) in accordance with its own laws. When the law of the "condemnation of memory" suddenly came into effect in our country, whole periods of our history were beyond the pale to millions of people. This is the reason for the colossal interest in many little-known episodes in our history.

Stalin's personality is the focus of public concern, but only in our imaginations. Stalin only symbolizes everything that was underestimated by history and the times. The central elements of historical interest are our fate, our pain, our pitiful bewilderment: How did the pattern of reality we know as Stalinism come into being? It is true that some people feel that this definition is far-fetched, but they are wrong. Stalinism was a perversion of the theory and practice of socialism which alienated the people from the government and fostered bureaucracy and dogmatism.

I think it is important that literature and history not concentrate solely on the character and personality traits of the "leader" when they are trying to elucidate the nature and genesis of Stalinism. The causes lie deeper and there is an entire group of them. There was only one political cause: the underdevelopment and deformation of genuine democracy and the destruction of the democratic foundations Lenin laid. The historical causes can be found in the "Russian tradition" of monarchy, the

inadequate political awareness of the people immediately after the revolution, and the absence of rich democratic traditions. There were also international causes: the constant threat of invasion, which helped to centralize power and strengthen the bureaucracy. There were even gnosiological causes: the unfamiliarity of the road ahead. Departing from Lenin's theories, people groped their way along this road, frequently with the aid of brutal "experiments." Among other causes, which would take too much time to list, there were those connected with the person. Shakespeare's Hamlet says something about a man "burdened by his defects." Stalin had a multitude of moral "defects" which were portrayed as the opposite, as a veritable Mont Blanc of virtues, in the atmosphere of the cult of personality. The "leader" loved power, and nothing else, and believed only in violence, as the "universal method" of attaining his goals. Without it, without the violence, Stalin would not have been Stalin.

Stalinism also had a military impact. The Military History Institute is now working on a 10-volume "History of the Soviet People's Great Patriotic War." When we were compiling the first volume ("On the Eve"), we found that while the party and all of the Soviet people were making such massive efforts at that time, Stalin made several major errors which influenced the start and subsequent course of the war. He had too much confidence in Soviet-German agreements, he could not evaluate the real politico-military situation of that time accurately, and he ignored many indications of concrete preparations and schedules of Hitler's invasion. Stalin reviewed the plan of national defense three times on the eve of the war, until his assumption that the fascists would concentrate their attack on the southern part of the border was acknowledged as the most probable scenario. The insistence on an offensive doctrine unwittingly reduced the concern and preparedness for long-range strategic defense. Just before the war, Stalin replaced three chiefs of general staff, one after the other. Besides this, there is no question that there was an acute shortage of experienced military personnel. The bloody purge which had eliminated more than 40,000 top- and middle-level political personnel and commanders in 1937 and 1938 had tragic ramifications. It took 6 months to train a platoon commander. But what about a division, corps, army, or district commander? This took years.

In our work on the 10-volume history, we intend to make more extensive and complete use of archives, including those pertaining to military honors, study casualty statistics more closely, and unearth many unfamiliar and undeservedly forgotten names.

History is not simply a succession of periods and eras. It is also an endless gallery of portraits of people who have walked on the earth. I think it would be good to compile a popular library of "Episodes in Military History" for the general reader in addition to the basic 10-volume work on the Great Patriotic War. It could include

scientific-literary portrayals of Russian and Soviet military commanders and national heroes and descriptions of the major battles which made our weapons and the humanism of the Soviet soldier famous. I think this kind of library would be a good field of cooperation by historians and writers—not in the sense of collective compilation, but of mutual enrichment. Incidentally, the preoccupation with collective effort makes works boring and deprives historians of their own voice. The more active promotion of new editions of the most interesting memoirs—invaluable sources of information and eye-witness accounts of the past—warrants consideration.

When you work in the archives, reading documents, you sometimes imagine that you can hear voices from the past. Some are hardly discernible and others are louder, sometimes furious and inclined to yell. The historian and the writer must face the past honestly and boldly. Neither the present nor the future is eternal; both will pass. Only the past is eternal. What will we contribute to it?

G.A. Belaya (Literary Historian)—*Two Artistic Models*

I was pleased with S.P. Zalygin's speech, in which he objected to the present tendency to establish such a rigid connection between history and the history of literature. I think that all of our present attempts to justify the fact that the history of 20th-century Russian literature has not been written yet are signs of our weakness and an inclination to blame historians for something we should have done ourselves. In essence, a literary history has already been written. "The Foundation Pit" was written by A. Platonov, the novel "We" was written by Ye. Zamyatin, "Doctor Zhivago" was written by B. Pasternak, "The Rout" was written by A. Fadeyev, and "Quiet Flows the Don" was written by M. Sholokhov. This history of literature does not include statistics or cite figures, but I think it is here that we find a portrayal of the dramatic journey of our society and the dramatic journey of our people. And historians will find much here when they start writing an authentic history of our country.

We literary historians have a different question to answer. This question pertains to fundamental problems. After the October Revolution Lenin said that we did not know what socialism would look like in its final form. The question historians face, we historians who use the term "socialist society," is the question of the exact meaning and content of the term "socialism." We want a specific, historically precise definition of the social structure, of the term employed today by those who defend "Doctor Zhivago" and those who curse the novel and believe it slanders the revolution. I realize this is a job for philosophers and sociologists, but, above all, it is a job for historians. Without their research, we cannot make any progress in compiling a history of Soviet literature and a history of Soviet criticism.

But I think that the literary historian also has his own difficulties, tragic and insurmountable difficulties. These are not only inaccessible archives, books which have not been published yet, falsified documents, or false judgments made to meet the demands of the moment and not even foreseen by us yet. There are more serious difficulties interfering with our work. Above all, there is the loss of objective scientific criteria. We analyze "new" and "old" literature without defining our terms. We speak of genuine works of art without revealing the meaning of the term. We still cannot agree on what the history of literature should deal with—with whatever was praised to the skies, entered textbooks, and became part of our "artillery" but was sometimes of dubious artistic value, or with whatever was revealed by the passage of time to contain the profundity of artistic generalization and artistic insight but once aroused misunderstandings, hostility, and arguments. We frequently substitute a history of literary events and literary affairs for the history of literature, but they are not the same.

The history of the literature of the 1920's is often depicted as the golden age of our art, mainly on the grounds that there were so many literary groups at that time. It is true that there were many such groups and they had their own programs and declarations, but I will take the liberty of saying that these declarations and programs could essentially be viewed only as aesthetic hypotheses regarding different patterns of artistic development in a society born of revolution. If we take a closer look, we can clearly see that two patterns, two global ideas about the art of the future—as an appendage of ideology or as a specific method of comprehending reality—already existed and were vying for supremacy in our society in the 1920's. These artistic models correspond to two competing models of socialism: "egalitarian socialism" (or "barracks socialism") and authentic socialism, which many people in the 1920's imagined as an order aimed at the harmonious development of the society and the individual.

Looking back over our bitter past experience, I wonder whether the artistic models had an equal chance when social realities were deformed? I think they did not. This was discovered almost immediately. For example, N. Osinskiy, an old party worker, commented in PRAVDA in 1922: "Akhmatova is a first-class lyrical poet," Akhmatova is able to make "concise, vivid, and resounding statements regarding the salient or distinctive features of the spiritual movements of various groups of our contemporaries." For this reason, he remarked, "we value Akhmatova's civic consciousness." Osinskiy saw that Akhmatova's philosophical and political views were not close to those of the builders of the new society, but he felt that if she was able to hear the "sound of the times," it was only because she had "an honest soul and civic consciousness." She "did not abandon Russia and did not want to abandon Russia...because of her national feelings, and not as a result of revolutionary fervor."

This approach to art was based on the conviction that art reflects life in its own specific way; that the artist can

portray life objectively by preserving the accuracy of facts; that the artistic image must be conceived and produced at the cost of great suffering within the artist's free spirit, and that although life makes currents flow, it is important that they are recreated in the crucible of the artist's inner world. Later supporters of this methodology based their arguments on V.I. Lenin's article about Lev Tolstoy, where Lenin wrote that "the era of preparation for revolution in one of the countries being crushed by slaveholders is presented in Tolstoy's brilliant portrayal as an advance in the artistic development of all humankind."³³ The significance of the material taken from real life was as important to Lenin as Tolstoy's "brilliant portrayal."

But the winner was another idea about art, another artistic model. The victors were those who believed that Akhmatova was, as G. Lelevich wrote in 1923, one of the "inner-Russian mystics and individualists"; that their work "can never be justified in Soviet Russia, from the standpoint of the proletarian revolution." In the opinion of these critics, art would play a secondary role in the new society. Back in the 1920's they were already writing that art in the new society "is not and cannot be the main source of an understanding of life in general. This is why it will have a tremendous role to play in supplementing scientific-historical generalizations." In this way, the objective nature of art was questioned.

I want to stress that this approach to art is not confined, as many believe, to RAPP criticism. When the theorists of "leftist" art wrote that the writer's role in the society was meaningless because it had been taken over by "big collectives" and when they said that "Eugene Onegin" would have been written even if Pushkin had never been born, they were also interpreting art as something auxiliary or subordinate. The idea of "social requests" was interpreted as "social orders." This approach to art led to an emphasis on easily comprehensible themes and topical material. The prevailing view of current reality, as V. Astafyev later said, was a "calendar" or superficial understanding of the present day. With this approach to reality, literature written to meet the demands of the moment thrived. But it could not satisfy the public, and the same critics who heralded the program began talking about the collapse of literature in 1927 and the crisis of literature in 1929.

I remember an argument between M. Gorkiy and F. Gladkov, "an argument between two deaf men," because Gorkiy praised Gladkov but said that his regional dialect, clumsy dialogue, and careless style needed more work. Gladkov was insulted because he felt that a relevant revolutionary topic was all that was necessary! The topic gave writers immunity. This was true for a long time in our country. Our judgments became extra-historical. The works of A. Fadeyev are a good example. When you read his books in the context of the literature of the 1920's, it is clear that Fadeyev did much for literature. The image of the Bolshevik he created was much closer to reality than Pilnyak's "leather jackets,"

who began roaming through our literature. But Fadeyev became a symbolic figure. He was even made out to be a great stylist, although he was obviously a disciple of Tolstoy, and in the 1920's neither he nor the critics concealed this connection.

Art reduced to ideology, art equated with ideology—this was the keynote of our society's development. It was true then and it is true now. Objective criteria for the evaluation of art and calculations of the profundity of artistic discoveries in the classics seemed to be unnecessary. Why did D.M. Urnov analyze the novel "Doctor Zhivago" (in the article in PRAVDA on 27 April) outside the artistic context of Pasternak's work, outside the historical context of the reality reflected in the novel, and, finally, outside the context of Pasternak's poetry? There are no critical arguments or scientific arguments in the article. It is simply an ideological harangue, and, what is more, the ideological purpose of the novel is deduced from the hero's thoughts instead of the author's views. The critic hoped to do only one thing—to discredit the novel.

The best of Soviet literature came into being in spite of circumstances and not because of them. This should determine our attitude toward new levels of our artistic heritage. The authors we are resurrecting today are the pride of our literature. It is becoming increasingly clear that the history of Russia is a history of the moral and spiritual stoicism of its artists. People need to know this history because it will strengthen their spirit and their faith in human potential.

Yu.S. Kukushkin (Academician)—*We Must Eliminate Everything Impeding the Study and Teaching of History*

Without any exaggeration we can say that Soviet historical science has never played such an active role in social life as it is playing today, during the period of perestroika. It has never been of such great social significance. By the same token, our historians today have a much greater responsibility than ever before.

After 1985 historians began taking part in perestroika with the rest of the population. We cannot claim any great success, but we already have some accomplishments to our credit. Historians also had time to make some serious errors in this short time, however, and this worries us. Some were frightened by the tasks set for historical science and began shying away from them, not realizing that there was no way to go back, that the road they wanted to take would lead to ruin. Others (quite a few) understood the advice to plug up the "gaps" in history as an appeal to cover them with black paint. These "promoters of the development of historical science" are doing something just as harmful as those who once varnished our history.

It is wrong to portray the last 70 years in the history of our people as an unbroken chain of mistakes and crimes. Statements of this kind, however, are scattered throughout our historical and literary journals and can be found almost every day in our press. It is bad enough when their authors try to cite facts to support their statements, but we have many examples of false declarations with no supporting arguments. As an example, I will cite a remark by Yu. Nagibin in *KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE*: "A history of our Soviet society which we can take to heart has not been written yet. And what they try to pass off as history is a combination of lies and concealment, huge 'gaps'" (*KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE*, 1987, No 8). Adhering to this logic, we could also deny whole periods in the history of our literature (some have already done this), but this would be intolerable. What we need is not indiscriminate denial, but scrupulous historiographic work and literary scholarship to analyze what our historians and writers have done.

How did the history books which do not satisfy us today come into being? First of all, this was a result of the shortage of reference sources. One of the speakers who preceded me was asked who had kept him from working in the archives. Many people. I will tell you about an experience I had. It occurred soon after the 20th party congress. When I was working in one of the central archives on the topic "Lenin—Chairman of the Defense Council," I tried to get the materials I wanted but did not have any luck. One day an employee brought me a stack of file folders and put them on my desk. As I looked through them, I came upon a folder containing my own personal papers, including the request for permission to work in the archives. The instructions written on my application—I still remember them—said: "Comrade Kukushkin is to be issued a limited number of secondary materials." This was the procedure for many years. The result was the loss of many irretrievable opportunities. Working in the archives is painstaking and tedious work, and we will never attain our goals if we continue doing it the old way.

Here is another example of our attitude toward documents. After the 20th party congress and just before the 40th anniversary of the October Revolution, a huge multitude of collections of documents on the revolution and the civil war were published. We recently celebrated the 70th anniversary of Great October, and I will be very grateful to any of my colleagues who can help me name at least a few collections of documents published at that time. These omissions should be corrected in the most vigorous manner. Leading historical journals should publish selected documents on a regular basis.

The next factor impeding our work is the serious lag in the development of Marxist-Leninist theory. Here we have no one else to blame, because we historians are the chief culprits.

Many of our publishing houses work too slowly, and this also has ruinous effects. One of my colleagues was very anxious that I discuss school textbooks in my speech.

What can I tell you about textbook publishers? Their production cycle takes at least 2 years. What is the result? A 9th-grade textbook which does not even satisfy its authors today and is being subjected to justified and unjustified criticism in the press was turned over to the publisher in 1984. It was then reviewed and approved by the councils of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and the USSR Academy of Sciences, by procedural associations of teachers, etc. But the textbook which was written during the period of stagnation was not published until 1986, at the height of perestroika, and translations into the languages of the nationalities of the USSR are still being published this year. This is an outrage, of course, but it is impossible to make any corrections or clarifications in the text. The presses keep rolling, textbooks are printed in millions of copies, and authors cannot make any changes at all in their contents.

It would be wrong, however, to merely admit that textbooks are unsatisfactory. We must take an active part in their radical improvement and in the writing of new textbooks. This is already being done: A sample copy of a textbook for the 10th grade has been distributed. The team of authors did everything within their power, but (and we admit this) this textbook also has many flaws. One of the reasons is that some of the materials we wanted to include in the book were removed for various reasons at different stages of the production process. When we tried to reinstate these materials, we were accused of undermining the publishing schedule and undermining perestroika in the schools. Which materials were left out? The final draft of the textbook for the 10th grade, for example, included data on losses in the Soviet Armed Forces on the eve of the Great Patriotic War. These data were excluded from the book, leaving only the remark that some marshals of the Soviet Union were undeservedly repressed. All of our attempts to put this information back into the book were futile.

Textbooks cannot be improved unless authors can compete, unless they can write different textbooks and let teachers choose the textbooks they want to use. The present production cycle of 2 years should be reduced by at least a year, and in our rapidly changing times, textbooks should be republished not once every 4 years, but much more often.

Writers could also be of considerable help in teaching history in the schools. Literary periodicals are printing wonderful articles. I read Ye. Nosov's article in *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* (1988, No 16) with great interest. I think that he and many other writers could take part in the compilation of books for young readers. This would be of great help to the schools. There are many types of publications on which historians and writers could collaborate successfully. We should also encourage the continuation of the multi-volume "History of the Fatherland in Novels, Stories, and Documents," which has been published since the beginning of the 1980's by the Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing

House. Each book in the series contains famous works of literature along with annotated memoirs, documents, and eye-witness accounts by contemporaries. Close cooperation by historians and writers could have a quick and massive positive impact.

A.I. Kazintsev (Literary Critic)—*Memory Can Be Mournful and Merciful*

The word "history" has been used frequently here. I would like to use another word—"memory." It is more human and more personal. The writers (with the exception of Viktor Astafyev and Dmitriy Balashov) spoke about history in abstract, somehow non-authorial terms. Recalling bitter episodes from the recent past, someone made the characteristic comment: "The era left its mark." As if the era were something with free will and reason. No, it was not the era that left its mark on people. They made the choice, they made the decision to serve either good or evil.

The aberration which lasted for long decades led to a situation in which the individual seems to no longer be regarded as an active and independent entity and is frequently simply ignored. It is sad when this happens in real life, but is it any better when it happens in literature? Try to remember the last time a critic discussing a contemporary work called the hero by name or used any common human name, as critics once used the names Natasha and Andrey or Grigoriy and Aksinya. Let us disregard the pretentious pseudonym "Stalin," which implies superhuman powers. But who, you might ask, should our critics refer to by name when most of the works of recent years have ignored the individual and have portrayed trends without involving their heroes in them. Stalin and, to some extent, Sasha Pankratov in A. Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat" or Timofeyev-Resovskiy in D. Granin's "The Diehard" might have a claim to vitality and artistic sovereignty, but the rest of the characters in these popular works are faceless cogs and are treated by their authors in the same way that the dictator they despise treated his subjects.

The precepts of that era are planted firmly in our souls. I was convinced of this by M. Shatrov's speech yesterday. I must say right away that the article by N. Andreyeva Shatrov was discussing is infuriating because of its dogmatism, theoretical impotence, and absolute lack of originality. I understand the press' vehement reaction to it. It is even more understandable in view of the broad prospects perestroika is opening up for the younger generation. I know this from my own experience. I am probably the youngest assistant chief editor of a literary journal. Just a few years ago neither I nor the other people of my age could have even dreamed of anything like this if it had not been for perestroika. Incidentally, young people are being motivated to support perestroika less by career opportunities than by spiritual prospects and the hope of renewal and national rebirth.

I understand why Shatrov wrote a response to SOVETS-KAYA ROSSIYA and I am angry that someone delayed its publication, but I cannot understand why the dramatist is demanding, even after the publication of the PRAVDA editorial, that his colleagues, first in one and then in all creative unions, support his opinion unconditionally. Now he is scolding social scientists for not being in enough of a hurry to express collective condemnation and collective support. But why does he think that all of us have to express our thoughts in his words? Or, in general, that all of us should use the same words? We have gathered here to discuss our recent history. Is it possible that history and hundreds and thousands of collective letters have taught us nothing? Shatrov will say that the content of his letter is different. I agree. But does he really have to be reminded of the importance of form! We must not pour the wine of perestroika, the young and intoxicating sense of freedom, into old wineskins.

I also want to say something about the aesthetic criterion. Without it, any discussion of literature would be unproductive. Shatrov's historical dramas have recently started so many arguments. Historians have found inaccuracies in them. What can we say? Of course they are more obvious to specialists. But I, as one of the millions of readers, think something else is important: "The Treaty of Brest" and "Farther...Farther...Farther!" are not historical dramas portraying the kind of emotions and passions of the Shakespearean scale that the revolution deserves. They are verbatim reports of events. And it is even worse if something in these reports is inaccurate. But this is not part of the literary critic's sphere of interests.

Rybakov's latest novel could also start arguments. Historians also have complaints about this work. In an article in LENINGRADSKIY RABOCHIY (26 February 1988), A. Kirilina, senior research associate in the party history institute of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom, says that "with the exception of the date of birth, last name, first name, and patronymic, the rest of the biography of Kirov's assassin was invented by writer A. Rybakov in his novel 'Children of the Arbat.'" I have no intention of getting involved in this argument between historians. I am interested in something else—the artistic side of the matter, as it is commonly called today, although it is obviously ludicrous to speak of the "artistic side" of a work of art. Even the most fervent fans of "Children of the Arbat" prefer not to discuss the artistry of the novel. But why should we not wonder whether the devices of the adventure novel, tried and tested in such works as "The Dagger" and "The Bronze Bird," are inappropriate in a disclosure of what might be the most bloody drama in human history? If they are inappropriate, then the novel should be discussed in a different context. After all, when we argue about journalistic works, such as the article "Cobras Guarding the Gold," we are speaking of facts and not of artistic structure.

The extensive public interest in history, including the recent history of our society, has also been crowned, however, with indisputable achievements in art. These

are M. Dudintsev's "White Clothes," the continuation of V. Belov's "Eves," and part two of B. Mozhayev's "Peasant Men and Women." Last but not least, there is the novel by Nikolay Skromnyy, the young writer from Murmansk, "The Turning Point," published in SEVER at the end of 1986. Skromnyy's novel warrants special discussion because it has escaped the attention of critics thus far and because certain features distinguish it from the works of more celebrated writers. Skromnyy was not a witness of the events he describes—collectivization and the dramas it produced. Furthermore, there was essentially no way he could have read about these dramas in books. His novel is probably the most impressive indication of the power of memory to bring events to life. It turns out that nothing was forgotten. Not one achievement. Not one incident of injustice. Not one painful moan and not one peasant's tear. It is this sympathy for the personal truth of the common man that is most appealing in the young writer's novel. After all, this kind of concern, which was the tradition in Russian classical literature, was seriously deadened as time went on. Furthermore, the very ideas of "personal truth" and "private grief" seemed to take on the negative connotations of the words "personal" and "private," especially if this was the truth of the "unenlightened" and "ignorant" peasant who was still not completely free of the "idiocy of rural life."

I recently read a shocking personal document: a diary of the last days of a prominent journalist from Leningrad who was exiled to a remote Siberian village in the 1930's. At first he is irritated by everything—the idiocy and stupidity for which people should be sued, if not executed (the first pages of the diary are full of remarks of this kind). He himself has been beaten by life, has been brought to his knees, and is almost on the same level as the "unenlightened" peasant he so desperately wants to teach and judge. It is not until the very end of his journey of humiliation and grief that he learns to look at the people around him in a different way. Then the words "compassion" and "mercy" begin to appear on the pages of the diary. A few months before his death, the man was reborn as a citizen and as a writer.

It has been more than half a century since he gained this insight, but when we read, for example, the Siberian episodes in "Children of the Arbat," we naturally wonder if everyone has been able to surmount this supercilious and arrogant attitude toward common laborers. This makes works by writers like Nikolay Skromnyy, who look at history through the eyes of the people, all the more valuable. They judge events according to how they affected the people. When we read these books, we can hear the beat of the huge heart of the people, full of memories—mournful and merciful.

Yu.N. Afanasyev (Rector, Moscow State Institute of Historical Archives)—*Freeing Historical Science from the Deadening Fetters of Stalinism*

It seems to me that all three of the reports were fairly calm and that if we try to compare their contents to the turbulent emotions of our time, we have to admit that

they sound like lullabies. And the fact that they contained surprising news about things we have already ceased to believe in does not change their traditionalist essence. It turns out that everything is already going well in the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Of course, it is too bad that the speaker cited only one fact to support his argument: the fact that good plans for the future have been drawn up there again. How many times does this make?

It seems to me that at conferences like today's we are still not getting through not only to the core of the problem (this will obviously take a great deal of time and a great deal of concerted effort) but even to a convincing expression of our intention to finally answer the question of what our historical knowledge represents today. And perhaps the even broader question of what the contemporary collective historical consciousness of our society represents and how it differs in different generations.

Many ordinary people are asking this question. The question also disturbs the leaders of our party. This is probably a good thing. And, thank God, we are already able to see this. The question was asked in the central committee report to social scientists and in the general secretary's speech at the February central committee plenum. V. Astafyev asked the question again yesterday, and his statement literally sent chills up my spine: A man who was in the war could not recognize it in the academic works on its history. And what do the people who are 25 today know about it? What would these people and the rest of us know if it had not been for Simonov, Bondarev, Bykov, and Adamovich?

Well, what does official historical science look like today? Here are a few examples. I would suggest that all of the people here today reread the letter published in PRAVDA on 24 April and signed by almost all of the members of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, headed by S.L. Tikhvinskiy. Many people, and I was one of them, probably wondered what the letter was about and why it was written. Why did it sound so impotent and long-suffering? There was a note of hysteria in it, as if it said: You must understand, we have to respond, even if we have nothing to say. Incidentally, the writers' response did not sound much better to me.

There are also other, equally eloquent—and somewhat protective—indications of official historical science's desire to avoid discussions of our present knowledge of history. I am referring, in particular, to the article in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA by two academicians, B.A. Rybakov and Yu.S. Kukushkin, where they respond to the anxiety and completely justified civic concern of Chairman G.A. Yagodin of the State Committee for Public Education by asserting, and thereby misleading the reader, that nothing is wrong with our school textbooks. The article deals in part with two textbooks—on the ancient world and on the Middle Ages. The textbook on the Middle Ages was published in the 1960's. It says

absolutely nothing about the achievements of national, not to mention world studies of medieval history that gave us a picture of the Middle Ages we could not even have imagined 30 years ago—"another medieval era," completely different from the denigrating renaissance accounts of the 15th and 16th centuries and the romantic varnished accounts of the 19th century.

We can only assume that the reverend academicians must have known this. But then why were they defending such obsolete textbooks with an oversimplified view of history, books described by one teacher as false and therefore genuinely dangerous? I can only assume that when they defended these textbooks, they were worried that attention might be focused on other books next, and, after all, the next textbooks in line are theirs, such as the 9th-grade textbook on the history of the USSR, where you would have difficulty finding even one credible page.

But I think it would be wrong to assume that the reluctance to look the truth in the eyes is only due to the personal considerations of one historian or another. It seems to me that if we work together to find an answer to the question of what our historical knowledge represents today, we would reach the inevitable conclusion (I am saying this after spending many years studying the history of historical science) that there are probably no other people and no other country in the world with a history as falsified as ours. This applies above all to Soviet history, but not only to Soviet history. When historians falsified Soviet history, they had to do the same to our pre-October past.

To be fair, however, we must say that it would be wrong to blame these historians and to perpetuate the myth that our historians are stupid people. They are not the problem, or at least not the whole problem. The regime Stalin established in our country had no need for history as a science. It needed history as the maidservant of propaganda and as the vindicator of the crimes the regime committed. This was a regime and this was a time when words and objects broke into a monstrous, phantasmagoric dance, as if they had gone insane. We started referring to all things with names other than their own. We called totalitarianism democracy, we said that anything that was just being started had already been completed, and we said that those who were swarming in the foundation pit were storming the heavens.

This regime created its own history, a false history in its own image. It is time to finally admit that we are facing a task of the greatest importance and responsibility—we must surmount the deadening effects of Stalinism in our historical science and in our social sciences in general. This is the only way to describe our main common goal at this meeting of historians and writers. It will not be easy to attain. The problem does not lie only in the peculiarities of historians and some of their personal or professional traits. After all, the injuries this regime inflicted on literature, destroying it and annihilating it,

were also inflicted on history. We must display fortitude and, after reviewing our own pain, sympathize with the pain of others. When we speak of the sacrifices of Soviet literature, we must also remember the pogroms to which historians were subjected, beginning with Tarle and Platonov and ending with the dismal period of Trapeznikovism.

But it seems to me that this is not the whole problem either. The unsatisfactory state and the low standards of our historical science are also due to decades of survival of the dullest. Finally, I have to say something about the natural habitat of historians. After all, people like Losev, Averintsev, or Lotman were something like "freaks of nature," like the ichthyosaurus lingering on in our world after the conditions of our habitat precluded its existence. These were rare gems, talents which miraculously remained and thrived in our reality in the almost complete absence of a nurturing medium for historical knowledge.

Stalinism in historical science is not a simple matter of ignorance and authoritarianism to the point of petty tyranny. These could disappear, for example, with the resignation of S.P. Trapeznikov. The main thing about Stalinism that still has to be surmounted is its monopoly—its monopoly on the truth, on new ideas, and on the initial interpretation of a source of historical information. This is a serious illness, and recovery from it will necessitate the realization that science, including historical science, is made in laboratories and in sectors, and not at congresses or in party committees.

Now when we talk about what we have to do to develop the historical consciousness of our society and eliminate the colossal deformities here, we should envision the maximum range of tasks to be performed. Then we will not focus only on textbooks, only on unresolved theoretical problems, or only on "gaps," but, for example, also on education in our schools and VUZes.

I recently addressed another gathering where I was just as pressed for time as I am today, and for the sake of brevity, I entitled my speech "The Priests of the Marxist Approach" and said that I was dedicating it to those who teach the social sciences in VUZes. Of course, the outrageous state of affairs in instruction in the social sciences in our country warrants special discussion. After all, what we teach students under the name of "Marxism-Leninism" frequently has essentially no relationship to Marx or to science. Today we are simply wasting a huge amount of time, almost 30 percent of all teaching time, on dogmatism and scholasticism and, with this kind of education, we are still shaping a certain type of thinking and molding socially passive and creatively unproductive people.

I think that our meeting today should at least promote the precise formulation of the need to free our historical science and the social sciences from the deadening fetters of Stalinism.

I.I. Mints (Academician)—*We Must Work Together on Projects*

This is not the first joint conference of writers and historians. An earlier gathering of this kind of special importance to us was convened at the suggestion of M. Gorkiy in the 1930's. After winning CPSU Central Committee approval for the publication of a history of the civil war, Aleksey Maksimovich established a main editorial board and also a special artistic editorial office, to publish joint works by writers and historians. This led to the publication of several works which are now regarded as bibliographic rarities. One was "War in the Sands," the history of the revolution and civil war in Central Asia, and another was a book about the struggle for Soviet rule in the Soviet Far East. I repeat, these were joint works by writers and historians.

New joint works by historians and writers must be considered, because important and interesting topics are not only knocking at the door but are also forcing their way in through the windows. One topic of general human interest is "Socialism and Total Disarmament," a process supported by the entire world and a process in which we are taking an active part. From the time of its birth, Marxism has been issuing appeals for total disarmament and for peace. The Soviet regime made this appeal the main principle of its foreign policy. Of course, during the first years of the worker and peasant republic's existence, when all of the forces of world imperialism were attacking it, its main goal was survival, the retention of its position, and victory. Even in the most difficult days of single combat with world imperialism, the Soviet regime proposed the negotiation of a peace treaty at least 10 times.

As soon as the heroic period of the salvation of the republic ended in victory, the Nation of Soviets advanced the idea of international peace as a general human principle. At the beginning of 1922, at the first international conference in Genoa, G.V. Chicherin, a member of the Soviet delegation acting on V.I. Lenin's instructions, submitted a proposal on total disarmament. The capitalist press stirred up an unbelievable commotion. The Bolsheviks were accused of spreading utopian ideas, ignoring reality, and disregarding a common law of human civilization, which, according to bourgeois authors, was, is, and will always be war.

The Soviet nation, however, insistently and systematically put forth more and more arguments in favor of peace at conferences, in the press, and in science, despite all of the objections of its opponents. The struggle for peace, which was started by the Nation of Soviets and was supported by all progressive people on the planet, has now become a huge international movement. A book (and only a book, not a multi-volume work requiring many years of effort) in which the history of the many international peace congresses would be portrayed along

with the history of foreign policy, could be a serious and necessary contribution to the resolution of the general human problem of saving mankind from nuclear annihilation.

We know of the CPSU Central Committee decision on the compilation of a new book on party history. In connection with this, some historians have suspended all of the research they began prior to its appearance. It seems to me that we cannot simply wait and see what happens. Why do we not try to do something on our own? For instance, we could give some thought to the division of CPSU history into specific periods. The present system is important and accurate in many respects (after all, it was established as a counterbalance to Stalin's "Brief Course"), but it is also obsolete in other respects. The new approach was outlined in M.S. Gorbachev's report on the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution. Marx taught us that the researcher of history should first disclose the objective content of the period in question and the actions of the leading, most progressive class of the era or period in question. But what is the objective content of our era? A transition from capitalism to socialism. This should be an important part of the system for the division of party history into specific periods.

We can join the debates on the different periods, but we could also try to write our own works. This should also benefit the people who are writing a textbook on CPSU history. We should recall that before the publication of the "Brief Course" in the history of the All-Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik), there were books on party history edited by A.S. Bubnov, V.G. Knorin, and Ye.M. Yaroslavskiy and works on the history of the revolutionary movement by N.N. Baturin, M.N. Lyadov, and others. These books and teaching aids were distinguished by a sound reference base, and their authors certainly did compete with one another, but they all agreed on the need to describe the party's experiences and disclose the greatness of the leadership of Lenin and his comrades-in-arms. The current arguments over new books could be to the advantage of the new textbook.

There is something else I want to say. Historians unanimously supported the PRAVDA editorial of 5 April and published their own statement. PRAVDA called for the broadest and most comprehensive development of criticism and self-criticism in all spheres of the Soviet society. It goes without saying that over-reaction, vague and incorrect remarks, and mistaken assumptions are possible, and we have seen and heard some of these. Mistakes must be corrected, and we will do this and convince people of the need to give up incorrect ideas, but if we leave some corners unventilated, the perestroika process will be disrupted. Dust and mildew collect in unventilated corners, and we will have to clean them, but it will take more effort than it does now. We must not waver in the continuation of perestroika. Scientists must make a more vigorous effort. Balzac said that the scholar does all of his work between two verbs—

wanting and doing. There is no limit on how many things he might want to do, but there is a limit on what he can do. This contradiction can be resolved by a third verb—knowing. Science demands constant inquiry, the verification of findings, and further development. The scholar must follow this pattern.

R.G. Yanovskiy (Corresponding Member of USSR Academy of Sciences and Rector of CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences)—*The Mass Consciousness Reflects the Needs of the Day*

It has been 3 years since April 1985. During these years we have continuously and vigorously changed the circumstances of our lives and ourselves under the conditions of socialism. Any perestroika of social relations and the economic mechanism must begin with a perestroika of the consciousness, the way of thinking, and with the rejection of tenacious and obsolete behavioral stereotypes. This is a job for the school, the entire system of education and indoctrination, and the society as a whole. It is significant that the revolutionary perestroika was initiated by the Communist Party and that all of the people are participating in it: workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia. The people were and are the main protagonist of perestroika.

The two most important fields of learning for all people on earth are their native language and literature and their history. Their attitude toward history is their historical consciousness. Under present conditions, the interrelations of practical or everyday thinking and theoretical thinking and their dialectical unity are of special importance. The accelerated development of the everyday or practical consciousness today is one method of expressing the new way of thinking, thinking based on common sense, not pretending to know the whole truth or dictating the absolute truth to others, but creative thinking which facilitates life and struggle under the conditions of an integral and contradictory world.

During our revolutionary perestroika, practical thinking has been inclined to stay ahead of theoretical thinking. This is one of the spiritual paradoxes of the revolutionary renewal of society. We have witnessed the delays in the development of theoretical thinking, primarily due to subjective factors, and we have learned that it is awkward and sluggish and does not always reflect the radical changes taking place in the society. The practical consciousness of the masses, however, has reflected the need for change—spontaneously, to a considerable extent—and has expressed the public mood, public expectations, and public determination to carry out profound and qualitative economic, social, cultural, and spiritual reforms.

As a result of this, processes and developments which were not recognized in time or in their entirety on the level of ideological theory have been taking shape spontaneously, in line with the new public mentality and morality. Sociological studies conducted by the CPSU

Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences indicate that 80 percent of the members of labor collectives believe they could work more efficiently and actively support the idea of perestroika. Consequently, the enthusiasm of laborers and the new value judgments must be generalized at the level of the new theoretical thinking and be utilized in their entirety. It is important to support the vital creativity of the masses and wage an uncompromising struggle against conservatism and dogmatism.

Experience tells us that ideas with no effect on the material and spiritual needs and interests of the individual will have little effect on his social behavior. In these cases, the human psyche slips out, as it were, of the sphere of ideological, theoretical, and pedagogical influence and is directly influenced by living conditions. In this connection, it is important to constantly seek new concrete and effective ways of realizing the socialist ambitions and ideals of the people.

Without this, the effective education of politically mature and spiritually and morally developed individuals would be impossible. Attaching special significance to the embodiment of the ideals of human activity and their relationship to the public interest, Lenin stressed that without this, they would "remain harmless wishes with no chance of mass acceptance and, consequently, realization."³⁴

The perestroika in all spheres of life in the Soviet society is setting increasingly responsible and difficult tasks for history and literature. Priority has been assigned to historical truth, responsibility, honesty, and the objective analysis of past experience in work and struggle. M.S. Gorbachev said that "history is good when it teaches lessons."³⁵ This is why our assessment of the past and our attitude toward it are matters of crucial political, moral, and practical importance. Oversimplified analyses of various periods in history and assessments of historical figures are impermissible here, as are biased, merely descriptive, or fragmentary discussions of events and facts.

The social consciousness of the Soviet people is closely related to the intelligentsia's level of civic responsibility, its dialectical thinking, its moral standards, and its ability to subject its own views to self-criticism, elaborate an independent scientific position, oppose conservatism, dogmatism, and avant-gardism on all fronts, and instill the masses with a socialist consciousness and the new way of thinking.

In this connection, I must cite an unforgettable example. I recently addressed a group of Novosibirsk University students. One of them asked: "Can we get rid of all of the old instructors who were around during the period of stagnation and the cult of personality and get new ones?" I answered that I had just visited the cemetery and had placed flowers on the graves of my own teachers, with whom I had lived and worked for a long time. These

were academicians M.A. Lavrentyev, A.V. Nikolayev, and G.I. Budker. On whose shoulders are you standing today? Where did we get the advanced physics and new accelerators which are working in many branches of the national economy? Where did our highly developed science of chemistry come from? You rarely remember that these prominent scholars were the founders of many modern fields of scientific and technical progress. By virtue of the dialectics of historical relationships, we are always propped up by progressive past achievements in our continuous development of national science, culture, literature, and education!

All segments of the Soviet intelligentsia represent a powerful factor in the creation of a social consciousness in the spirit of perestroika and its ideological reinforcement. The main sphere of our activity is the development of the people's creative enthusiasm, the individuality of each person, the enhancement of the authority of the party and the strength and influence of the multinational Soviet state, and the establishment of the new way of political thinking. Creative activity should be among the vital needs of each individual. Our literature, history, and culture have an exceptionally important role to play in the attainment of this exceedingly important objective. Under the conditions of the revolutionary perestroika in all spheres of social life, their enlightening function, a profoundly party mission, will grow and will acquire new humanistic meaning.

Yu.G. Burtin (Literary Critic)—*Conditions of Consolidation*

We are now experiencing a period of extreme difficulty, a period which, in some respects, could jeopardize perestroika and our future. The danger seems to have subsided in the last few days, but we are deluding ourselves if we think that perestroika has an easy road to travel. There are too many obstacles along the way. I think that shallow statements, machinations, and insincerity represent one of the greatest dangers today (of course, they have always been dangerous but they could be particularly damaging in our day).

Why might they be more dangerous today than before? Because for so many years we led our people, our readers, astray with meaningless or false statements and caused them to lose faith in the printed word and the public announcement. If we want to advance the cause of perestroika, we will have to renounce this heritage and give up this bad habit.

We are having a hard time renouncing it. In this connection, I would like to direct attention to a recent document—a simultaneously literary and historical document. It was mentioned in passing by Yu.N. Afanasyev. I am referring to the letter by the secretaries of the Writers' Union, printed in PRAVDA on 19 April and in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA on 20 April in connection with the third anniversary of perestroika. I regard this document as an eloquent and indicative sign of the

failure to overcome harmful babbling. I also felt it was necessary to express my opinion of the letter because I am a member of the Writers' Union, and those who signed the letter were speaking on behalf of the union—that is, seemingly on my behalf. I will not read the entire letter to you, but here are a few excerpts.

“During these years the theory, strategy, and tactics of perestroika were elaborated collectively.” We have heard these words more than once, but let us now say in all honesty that this is not true. An objective was set. It was formulated correctly as the objective of democratization and economic reform. But where is the integral theory of perestroika? We are just beginning to elaborate it. And this makes the statement that the strategy and tactics of perestroika have been elaborated all the more premature. This is self-deception. I will go on: “Perestroika...has become social practice and the core of our daily life.” This is another exaggeration. It has become this only to a certain, negligible extent. There is more exaggeration further on. “It has entered us as a way of thinking and action. It appears that all of us have become different people in such a short time.”

Now I am looking at the signatures. Who has become a different person? The last signature is Shatrov's. I do not think that Shatrov has undergone any kind of profound moral restructuring in recent years. He has been an honest writer throughout the last several decades and throughout his career. In general, he continued to do the same thing, more and more vigorously, and it was hard to do because he was being hampered, but where is the reversal here? I do not see any moral reversal here. Or what about Yu. Chernichenko (I am reading the signatures in reverse order)? I do not think this statement applies to him either. Or to I. Dedkov, my colleague in literary criticism. Or to V. Bykov or V. Rozov.... I think that these are people who once did undergo a restructuring, a profound internal one. This happened around the time of the 20th party congress. Later their convictions grew stronger, but there was no cardinal reversal because this is not part of human nature anyway. Could a normal person's views undergo several absolute reversals in one lifetime?

Now I am looking at other names on the list: for example, Markov, Alekseyev, Mikhalkov, and Chakovskiy. I have been living on this earth for quite some time and I know how many of their reversals I remember. I assume that they sincerely reversed their views for the first time in 1956 with the rest of the country. Later, however, when a new period in our history began in the middle of the 1960's and a new ideological line prevailed, they made a second sharp turn, an unannounced one this time. They moved from democratization to neo-Stalinism and stagnation. They did much to create this atmosphere of stagnation in our literature and in the country in general. (A.B. Chakovskiy asks from his seat: Was there stagnation in the newspapers too?) Of course it was in the newspapers too.

Go back and reread issues of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA from the 1960's and 1970's. You will remember whom it convicted in our Soviet literature. You will remember how many honest and genuine writers had their fill of insulting accusations of "denigration" from the leadership of the union and its press organs. You will remember how they picked holes in Abramov's "Around and About," Bykov's "The Dead Feel No Pain," Yashin's "Wedding in Vologda," Mozhayev's "From the Life of Fedor Kuzkin," Trifonov's "House by the Shore," Granin's "Personal Opinion" and "Our Battalion Commander," Iskander's "Kozlotur Constellation," Grekova's "On Probation," part one of Belov's "Eves," Rasputin's "Farewell to Matera," etc., etc. And whose fault was it that for decades we could not read Bek's "New Appointment," Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat," Tvardovskiy's "By Right of Memory," or Akhmatova's "Requiem"? Or did you have nothing to do with this, Comrades Markov, Mikhalkov, and Chakovskiy? But now it turns out that there has been a new reversal, and that "in such a short time" you have already become "different people"! Excuse me, but I find this hard to believe, it is against all of the laws of psychology.

The same document goes on to say: "They are the ones...." Who are "they"? It turns out that they are not people, but "methods," and they are "impeding the development of democracy and constantly trying to keep glasnost and freedom of speech 'within bounds.'" But, dear Comrades, you were the ones who did this for many years, and with great success. It was this that was your main and constant concern with regard to literature: to keep these very same things, freedom of speech and glasnost, within bounds or, on the contrary, to make them out of bounds.

I will read on: "To what kind of past do the inhibiting forces want to return our country? To stagnation, which is a synonym for decay?" and so forth. Very aptly put. But who are these "inhibiting forces"? We have already grown accustomed to looking at inhibiting forces through a telescope, seeing them somewhere on other planets. Meanwhile, they have been here with us. After all, along with the signatures of truthful and honest writers, we also find the signatures of literary representatives of these very "inhibiting forces" who have obscured the real state of affairs and discouraged any analysis or comprehension of our reality.

"Soviet writers have done much to help the socialist society know itself and realize the need for revolutionary changes," the letter says. Yes, Soviet writers have done this, although with a marked decline of vigor in the 1970's and early 1980's, but what position did the leadership of the Writers' Union take in relation to these writers? I do not remember a single case in which the union expelled or even criticized a member for varnishing the truth or fawning on the latest leader. This never

happened. The target of criticism was always the same: "denigration"—that is, essentially the same truth that our respected leadership is now swearing to uphold.

I would definitely divide the list of secretaries of the Writers' Union into at least two groups. For me, they are different lists. But I do not want my speech to be regarded as a speech against consolidation, even though this has been our literary leaders' favorite thesis for many decades. I am also in favor of consolidation. But on what basis? The fact is that the document I am discussing proposes consolidation on a basis convenient for those who headed the Union of Writers during the 20 years of "Brezhnevism," who administered the union in the spirit and interest of stagnation, and who are now trying to emerge from the water dry and derive as much benefit as possible from the new situation. But writers like Shatrov and Dedkov did not notice this subterfuge, and I think they made a mistake. It is an understandable mistake and I do not blame them a bit. How could they, as sincere advocates of democratization, not sign a letter in support of perestroika, a letter condemning inhibiting forces, and so forth?

I must stress that my speech was not dictated by a desire for revenge. The important thing is not to "demand the blood" of the organizers and executors of the policy of stagnation or even to give them the same treatment that Bulgakov's sinner received and hand them a handkerchief each night in memory of the literary infants they smothered (or the abortions for which they are to blame). But if we really want changes in our life, the first change should be our own renunciation of meaningless statements, machinations, and lies. Until we have done this, we will have absolutely nothing to discuss and no reason for discussion. I want to end my speech with an appeal for this kind of consolidation.

S.A. Nebolsin (World Literature Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences)—*History Is Not a Subject, But Life*

In essence, our specialty, which is auxiliary to the work of writers, consists in the coherent transmission of the ideas of others. It is probable that conveying the intelligent thoughts of others is always better than expressing a "personal opinion." The people who contemplated the past and the future long before our time had many ideas of value to us. The freedom of this contemplation, which is rather extraordinary, can be disheartening at first. It might even seem mischievous or appear to be a mockery of history, of the common concerns of progressive citizens, and of the immutable laws of existence. At first it might even seem that the ideas of the distant past belong only to that time. Then the support gained from that time is unexpected, but this makes the educative powers of long-dated ideas even more eloquent.

Yes, perhaps the problem is that the inspired artist sometimes does not seem to acknowledge any academic versions of history or want to place any kind of supreme

will or authority above himself and above all independent forms of life. To the artist, the difference between individuals and natural forces is not a hard and fast rule. He is a natural force himself, and he is accountable to no one. Can an artist with this temperament say anything reliable about the stern laws of the world, especially to us, with our stringency in such matters? Only by chance. At the beginning of 1836 Pushkin wrote: "It does not bother me if the press can fool the dolts freely or if sensitive censorship frustrates the joker's plans for a journal." This is what he thought of all the "loudly advertised rights which have made more than one person giddy." In this case, no one could say that this has nothing to do with our concerns, and many of us might even find it disconcerting. But let us move on to Pushkin's final days, when the poet wrote his last, genuinely testamentary message. "Be then docile, Muse..." This finally puts everything in place. Pushkin said this when he was just entering the years of mature wisdom, and he meant it as a law for the writer of history. After all, Pimen says exactly the same thing in "Boris Godunov."

The existence of a single law for all, its predominance over frivolous whims, the duration of its effects, and the long-range vision in which the law, a single event, or a long chain of events are seen with equal clarity—these are Pushkin's intelligent and completely modern ideas about creativity and about the work of the historian. These are ideas about their essentially identical subject matter. If we remember what Nicholas I said, these were the ideas of the most intelligent person in our state. We see this high level of intelligence and what might be called methodological thinking in Pushkin's assessment of Karamzin's work: "A few arguments in favor of autocracy, eloquently refuted by the credible general plot of the story." This can give us direct guidance in our present efforts. The general credibility of a story about the past is more valuable today than ever before. It is connected with the choice of long-range objectives, which cannot be called anything other than a choice at a fateful crossroads.

An intelligent man of the 20th century, writer and internationalist S. Gudzenko, sensed something after the war that is useful to compare to our situation today. "We will not die of old age; we will die of old wounds." He said this about the generation of those who fought in the war, but it can be applied to everything Soviet and Russian. A healthy social entity, a healthy social structure, could be on the verge of a death sentence or diagnosis not because it has already outlived its purpose, but because of the many wounds it suffered on the way up, at a time of completely possible growth. What is more, the outcome could be decided by an exasperating tendency to keep picking at the wounds, which time itself would have healed, and making them more and more painful and serious.

It is the historian's responsibility (a responsibility to the past and for the future) to heal past wounds. This requires some of the fabled water of death: It requires the

precise reconstruction of a repeatedly dismembered body, the reunification of all the parts, without any omissions or substitutions. We need clarity: What was the actual appearance of what we see today in disfigured form? Otherwise, the continuation of life would be impossible. And what is the writer's job? Some people feel that he has another responsibility: to sprinkle the body, which might be whole but is nevertheless dead without artistic contact, with the water of life—to see the past in terms of its purely human dimensions and genuinely inspired personal destinies. The special need for this, so that life can go on, is obviously indisputable, but can the historian employ this personalizing and revitalizing principle in his work?

However incomparable the talents of Pushkin and Gudzenko might seem, they both remind us, in their own ways, that history is, strictly speaking, not a subject, but life itself. How can we not consider the significance of the principle of life, human life, in the historical event, in historical writing, and in historical choices? Socialism (at least the socialism that we are part of today), by virtue of its inclusion in the strategic ranks of the global drama, has the right to employ tactics. It has the right to make turns or a carefully planned retreat. But unless it wants to leave the stage at a young age, it does not have the right to be paralyzed by confusion. And here it is not enough to merely grope for a reliable road; people must be able, people must know how, to travel the road together. A human life or the life of a single generation can seem so short in comparison with the broad dimensions of history that it would be possible not only to stand still, but even to keep moving along a seemingly firm road and never notice that you are walking across the road, for example, instead of down the road, that you seem to be reaching the other side and that even though you are constantly putting one foot in front of the other, you are not adding a single step to the proper advancement of all.

A society has different ways of emerging from a past where it incurred many wounds. The choice is made by people, and they make this choice in line with their affiliation with the whole entity and often in line with the distinctive features of the entity. In the presence of many dangers and in view of the validity of many purely personal tactics, we have only one common exit: We can continue to develop on our own basis, which did not take shape for so long to no purpose, and can keep the basis from being torn to pieces. And to avoid deceptive movements along the right road, but movements only to the side or backward, movements which obscure this truth, historical thinking must learn much more from the thinking artist.

The significance of the historical thinking of our great writer V.A. Kaverin was already discussed here, and certainly with good reason (by V. Oskotskiy). Lev Tolstoy reminds us of what lies at the basis of the general course of history. When he complained about Solovyev's work in his diary in 1874, saying that "everything, according to this history, in Russia before Peter I's time

was disgraceful: cruelty, thievery, tyranny, boorishness, and the inability to do anything at all," the great writer's irritation is understandable, because "how did all of these outrages produce a great and unified state?" His conclusion, which is a commonly acknowledged fact today, is even more understandable: "It was not the government that made history." Another of Tolstoy's contentions is also understandable: Without some mention of those who produced, even if what they produced was stolen, of those who put things together, even if it was torn asunder, and of those who "guarded the sanctity of religion and the poetry of the people," even if they were cursed repeatedly, without some mention of these, the history of a great country is unthinkable.

Do you see how much historical works are in debt to the active human being, who still exists but now gives them so much that is worthless? I cannot believe even the sympathetic words that were said here today about the extraordinary misfortunes of this human being in the recent past, when he had just emerged from his state of idiocy. I cannot believe that the human being was in this state even earlier. The historian is wrong to make supercilious remarks about the savagery of the main motive substance of history or to assert that the people of the recent past were stupider or acted more incongruously than we. But the historian is right, fair, and humane when he insistently reminds us that many of them could be here with us today instead of in their graves. The smug dismissal of memories of this kind would mean that we are just as likely to make the same mistakes in the future.

It is not the smug, the complacent, or the self-sufficient historical consciousness, reassured by the illusion of its one-day-old "modernity," that demands our humble examination. Today it is clear that the creation of the top level took a thousand years and cannot be recreated in a day. This is necessary, however: Judgments must be handed down, but it was the top level of our minds we managed to lose. This is why it is so difficult to learn lessons from the past and follow the reasoning of past minds. We also lost the top level of our scientific personnel, which was discussed yesterday with such absolutely warranted concern by F. Kuznetsov. In all of these respects, our human being still needs much more rejuvenation and improvement.

A.B. Chakovskiy (Editor-in-Chief of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA)—*We Do Not Want Another 1937*

Allow me to confine my speech to a brief response to Comrade Burtin. He insulted LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. I, who have been working on this team for 26 years, must respond. Can you think of any newspaper which was more active in the struggle against bureaucratism, against corruption, and against greed ever since the 20th party congress, and even before it? Who led the campaign for a clear Lake Baykal? Who, for example, led the campaign for the maintenance of ecology in general,

when this word was still almost never used in our daily conversation? It was led by Zalygin, Chernichenko, and others. And where? In LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. Who has engaged in criticism and self-criticism? And whom has LITERATURNAYA GAZETA ever insulted?

Comrade Burtin blurted out some names here. In almost every case, we printed positive articles supporting these authors. What does Comrade Burtin want? To start a search for those who supported the cult of personality? Did he not support it? What does he want, a revival of "Beriya-ism"? I thought that my use of this word would probably arouse the disapproval of my comrades, but I am speaking quite honestly, even if it may sound rude.

All of you know LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. When it was attacked a few months ago by one of the secretaries of the Writers' Union (I will not mention him by name here), we printed his philippic in its entirety in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, even though it contained everything imaginable, including the demand to eliminate LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's second section. We received more than a thousand letters in support of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, and I read some excerpts from these letters at a meeting of the secretariat of the Writers' Union. So, go ahead and criticize us, say that we have many flaws, say whatever you want, but as far as moral standards and ethics are concerned, I think that no honest person here today would stand up and say that LITERATURNAYA GAZETA has acted dishonestly or unethically.

Ye.A. Ambartsumov (Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, USSR Academy of Sciences)
—*Why a Truthful History Has Not Been Written Yet*

I have the impression that our historians on the academy level are quite reluctantly, and only under the pressure of questions from the floor, forcing themselves to make halfhearted admissions of their own insolvency. This was just done by Academician Yu.S. Kukushkin, but it did not keep him from calling the opinion of discerning writers "harmful." But what is so harmful about what Yu. Nagibin said? That a truthful history of the Soviet society has not been written yet? But after all, this is obvious. Our official historiography turned out to be in an even wretched state than the other social sciences.

It is true that some honest works about Soviet history were printed even in the years of stagnation (with great difficulty, of course, and sometimes their publication was blocked at the last minute)—V.P. Danilov's study of collectivization, for example, or V.A. Anfilov's work on the beginning of the war, but they were more of an exception to the quite depressing rule. Have there been any scientific descriptions, for example, of the resistance of Stalin's collectivization by the peasantry? Or of the famine of the early 1930's?

What did the history institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences give readers? Multi-volume works compiled by a large team of writers and having no discernible author's voice, dull, dismal, and even structurally slovenly works studiously bypassing controversial topics. Spirited thinking was smothered under mountains of facts, but there were also outright distortions of history. I respect the professionalism of Yu.A. Polyakov and I.B. Berkhin: The former knows everything there is to know about the history of NEP, and I am grateful to the latter for giving me a taste for history when I was still a student. But who forced them to write about the acts of sabotage committed by the Tilling Peasants' Party and the Industrial Party in their two-volume history of the transition period, "Ot kapitalizma k sotsializmu" [From Capitalism to Socialism] (Moscow, 1981)? I suppose it was not easy to print the truth in the beginning of the 1980's, but then it would have been better to say nothing at all. And after all, this two-volume history is not the worst possible work: It at least contains some specific information, even if it does misinterpret it. Is it any wonder that when official historiography "moved in this direction," truthful history began to be developed outside this petrified and clogged system, particularly by our writers—F. Abramov and Yu. Trifonov, S. Zalygin and B. Mozhayev, V. Astafyev and F. Iskander, A. Rybakov and M. Shatrov, who began writing history in the place of those who could not or would not do this.

The representative of NASH SOVREMENNİK here tried to contrast our outstanding writers of "village prose" to A. Rybakov and M. Shatrov. Exaggerating the possible weak points of their works (as if some "village" novels have no weak points!), A. Kazintsev tried, for reasons which can be inferred, to discredit Rybakov and Shatrov. But is it not true that all honest and talented anti-Stalinist writers are contributing to the common democratic cause?

The advancement of "outsiders" in historiography is natural in view of the impossibility of saying anything meaningful in the "official- historical" context. The overwhelming majority of professional historians, capable and initially honest men (but, unfortunately, only initially), surrendered to the situation. After spring 1985 one of the few gratifying exceptions to the rule was the untidy and even somewhat chaotic but sincere article by Academician A.M. Samsonov on the beginning of the war in ISTORIYA SSSR, which resembled a rare phenomenon among the works of professional historians crowned with academic titles.

And think of the garbage, the half-truths or outright lies, the historians who write textbooks drummed into the heads of children! Academician Yu.S. Kukushkin was complaining here that editors added something to his textbook or took something out of it. But if so, who kept you from taking your name off this book? Furthermore, after reading Yu.S. Kukushkin's work about collectivization, I do not think that the views expressed in the textbook could diverge considerably from the author's own views.

V.A. Kumanev said here that if historians had written differently (meaning truthfully?), their works would not have been printed. But we could recall O. Mandelsham's angry exclamation: "But they printed Socrates!" Now that truthful works by writers have been extracted from the dust of archives or their desks and are being published, we can ask our leading historians what they have in their desks. Of course, this is not the fault of historical science alone, but also of its dependent position. This suggests that society needs an independent science, which would always tell the truth, no matter how unpleasant it might be. In the final analysis, society, and the government too, can only benefit from this.

People stubbornly name, in accordance with Stalin's view of things, 1937 as the date socialism was built. Please tell me, what kind of socialism was built then? Besides this, the year of 1929, a genuine turning point, is "skipped over," but perestroika is called a separate phase. Unfortunately, this unnatural commingling of Stalinism with ritual bows to new currents is characteristic of our official historiography. I think it would be best if I.I. Mints, who is known as the founder of the study of civil war history, could tell the press about the kind of pressure he was under when he repeatedly changed his position and what kind of deviations from objective history he had to make. This would be of such great educative value to young historians.

I would like to ask Griboyedov's question: "But who are the judges?" The report on problems in the history of the Soviet society in connection with perestroika was undertaken by V.I. Kasyanenko, who spoke here about our common desire for the truth. But what should we think about the following incident: In 1987—that is, after perestroika had begun—he published a book "Pravda i lozh o Strane Sovetov (iz istorii borby protiv antisovetizma)" [The Truth and Lies About the Nation of Soviets (From the History of the Struggle Against Anti-Sovietism)], at least half of which dealt with the 1930's. In this book you will not find even a mention of the lawlessness and repression of that time. On the contrary, it is an apology for Stalinism (which is called a myth) and for Stalin's "analytical" henchmen—P.F. Yudin, M.B. Mitin, and others who were implicated in the repression of our social scientists.

But what can we read now in VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, where V.I. Kasyanenko is the chief editor? Let us look at issue No 4 this year. The debate begun here on "The CPSU Between the 20th and 27th Congresses" starts with a statement by V.I. Glotov, who, among other things, drops a curtsy to the notorious article by V. Golikov, S. Murashov, I. Chekhivishvili, N. Shatagin, and S. Shaumyan, effectively disavowing the anti-Stalinist line of the 20th congress and attacking our progressive social scientists with creative minds. In Glotov's opinion, however, the authors "justifiably" objected "to the exaggeration of errors committed during the construction of socialism" (p 62). A letter from L.N. Bevestnyy, obviously composed for the purpose of vindicating Stalin, was published in the same issue. He makes

an attempt to revive the myth of "acts of sabotage" and to justify the notorious law on cereal crops, but the main thing is that after the author finishes the requisite "condemnation" of the repression of the innocent, he asks "another question: Was it possible to be liberal at a time like this?" (p 109).

I do not know when this issue was compiled—before or after the publication of N. Andreyeva's article—but I can clearly see that the quoted passages express the same point of view and that the specialized nature of the journal is the only reason that they are unknown to the general public. I wonder what would have happened if the position of N. Andreyeva, of those who "do not want to compromise their principles," had won official and complete approval. I can imagine how maliciously some of the historians who spoke here today would have attacked critical thinking.

I have two specific proposals. Since we cannot start publishing new textbooks soon (especially if they are to be written by the old authors, from whom it would be simply criminal to expect restructuring), we must quickly publish a two- or three-volume work on national history for reading—an anthology of truthful works by our writers. Second, we should lift the taboo from objective studies of Soviet history by progressive Western authors, such as the Englishman Carr, the Italian Boffa, and the American Cohen. These books can be published just as quickly for our general reading public.

O.M. Poptsov (Writer)—*Life Is the Main Thing*

It is wonderful when we refuse to keep quiet and we freely vent our righteous anger about the imperfections of life, but it is odd that the anger is usually directed at our colleagues in a neighboring field, as if we ourselves personify only professional perfection and civic fortitude. Of course, things could be better in historical science, and even historians have said this here, but when the anger is vented by an economist, it gives us something to think about. It is hardly likely that economic science was totally sinless and was always constructive and perfect in recent decades. Literature and art also have something to confess, but confession is not the main thing, although it may cleanse the soul. Life is the main thing.

I am not a historical novelist, much less a historian, but closer to the opposite. I belong to the generation of writers who can justifiably be described as historically undereducated (although it is wrong and unfair to confine the adjective uneducated to only one or two generations). Most of our society is historically uneducated. This is too serious a biographical flaw to be regarded as a peculiarity. The presence or absence of a historical education determines the nature of public thinking, and today it is understandable that we are not simply unaware of the history of socialism but, I might say, have no acquaintance with it at all or have only isolated

encounters with it now that the people have an opportunity to read the text of their own biography independently and are feeling pangs because they are reading it for the first time and not even in its entirety yet.

Objectively speaking, we have never had a written history of socialism as such. In general, it has been what might be called an "illegal topic," and my generation learned about it through personal experience. Because of this, it was extremely personal, individualized, and subjective. The study of history was supplanted by the impression that we were making history and that this was supposedly enough. It is the popular belief that the mounting interest in history over the last 8 or 10 years is the result of the awakening of the public consciousness. I think this is not exactly true. Of course, there was an awakening, but there was also something else—people are sick and tired of hearing lies. Figuratively speaking, the people are reaching out for documents, for primary sources.

It is valid to ask why what happened to the history of socialism did happen. I think that this is not even an academic question. It is a question tormenting the general public. The politicizing of life to the maximum, a practice we witnessed for decades, gives rise to stereotypical economic, social, and spiritual structures and stereotypical phrases, as well as stereotypical perceptions. A politicized economy, culture, science, and art ceased to be a characteristic of a particular period and became a theory of social development. In time this process fostered extreme practices, and if we look back, we can see that what we witnessed was less the politicization than the bureaucratization of all fields of social thought: a situation in which the economy developed not in accordance with economic laws, but under the pressure of bureaucratism, consenting to its whims and references to political obligations; a situation in which culture and art developed not in accordance with the laws of creativity, but also with a view to the policy preached by bureaucratism and were adapted to this policy.

The same thing happened to history: The imposition of certain assumptions was more complete here than anywhere else. The social consciousness was convinced that current policy was the history of socialism. In other words, the history of socialism was anything Stalin said; and later it was anything Khrushchev or Brezhnev said. In the public mind, the history of the CPSU seemed to take the place of the history of the socialist state, implying that they were one and the same. Is this true? This is a question for historians, and it is a question of vital importance.

We have a system of political indoctrination and political education and we are firmly convinced that this is the system of the historical development of society. I think that we are somewhat mistaken here as well. Politicizing is dangerous because it changes the situation, so that the

main areas of public thinking do not develop in accordance with basic professional laws (or the economy in accordance with economic laws and history in accordance with the laws of history), but on the basis of a superstructural, transitory state in which professionalism is secondary to organizational and political impulses. This "leaches out" the society's creative potential.

Today's speeches by historians only confirm the accuracy of the thesis that "history is a disciplined science." This makes it seem all the more odd when historical science begins to analyze socialism and suddenly rebukes the writer who discusses crises in the history of the socialist society, accusing him of inaccuracies and of deviations from the historical truth, the very truth historical science concealed for almost 60 years! But the characterization of Lenin in earlier literature, often resembling a mere catalog of virtues, has not, oddly enough, aroused any vehement objections from historians.

Historical science was pleased with that familiar image of Lenin, not because it was accurate or inaccurate, but because it was loyal to the political period during which it was displayed, published, and circulated. As soon as the image of Lenin conflicted with reality, heightening critical perceptions and revealing serious deviations from the theory of socialism and distortions of it, historians "armed themselves" for the defense of dogmata. We seem to be unable to give up the image of Lenin Stalin once granted us. I think this is a fundamental problem in contemporary studies of Lenin's life and works.

Revolution always implies not only construction, but also the severance of ties, the denial of a past impeding the revolution. This is the nature of dialectics. Oddly enough, however, the process of severance turned out to be so viable that it acquired a permanent nature. After the 20th party congress, all history connected with Stalin's name ceased to exist, as it were, and was limited to the information politicians gave us. Later the same thing happened with the period of voluntarism and then with the period of stagnation. This is how the "gaps" came into being.

In connection with this, I often ask myself a sobering question: What happened to the millions of tons of paper used for the circulation of political reports and speeches that were issued and reissued and were then suddenly deemed unnecessary? History is not a commodity which can be offered to customers or withdrawn from the market, and it is not the property of the bureaucracy, as it seemed to be for so many years. History is the spiritual property of the people. It is not leased to the people; it simply belongs to them. We must acknowledge the dismal fact that the public interest in history took historical science by surprise, it was frightened by this

interest, and it is still resisting it. And not because it is a bad science. Bureaucracy made the history of socialism a poorly equipped and therefore unproductive science.

The man who understands his past is the master of his future. But here is what bothers me: The historical authenticity of literature dealing with the present apparently presupposes the ability to sense and understand the continuity of the good and the evil created by society and the social system. Our criticism is directed at the past, and this is valid and justifiable, but it seems to me that the bureaucrats opposing this process have not lost their strength but have simply calmed down and are even promoting the process: Let them make a massive effort and be as zealous as they want, they seem to be saying, there are not enough of them to stop us.

Literature has not started analyzing the processes of stagnation yet, but it will certainly have to start doing this soon, and it must be assured that the political system, historical science, and our literary scholars will give it their understanding and support. This will not be easy, because this misfortune, this social outrage, is still among us: Today's public administrators grew up within the old organism and are therefore not free of sin. This will require creative maturity and intellectual maturity, but these difficulties still lie ahead.

Ye.P. Chelyshev (Academician)—*International Aspects of the Topic of Discussion*

At the beginning of 1982 the social sciences section of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences approved a program of "Comparative Analysis of the Effects of the Socialist and Bourgeois Systems on the Culture of Developing Countries." I was asked to head the project. We began our work during the period of stagnation. Our research led us to the conclusion that, despite all of our efforts, the culture of the developing countries was being influenced less by the socialist countries than by imperialist countries, especially the United States, which was more skilled, better equipped, and better qualified to conduct this kind of work in developing countries. We immediately compiled several analytical papers containing an assessment of this fact and suggesting ways of heightening the effectiveness of cultural exchanges. Far from all of our observations, conclusions, and judgments, however, evoked the proper response. Defending the "honor of the regiment," some called our work "denigrating," described it as "unqualified interference," and so forth.

It appears that the tenacity of stereotypical thinking and the absence of contacts and the necessary mutual understanding among various organizations and establishments engaged in ideological work in our country represent one of the causes of the retardation of our social sciences and the inadequate results of our mass media product for overseas consumption and the activities of our organizations in charge of cultural exchanges.

Within the framework of our research, I spent many years visiting universities in developing countries and read their textbooks on the history, economy, and culture of the Soviet Union. Most of these books were by American and English authors and portrayed our country in a tendentious tone and a distorted light. I repeatedly asked my colleagues in the developing countries why they did not use the textbooks on our country which were written by Soviet authors and were published in foreign languages by the Progress Publishing House. They told me that they regarded textbooks published in our country as propaganda literature. As a result, university students in developing countries are given distorted information about our country.

How can we correct the situation? How can we write a textbook on the history of our country that will be acceptable to universities in developing countries? I once asked the director of the Progress Publishing House this question. He told me that he had asked many Soviet scholars to write a textbook providing an objective and truthful account of the history of our country, but no one had wanted to take the risk. And even if this kind of textbook had been written and published in our country and accepted by a foreign university, it could easily have been compared with the textbooks used in our history classes, and it would not have been easy to tell people why foreigners were studying a truthful history of our country while students in the Soviet Union were not supposed to know the truth about the history of their own country. Our textbooks are used widely abroad in the natural sciences, medicine, and engineering. We must quickly make every effort to compile high-quality, truthful textbooks for foreign universities.

Our mass media, scholars, writers, journalists, and artists have been trying for years to create an idealized image for our country, an image appealing to the rest of the world, and have attacked all of those who undermine this image. Our attitude toward representatives of the foreign public has often depended on their acceptance of this image. Their criticism of us was usually seen as an indication of ill will or hostility. Conversely, we drew closer to people who were lavish with all kinds of compliments. What is more, complimentary remarks were usually quoted in our press, and sometimes became the criterion of attitudes toward our actions and a way of judging public opinion in a particular country. But after all, those who criticized us were frequently our real friends, and those who constantly praised us and supported us turned out to be hypocrites.

Many foreign experts on culture and literature, critics, and translators have taken part in creating the Soviet Union's image in their countries, viewing us through the prism of their own philosophical outlook. We usually categorize all foreign authors who criticize the Soviet culture and do not accept socialist ideals or our way of life and thinking as bourgeois Sovietologists and we naturally analyze their works from this standpoint. It seems to me that in line with the new thinking, our

research in this area and our criticism of foreign authors require serious adjustments. We do not always take their differences into account and we tend to approach them all in the same way. Among them there are many seekers, doubters, and people who have been misled.

Our researchers, however, approach their works and their activities as if they have forgotten that these people live in the capitalist society and are therefore influenced by it. This is what I.Ye. Golik does, for example, in his book "*Zarubezhnaya kritika o sovetskoy literature*" [Foreign Criticism of Soviet Literature] (Moscow, 1976). Instead of analyzing works, he hangs labels on their authors. Works by other critics of foreign authors are also marked by biased opinions and character assassinations instead of analytical research methods. Even the passages from these works cited by our critics, however, indicate that they are not so mistaken in their assessment of various shortcomings in our literature and negative developments in the life of our society, which we ourselves are criticizing more severely today. In addition to receiving fair criticism, several anti-Soviet authors are scolded by Golik and J.P. Sartre for directing attention to Soviet works portraying "people from the Stalin era who have been misled and are seeking something else" instead of to novels with a "positive hero." But it is precisely the seekers we are most likely to discuss today. With our predictable responses to the works of foreign authors, our vicious attacks and reviews, we often repelled them, turning seekers and doubters into enemies. We once railed against G. Lukacs and cursed him for deviations from Marxist views, while progressive cultural spokesmen in many countries treated him with the greatest respect and published and studied his works. As we know, he once supported A. Platonov.

Today it is hard to accuse our social scientists of unsatisfactory work methods too sternly. We have to blame the situation, the spiritual and ideological climate in our country. I remember when the Khudozhestvennaya Literatura Publishing House in Moscow published an 8-volume and a 12-volume set of R. Tagore's works in the 1950's and 1960's and we were unable to convince the publishing house administrators of the need to publish all of his "Letters About Russia," which he wrote after he visited our country in 1930. The problem was that during his short stay in Moscow he saw not only the seedlings of a new life in our country but also noticed the sprouts of a "totalitarian regime" and mentioned this in one of the letters. This is why it was thrown out of Tagore's wonderful work, and when the Indians wanted to know why this had been done, the people who had to explain it to them were the scholars of Indian affairs, and not the person who ordered the "cut."

Now I must say something about the ideological struggle that is being waged at this time in different spheres of artistic culture. Our works on this matter will only have an effect and an impact when they rest on a strict scientific analysis of foreign ideological, aesthetic, and philosophical theories. Our works and public statements

lose their impact when they contain inaccurate, biased, and underqualified interpretations of the point of view of foreign authors, when the arguments in them are not strictly scientific, professional, and relevant, and when our scholars cite nothing from the works of foreign authors but ideas, beliefs, and quotations providing grounds for scathing criticism. If we want the ideological struggle in artistic culture to be effective and beneficial rather than detrimental, we will have to be more flexible and use only accepted methods of struggle. Otherwise, the results will be the opposite of what we expect.

Dogmatism and oversimplification are impermissible in our ideological works. Inaccurate or poorly substantiated arguments regarding important ideological issues can only alienate us from foreign scholars, including those who sympathize with us.

If we want our ideological works to achieve their purpose, we must study works by foreign literary scholars regularly and constantly, and not just occasionally or sporadically. The ideological struggle must be waged in a timely manner, and we must struggle against the enemy on the battlefield. We, however, sometimes struggle against forces representing yesterday's political currents and against ideas which are obsolete and have been replaced by new ones, which should be analyzed carefully before we begin struggling against them. This problem warrants serious and earnest investigation with a view to the fact that the ideological struggle in today's world is not coming to an end. To achieve our purpose, we must wage it with modern scientific methods based on the new way of thinking.

P.G. Gorelov (World Literature Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences)—*Requirements of the Ideal*

I would like to begin by reminding you that 1988 is a special year. Our chronicle ("From Whence Came the Russian Land") says that in 988 "Vladimir...sent for...the children of the best families, and sent them to schools for instruction in book learning." This means that 1988 marks the millennium of our historical, national, and cultural existence, recorded in, among other things, "book words."

Today our journalists are reflecting on socialism's 70-year journey, on perestroika and glasnost, and on the fundamental ideal of October. In his article "Return of the Ideal," S. Kondrashov writes that "the main thing is to preserve the spiritual community of the majority of our population through adherence to the ideal of October." But is it possible that this spiritual community would be weakened or diminished if the preceding thousand years of the Russian land also turns out to be connected with contemporary social reforms? When were we convinced, and who convinced us, that the historical journey of our people and their traditional age-old ideals could not be connected with the fundamental ideal of October? Finally, let us ask ourselves this question: How deep are its historical roots and exactly

what is the ideal of October in relation to our people's ideals in this millennium? What will inspire us—both as individuals and as a people—in the future?

The historians and literary historians here admitted to each other that they had not been able to compile a true history of the Soviet society or a genuine history of Soviet literature. The words L.N. Tolstoy wrote in his diary after he read S.M. Solovyev's "Istoriya Rossii" [History of Russia] were quoted in this context. Tolstoy then wondered why Solovyev had not portrayed the main protagonist of history, the common people, and therefore did not discover or understand the secret of history, the inner purpose of its dynamics, and its mainspring. I must say that all of this is only the beginning of what Tolstoy said, a mental running start, as it were. The writer goes on to say, but I will not quote all of this, that there is "history-as-science" (which is fundamentally incapable of describing the life of the people) and "history-as-art" (which is fully capable of doing this). It is true, Tolstoy clarifies, that "history-as-art, just as any other kind of art, strives for depth rather than breadth, and it can describe the life of all Europe or a month in the life of a single peasant in the 16th century." Only in this way, according to Tolstoy, by means of "the highest artistry," through artistic images, can history "encompass the unencompassable"—describe the life of millions of people.

Now, let us ask ourselves if we have a history of the last 70 years in Tolstoy's sense of the term. Luckily, we do. I will mention just a single writer whose power to convey our history through artistic images, a power he paid for dearly, is unlikely to be disputed by anyone today. This writer is A. Platonov. His most depressing and frightening work is probably "The Foundation Pit." We have already been intimidated with the "pit." People have pointed to Platonov's literary warning as an extremely gloomy prophecy regarding the fate of what was undertaken in the 20th century "by the vast silent majority of humanity" for all humankind. This was a reference to the same ideal of October. This time, however, we will not forget what people wanted it to conceal, to the point of invisibility, and what they did conceal, as we know, with some success.

Platonov did not believe that the situation was hopeless and did not think that confinement within the "pit" was inevitable. Platonov must not be confused with his fictional characters, as he often is by those who recognize themselves in these idealized characterizations. It is simply that he portrays the higher truth of the ideal and of conscience lying behind the truth of life. We were the ones who managed, without any outside help, to call everything spiritual "bourgeois deception" and foster the sinister type of character with an "iron will" in our national history. And we have no one to blame for this but ourselves.

Today we have no more of the optimists who were able to assert that "happiness is inevitable." Those who "regarded the truth as the class enemy" are also gone.

The activists who were preparing to "march the population into socialism in echelons," but only arranged for the "production of historical idiocy on a semi-industrial scale" instead, have also disappeared. To a considerable extent, we have also put an end to the attempts to be the first to "grasp the future with a bit of paper." And, last but not least, there is no longer any need to see human beings only as "living railroad ties on the road to socialism."

"Where does the heart fit in?" This is clearly the main question. With a "misplaced heart"—and who but Platonov, as an eye-witness, would know this better—a person or all the people could "chop so much wood!" So that the "main radiant force" does not throb in vain, Platonov assured us through the words of the old foreman contemplating "the kind of calipers that could be used to test Bolsheviks," we must "keep looking." What the writer found most frightening—and with good reason—was the empty heart, especially in those who "command from afar." We should not forget that in "The Foundation Pit," the people send the over-accommodating activist to the trash heap of history along with the kulaks.

We will not understand the strength of the historical optimism Platonov witnessed if we forget the heroes of his "Foundation Pit." And is it not the same Chiklin, Veshchev, Chagatayev, Yushek, and "sandy school-teacher" who realize during the war that "the noble truth of the Russian people must be defended with the indestructible force of the soldier" and that "all our great and eternal motherland" is behind them? Are they not the ones who blow themselves up to ensure the destruction of the enemy? "Oh, what do we care about the Germans," the old peasant who has been through the war says. "They cannot match our experience, we have gone through so much more!" Do these words not send a chill up our spines today, now that we know we do not have all of the facts about conditions before the war?

Obviously, the greatest threat today is the danger that the real truth will be supplanted unobtrusively by the half-truths which multiply so quickly in a vacuum and are usually accompanied by references to the "increasing complexity of our reality." What sometimes happens is that the truth is replaced by something designed to act in its place only temporarily, something that is, in Dostoyevskiy's words, only "similar, related, almost the same, but actually quite different." This insidious similarity is the most dangerous thing today.

It is time for the serious admission that the "old legends" were what helped us "cross the abyss." In fact, the real abyss is the complete neglect of "old legends." What we need so desperately today is to come down to earth instead of trying to soar above it, we need daring rather than impertinence, we need to serve without being servile, we need a single national banner rather than the countless group banners of the ideological civil war, and we need the whole historical truth instead of meaningless

eloquence and shameless exposure. The person who said that deception was not the only thing capable of pre-eminence and that the need for the pre-eminence of the truth is much more serious today was correct. The only ones who could object to this today are those whose "minds are obscured by their senses," as the old saying goes. This, the preoccupation with personal interests in isolation from national goals, making these interests divisive and petty, is a common ailment among today's pseudo-intellectuals with their unconditional belief in their "own" or "group" validity.

The most promising sign is the gradually growing realization of the futility of attempts to reconstruct something by means of administrative changes alone or through the strength of a single authority, without reliance on the national and social consciousness and without confidence in the organic forces of life. "Democracy" and "democratism" should imply (and do imply) the "people" and the "national spirit," if we do not want to stir up demagogic instincts and the undesirable extremes of unlimited democracy on the one hand and regimented democratism on the other. The national spirit bears the same relationship to the people as personality to the individual. There is nothing tangible or living outside the national spirit and the personality. A nation without a national spirit and a depersonalized individual are, we must admit, joyless entities. The national spirit encompasses our historical mission and all of the purpose and meaning of our historical existence, and we must therefore take special precautions to keep the dissident ideas of undemocratic and demagogic sectarianism from surreptitiously infiltrating and then supplanting our vested national interest.

Let us remember the greatness of the simple and sincere advice of those who lived through the war: "Live, fulfill your destiny, let everything happen as fate has ordained" (A. Platonov, "With the People").

A.A. Fursenko (Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences)—*Strengthening the Alliance of Historians and Writers*

The perestroika and the current processes in our country, the reassessment of our earlier beliefs about the past, are also affecting us, the scholars of American affairs. I would like to begin with one specific example. On 21 January 1949, at a memorial gathering on the 25th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's death, Pospelov presented a report, at Stalin's suggestion, on "The United States—the Organizer and Inspirer of the Anti-Soviet Armed Intervention." It contradicted statements by Lenin and Chicherin and distorted the facts. This report cannot be called objective. It misrepresented the United States' role in the intervention against Soviet Russia. Everyone knows that the United States took part in this intervention, financed those who took part in the intervention, and had specific political objectives, but it did not play the role depicted in Pospelov's report.

It also said much that later had a strong negative effect on the development of Soviet studies of American affairs. The speech gave the signal for the persecution of scholars of American history. An extremely harsh review of historian V. Lan's book "SShA ot pervoy do vtoroy mirovoy voyny" [The United States Between the World Wars] was published soon afterward in BOLSHEVIK. We are now asking historians to write interesting and engrossing good books which would be read by the people as well as by specialists. I can definitely say that this book met all of these requirements. It was a wonderful, interesting, well-written book which met any scientific standards or requirements. But the book was demolished. And Lan was one of our first Soviet scholars of American history. He wrote one of the first Soviet books on U.S. history, "Klassy i partii SShA" [Classes and Parties in the United States], which is still an important work today.

The reinterpretation of American history and Soviet-American relations which began at that time was intended to create what we today call the "enemy image." We cannot agree with the guidelines which were set at that time for Soviet studies of American affairs. I believe that we have been able to surmount most of them and have taken a different position today, but we can still see some of the after-effects of this approach. It seems to me that the time has come to stand up and say that this was one of the wrong turns we are discussing here today.

All of us, in all fields of history, must define our own feelings about participation in perestroika. We have been discussing the "gaps" in our history of the 1920's and 1930's, but there are also "gaps" in the history of foreign policy that seem quite recent. I realize that foreign policy is a fairly sensitive topic but it must be discussed nevertheless.

There is (or at least there was) a hotel in Washington, the Occidental, with a plaque saying: "A Russian diplomat and an American television correspondent had a meeting in this building in October 1962 which prevented World War III." The name of the American TV correspondent, John Scali, is well known, but who knows the name Fomin? American literature also mentions another man, Bolshakov. These were the men who made a heroic effort on behalf of our leadership to save the world from war at the time of the Caribbean crisis. American accounts of this are numerous and quite detailed.

I must say that I tried to write about this in our country but found it absolutely impossible to publish anything. I was told we could not write about them. Why is it that the Americans could know about these men but we could not? It seems to me that we should have heard of them. They are heroes who should be famous in their own country. I think that we have many of these "gaps" in the field I am discussing.

One of our main areas of extreme difficulty and major problems is the information shortage. People here have already discussed the difficulty of gaining access to archives. One of my American colleagues recently asked me: "Why is it that you have access to the archives of the State Department and Justice Department and to private archives when you work in the United States, but you do not let us have the papers of the tsarist ministries you overthrew in 1917?" I answered: "You know, we do not always have access to the papers of those ministries ourselves." Is this a normal situation? I do not think so. I think that when we talk about shortcomings in our work, we should talk about these obstacles. They are obstacles, pure and simple obstacles! I do not know how anyone can surmount this resistance and reluctance to issue these materials to foreigners and even to us.

As far as foreign literature is concerned, the situation in our country is absolutely unsatisfactory. Things are particularly bad in Leningrad. Both of the city's large libraries—the library of the Academy of Sciences and the public library—have stopped subscribing to two American journals of major importance—the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW and the JOURNAL OF MODERN HISTORY. We have to go to Moscow to read them. This is how things are for us in Leningrad. The only thing that lets me, for example, work and study the history of the United States and current events is my habit of bringing many books back every time I take a business trip. I am essentially making my living with this library and I am letting my students use it too.

People here have already discussed the ideas M.S. Gorbachev expressed during his visit to Washington and in his book on perestroika—his ideas about the role of the intelligentsia, his belief that the intelligentsia is like yeast and that the creative alliance of scientists and the artistic intelligentsia is an essential condition of perestroika.

This is an important and inspiring statement, but I must say that there are some discouraging facts in this area as well. An article by Higher Party School Docent Popov, written in the same vein as Andreyeva's article and proposing a broader interpretation of dictatorship by the proletariat in our day, was recently printed in our Leningrad journal DIALOG (this issue was signed to press 3 days after PRAVDA printed its well-known editorial). In his report, P.N. Fedoseyev stated our feelings about proletarian dictatorship at this time in line with party policy. But the article I am referring to took a step backward by saying that the functions of dictatorship by the proletariat must be strengthened and broadened, and by referring to the intelligentsia as a fellow-traveler at best.

I want to call your attention to the fact that although we in this room are discussing some extremely controversial matters, are engaging in heated arguments, and are expressing radical points of view, this is certainly not being done on the local level. It is not even being done in a city like Leningrad. It is extremely important that

people are listening to the intelligentsia today, that they care about its opinions, but we must also learn the rules of argumentation. Otherwise, our debates will not enhance our mutual respect. The terminology and methods used in arguments should not transcend the bounds of propriety. We must respect each other and ourselves.

People here have discussed the differences in the treatment of different writers. I think we should support pioneers. There are writers who can be described as pioneers and should be acknowledged as having this right. Whatever we might say about Rybakov's novel, he was the first to write one. There were also other dramatists and novelists who were the first to say something, and they deserve our recognition and must not be denied this right. This is a patriotic attitude and a patriotic achievement, and we do not have the right to ignore them. We must acknowledge the writer's right to independence, even in works not devoid of conjecture.

Historians, of course, are in a different position. We can advance various hypotheses, but each one must be supported by documented facts. I have already talked about archives—this is not always easy to do. We cannot always get what we want from archives. I want to stress that the alliance of historians and writers is a productive alliance in principle and should be fostered.

When Yu.N. Afanasyev spoke here, he said that there was never another country in the world with a history as falsified as the history of our country after 1917 and before 1917. I have the greatest respect for the patriotic fervor of Afanasyev's statements, but I cannot agree with this particular thesis because, after all, Soviet historical science does exist. I am a researcher of American affairs, but I also study Russian history. We have sound basic works on the history of Russia. When foreign scholars come to our country, they want to meet our specialists for the purpose of discussion and consultation. This should tell us something.

The people who support perestroika can take different approaches to the assessment of various events, but we must work together and form a united front for the triumph of the cause of perestroika.

V.D. Polikarpov (USSR History Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences)—*There Are No Grounds for Complacency*

We must admit that writers are now in the vanguard of perestroika and we must engage in some self-criticism and also admit that historians, in contrast to writers, literary scholars, and journalists, are still part of the rear guard, and that the exceptionally optimistic statements which were made here about the present state of affairs in historical science are reminiscent of certain periods in our past because of their complacent tone.

Is there any reason to say that perestroika is going well in our field of learning and that we have conquered some of its frontiers? The funeral services for the "thaw" after the 20th and 22d party congresses began with exactly the same kind of "self-reassurances" in historical science. These were followed by articles in PRAVDA, first in fall 1965 under the official signature of S.P. Trapeznikov, the man in charge of the Department of Science and Academic Institutions of the CPSU Central Committee,³⁶ and a short time later, in January 1966, under the signatures of three prominent historians who declared, after receiving a signal from Trapeznikov, that there never was a cult of personality, that this was a non-Marxist term, and that it was redolent of subjectivism and therefore scientifically invalid.³⁷ This is how the ban was imposed on investigations of the nature of the cult of personality and its effect on historical science and on life in our society in general.

Now the party central committee is advising us to study our past history and learn lessons from it, not only lessons about the construction of socialism as a whole but also about the development of historical science. After all, historians turned out to be completely unprepared to satisfying the sudden outburst of public interest in our Soviet history in the atmosphere of perestroika. We must decide what was inhibiting and is still inhibiting the development of our science and learn the factors, influences, and various types of pressure leading to its present critical state. The end of the 1920's is an extremely important turning point in history. It was delineated sharply by Stalin's letter to the editor of PROLETARSKAYA REVOLYUTSIYA and a speech he made the same month at a meeting of economic administrators. The letter imposed a ban on the further investigation of issues on which Stalin had his own opinions, which were prescribed as axioms. Anything arousing his displeasure began to be condemned from the highest rostrum: It was labeled "quackery," "fraudulent chicanery," or, for a greater impact, "Trotskyist contraband."

"New" procedures of scientific research were prescribed. People who used "paper documents" to study history were called "hopeless bureaucrats" or "archive rats." In the future it would have to be studied on the basis of the "acts and actions" of various individuals.³⁸ The specific individuals were listed by K.Ye. Voroshilov at the end of 1929 in an article written for Stalin's 50th birthday. In his speech at the convention of economic administrators, Stalin accused the most "qualified part of the old technical intelligentsia" of sabotage and "interventionist hopes" and announced that the "policy of obliteration" would be used in the treatment of these people. This is when he said that the "subversive movement...was cultivated...by the exacerbation of class struggle within the USSR."³⁹ This idea later became a constant refrain in all of Stalin's indicting speeches. Historians were subjected to the same kind of slander and "policy of obliteration."

Science was also presented with a corresponding methodology. As statistician M.N. Smit admitted in his book

in 1931, the remark that a particular theory was "non-Marxist" was all it took for the State Political Administration to assert that its connection with "sabotage" was "obvious."⁴⁰ Later, after M.N. Pokrovskiy's death, the groundwork for the exposure of his "subversive anti-Leninist theories" was laid by the obliteration of "enemy groups of counterrevolutionaries on the historical front" by "our glorious People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs,"⁴¹ as A.M. Pankratova said with delight then, before the same fate overtook her 20 years later. Is this not the same methodology that was preached by the recent head of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism, as M. Shatrov proved to us here?

Works by Marxist historians who became the victims of repression were burned. Only single copies were kept in the special depositories of the country's largest libraries. This was also the fate of the works of authors who had not been repressed if they quoted politicians who were classified as "enemies of the people" or contained any positive mention of these politicians. An inquisition of massive proportions engulfed the entire country and destroyed the intellectual potential of our society with demonic ruthlessness, devouring countless numbers of products of human intelligence. This insane policy was reinforced in 1938 by the "Brief Course" in the history of the VKP(b)—this essentially repressive code of Stalinism, a collection of criminal political assessments of people, events, and theories. In a special central committee decree of 14 November 1938, Stalin declared the "Brief Course" the "only official" handbook, not subject to "any kind of arbitrary interpretations," on the main aspects of Marxism-Leninism and party history. This decree was then declared a "perestroika," but only in the direction of regression from Leninism. Jeering at the creative spirit of a great scholar, the decree announced "an end to the arbitrary statements and confusion" and the "plethora of different points of view" in earlier textbooks.⁴² This is how the inflexible stereotypes which fettered historical science and all theoretical thinking for many years were officially approved.

There was some improvement in the spiritual atmosphere after the 20th and 22d CPSU congresses, but the momentum they provided was not enough for a radical turning point or for the elimination of the negative tendencies which held absolute sway in historical science. The "thaw" of the middle of the 1950's and the early 1960's was followed by another period of stagnation. The campaign led by S.P. Trapeznikov played a pernicious role in the development of Soviet historical science from the early 1970's to the middle of the 1980's. Historians who fawned on him occupied key positions in academy establishments and VUZ's and effectively put an end to the "new direction" in historical science, representatives of which had dared to arm themselves with all of the progressive methods of Marxist science and to begin investigating important unresolved issues in the country's pre-revolutionary development, the correlation of democratic and socialist tendencies in the revolutionary liberation movement, and other important topics in history.

The efforts of researchers and the publishing network were geared more and more to the support of anniversary campaigns and the compilation of uncontroversial, "generalizing" works, essentially paste-ups, with "distinguished" editorial boards, which were supposed to protect these works from any kind of criticism whatsoever and, in some cases, guarantee the compilers, the authors, and of course the major-domos, medals or orders and the State and Lenin prizes, as in the case, for example, of the 12-volume history of World War II, which was discussed here by writer V. Astafyev and historian O. Rzheshevskiy. They did not mention the fact that all of these awards were conferred privately and that no statements were issued to inform the public of these awards.

In those days many historians avoided the study of Marxist theories in their entirety and were content to have a small set of quotations to use as an indication of their adherence to Marxist methodology. Any attempts at a creative reading of the classic works of Marxism-Leninism for the analysis of historical processes were regarded with suspicion, as something threatening the revision of dogmas. As a result of the administrative interference of incompetent people in the science, a limit was imposed on productive inquiries by researchers into issues of major importance and on the development of scientific theory. This practice was supported by various agencies serving as the patrons of rigid conservatives and demagogues.

The new direction in historical science and the new reading of the theoretical legacy of the founders of Marxism-Leninism were alleged to have been "condemned by the academic community" and were excluded from our science for a long time. Unfair criticism and all types of statements condemning these new practices were made under the guise of debate, and the researchers who were the targets of this harsh criticism were denied the right to defend themselves in the press. The resulting destruction of creative impulses gave Trapeznikov's group a monopoly on the study of the history of the USSR, especially the Soviet period.

We have now reached a point at which the specialized historical journals under the jurisdiction of the History Department seem to have reached their limit in terms of circulation and in terms of their ability to disseminate truly scientific knowledge in our society, and this is happening at a time of a reawakened common interest in historical knowledge. Whereas the literary and sociopolitical journals staying ahead of perestroika are printed in editions of more than a million copies, historical journals are printed in editions of 15,000 or 20,000 copies. This is all they print for our huge country, and we should also remember that many of these copies are sent abroad.

There is one more thing I want to say. People here spoke about archives. A recent report in the press announced the opening of archives and said that the only problem was that historians do not want to "lay claim to" the files

stored there. In fact, however, instead of opening the archives, some people are actually making access to many of them even more difficult and broadening the channels for arbitrary decisions by archive administrations. In other words, they are acting in accordance with the old belief that only "archive rats" want to make use of "paper documents."

G.A. Mitin (Literary Critic)—*Let Us Not Create "Gaps" Ourselves*

Everyone is interested in the progress of perestroika in general, but it seems to me that writers, critics, and literary historians are primarily interested in its progress in the minds of people. You must have noticed that the views expressed here have been quite varied: Different groups of people, even in Moscow, are distinguished by absolutely different degrees of restructuring.

I recently went to Tomsk Oblast. The first Lipatov lectures were being presented there, in V. Lipatov's birthplace. Everything looked quite promising at first: There was a book-lovers' society, and quasi-literary passions were boiling and seething. But this was only at first. When we arrived in one of the floating offices Lipatov wrote about, we got into a furious argument with the workers there when we defended perestroika and the workers said that there was no such thing as perestroika. Our remarks aroused the interest of the party gorkom buro, and we were invited to address a joint meeting of the Komsomol gorkom and CPSU gorkom buros. Our frank and informative discussion aroused the interest of both sides. A meeting with the aktiv was scheduled for the next day. The aktiv was a pitiful sight and behaved more like a "passive," and the few notes we received were anonymous. For this reason, I think it is still too early to say that we have already become complete different people. We simply cannot say this.

As for "gaps," they are appearing in the most unexpected places. For example, I learned from an article in NOVYY MIR of this "gap" in a history textbook: The section on the 17th century does not even mention Tsar Alexis, Nikon, or Avvakum. I cannot even imagine how this century in Russia's history can be discussed without a mention of these three.

During the period of stagnation one of the old methods of creating "gaps" in contemporary literature was revived, so to speak: the method in which critics say nothing about particularly outstanding works. They said nothing, for example, about N. Dumbadze's novels "Solar Night" and "White Flags," M. Alekseyev's story "The Brawlers," and V. Katayev's story "Werther Has Already Been Written." But after all, this also created "gaps" in criticism, and no one is in any hurry to plug them up. Furthermore, it seems to me that we are creating the same kind of "gaps" now, during the years of perestroika. We turned V. Astafyev's "Sad Detective"

into one of these "gaps." Our critics displayed no interest in the genuinely profound philosophical and socio-historical implications of this work, but it is one of the greatest achievements in contemporary Russian literature and we cannot take pride in the silence of our critics.

I must say that we have experienced all of the zigzags of our history in recent years and we will remember these zigzags, and this is why: In 1963 the editors of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA asked me to write a rush article about A. Solzhenitsyn's novella "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich" and published the article the next day. But what happened after October 1964? My article about V. Voynovich's novella "I Want To Be Honest" was removed from TEATR in the composing room (even "wanting to be honest" was forbidden then!) and my article about a performance of V. Aksenov's play "Always on Sale" in the Contemporary theatre was removed from the proofs of the weekly LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA. Were the chief editors of these publications to blame? I worked for the press, including LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, myself at that time, and this is why I know that chief editors did not make the final decisions on these publications. These decisions were made, figuratively speaking, by the times.

Critics had good reason to quote Stalin profusely during the period of the cult of personality, and Brezhnev during the period of stagnation. This was expected of us, the critics and editors, and of them, the party organs in charge of the press. Quotations were a verbal "sign of loyalty." "And what lies behind the words?"—I. Zverev demanded to know. He was one of the "alarm clocks" of the period of stagnation. His acute writer's sensibility discerned a characteristic and indicative feature of that period: the disparity between words and actions. This serious problem lay at the heart of the characterization of section foreman Gasilov in V. Lipatov's novel "And This Is All About Him." It is not surprising that the word "Gasilovism" appeared in the critics' responses to the novel, but it appeared and quickly disappeared—after all, our life was then being controlled (and still is to some degree!) by the masters of "Gasilovism."

Duplicity, the "false bottom," and the ability to dissemble—these social evils are still helping the Gasilovs disguise themselves as supporters of perestroika. I think that exposing this disguise will be difficult but necessary. To tear off the mask and reveal the contradictions between the use of perestroika terminology and the commission of anti-perestroika acts—this is what the people want writers to do today, and this is one of the main functions of our journalists today. The inertia of "stagnation" could be the most tangible and most menacing threat to perestroika. It is no coincidence that some call the preceding period in the history of our society the period of calm, instead of the period of stagnation, with a deep sigh of regret. This is the reason for their passivity.

Unfortunately, the Gasilovs, on the other hand, are still active. Today, of course, they are in favor of glasnost but against "permissiveness." We often hear the statement that democracy is not permissiveness. Does LITERATURNAYA GAZETA not reject articles on this pretext? Does it not know "better than anyone else" what can and cannot be published? We ourselves can understand perfectly the difference between democracy and permissiveness, but for some reason it turns out that representatives of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA still know more than we do about this, and that writers are still not in charge of their own newspaper.

I would also like to return to this question: What shall we do about the emigres from the stagnant period? Let us recall how Lenin drew a clear distinction between Tolstoy the philosopher and Tolstoy the artist in his articles about Tolstoy. We have not dared to do this with contemporary writers, we seem to have "forgotten" this, but it seems to me that we must remember this Leninist principle and return our emigres (this is the most disgraceful development in our life in recent decades), and if not the people, then at least their works. It was impossible to watch, for example, as they took V. Nekrasov's "Front-Line Stalingrad" or G. Vladimov's "The Big Ore" out of the libraries. What would our military prose be without the first of these books and our literature about the working class without the second?

In conclusion, I would like to say something about G.A. Belaya's suggestion that we discuss two models of art: independent art and auxiliary art. I agree that they always did exist and still do. It is quite probable that they will always exist, but the development of Russian literature did not depend on these models. It seems to me that the main model, which came into being along with the first brilliant Russian writer, Avvakum, and then continued to exist through the centuries, is art which serves its people independently. Independence does not preclude service. In fact, the situation is quite the reverse, as we can see from works by not only Platonov and Bulgakov but also the talented writers who are still alive today, including those who spoke here yesterday and today. I am certain that an independent spirit can only help the genuine writer serve his people.

Yu.A. Lukin (CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences)—*Perestroyka, Democratization, and the Artistic Culture*

The colossal changes that are taking place in our society, including changes in the spiritual sphere, took literature and art by storm and led to the re-evaluation of unpublished manuscripts in editor's bins, museum reserve collections, and "shelved" films. Our spiritual life and aesthetic consciousness benefited from the accessibility, however belated, of many previously unknown works by B. Pilnyak, Ye. Zamyatin, A. Platonov, M. Bulgakov, V.

Khodasevich, O. Mandelshtam, A. Lentulov, and M. Chagall and of movies made in the last two decades by A. Tarkovskiy, A. Oskoldov, A. German, K. Muratova, and A. Sokurov.

Although we must say that the inclusion of works by these authors in our spiritual life is a positive development, we should not think that all of them are of equal artistic value. Most of the works which were undeservedly closed off from viewers and readers in the past, however, were rejected primarily because the aesthetic criteria and peculiar interpretation of the truth in art during the years of stagnation categorized them as too "pointed"—or, to be more precise, as too critical. Today we realize that the criticism of negative trends in the works of Zamyatin, Platonov, Bulgakov, Bek, and Dudintsev indicated a much greater love for socialism and the people than the sugary description of the life of the Kuban cossacks or the cardboard battles for grain in "Bearer of the Golden Star," that there was so much truth about the times and about Stalin in B. Grossman's epic about the battle of Stalingrad, "Life and Fate," that it is no wonder one party leader said unequivocally that "this cannot be published in the next 200 years."

These rediscovered works compel their readers and viewers to look at the history of our artistic culture in a different way and clarify many of our theoretical postulates. Some critics and researchers whose pens are inclined to be overly friendly to previously unexamined material, however, are making statements which might present a distorted and biased view of our artistic life if they enter textbooks and reference works. There have been demands for the critical reassessment of the works of Mayakovskiy, and of Gorkiy, Sholokhov, and Fadeyev as well (in MOSKOVSKIY KHUDOZHNIK). Some critics are comparing and contrasting A. Platonov's "Foundation Pit" and "Chevengur" to M. Sholokhov's "Virgin Soil Upturned" and A. Malyshev's "People from the Backwoods." In the same way, the works of A. Lentulov, N. Tatlin, and M. Chagall are being contrasted to the legacy of A. Deyneki, Yu. Pimenov, and P. Korin.

Any kind of distortion—the neglect of some artists and currents or the exaggerated interest in others—is alien to the history of art. The entire multicolored and multihued palette of individual creative styles and currents and their rise and fall constitute the true appearance of the history of our art.

Another problem I would like to discuss is the civilized nature of our debates. Unfortunately, we have trouble criticizing perestroyka; we have not learned to conduct debates in line with the new way of thinking. On 6 April 1988 a program entitled "The Truth About History and the Position of the Artist" was shown on television in Leningrad. An interview with M. Shatrov in a Leningrad concert hall was taped, and then a roundtable discussion was organized in the TV studio. Six economists and historians discussed Shatrov's play "Farther...Farther...Farther!"—or, more precisely, condemned it—after

they had watched the Shatrov interview on tape along with the Leningrad viewing public. The directors of the program filmed and edited everything in such a way that the social scientists represented "the truth about history" and Shatrov represented "the position of the artist." This program was a perfect illustration of the ridiculous situation of judgment by default, in which scientists condemn literary works in the absence of their authors. Furthermore, it was significant that not one of the scientists was an expert on literature, theatre, or art.

The social scientists in the Leningrad program correctly stressed that all of us should reread V.I. Lenin's works over and over again. I agree completely, but I must add that this also applies to the parts of Lenin's legacy dealing directly with the nature of artistic creativity. Lenin, who was well aware of the uniqueness of artistic creativity, said, quoting L. Feuerbach, that "art does not demand the acknowledgement of its works as *reality*," that in a work of art "the only important thing is the *individual* situation, the analysis of the *characters* and mental processes of *specific* types of individuals."⁴³ Lenin did not deny that "the artist often acts under the influence of feelings which become so strong that they override all other considerations."⁴⁴ I think that much of the criticism of writers and dramatists is a result of the failure to draw distinctions between historical research and works of art.

A society looking ahead, into the future, must have an excellent knowledge of its heritage, so that it will not repeat the mistakes of the past and will know the truth. The vital needs of social truth, moral requisites, and the requirements of social justice necessitate a knowledge of the past. There is no social or moral justification for the avoidance of analyses of the past or the denial of the truth, however painful it might be. If our generation does not do this, our grandchildren will. But when they discover the truth, they will also study our reasons for concealing it.

The next problem I want to discuss is connected with the past lack of correspondence between the true value of various works and their official evaluations. In the last 70 years we have been raised in the tradition of the biased approach. Ballets in the Bolshoy Theatre and plays in the Malyy Theatre are masterpieces. If A. Chakovskiy's novel "The Blockade" wins the Lenin Prize, it is a new masterpiece of worldwide significance (after all, this is what the prize rules say). The most distressing part of our legacy from the period of stagnation is the double standard. In our culture this resulted in an unprecedented gap between the judgments of officials and art critics and the opinions of readers and viewers. Prizes were awarded to some and critics praised others, but the people read, watched, and listened to still others. If I just say the names Iskander, Akhmadulina, Okudzhava, Kim, Mozhayev, Glazunov, and Shilov, you will know what I mean.

One of the most serious shortcomings in the management of culture, a shortcoming which still exists, is its bureaucratization, especially the prohibitions connected with it. Authoritarian methods unavoidably turned into a regimented system of administration and hindered the development of culture. In ideology, culture, and art, it is impossible to order someone to have a certain opinion. Ideological work cannot be performed by individuals who are certain of their own infallibility, who believe that only "those at the top" know the truth and know what the people will "understand" and what they will "not understand."

The fundamental restructuring of the management of cultural processes will necessarily entail democratization. Democratism, faith in the artist, tolerance of the unfamiliar and the new, competence, goodwill, the encouragement of initiative and ingenuity, and the support of talent—these are the cardinal principles of party work in the cultural sphere and the entire spiritual sphere of perestroika. The renunciation of bureaucratic decisionmaking, a creative atmosphere, tolerance, the comparison of different points of view, with no one claiming exclusive rights to the truth, the socialist plurality of opinions, and the restoration of Lenin's principles of cultural policy in their entirety—only these can guarantee the augmentation of culture's role in the perestroika of the social consciousness and the enhancement of the value of the socialist multinational culture.

I also have something to say about current publishing practices. Many articles by literary critics on historical works or works portraying the years of stagnation have been published in the last few years. The names of the critics (Yu. Burtin, A. Nuykin, V. Bondarenko, and several others) are known to everyone, but it is disturbing that all of these articles are "polemic comments." This genre is predominant in our periodicals, and I am afraid that it might be predominant in our publishing practices as well. Where are the analytical articles with sound academic analyses of current issues in culture and the arts and their objectives in light of perestroika and the new way of thinking? Editors of journals, not to mention newspapers, avoid printing analytical works.

Can anyone remember a single newspaper or magazine article this year that discussed the issues of party spirit, national spirit, the creative method, traditions and innovations, or trends in the development of the socialist artistic culture in light of the current atmosphere and with references to contemporary works of art? Is it possible that the February (1988) CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the upcoming party conference do not necessitate a re-examination of these and other theoretical and methodological issues?

I am afraid that if a little-known author takes a scientific manuscript to one of today's publishers, the publisher will feel that the work will be unprofitable under the conditions of economic accountability. I read somewhere that zealous crusaders against alcoholism chopped

down thousands of hectares of grapevines in our country. Will our theoretical thinking, our social sciences, literary scholarship, linguistics, and art history, suffer the same fate as the vineyards under the conditions of the cost-accounting policy in publishing and the emphasis on profit?

V.A. Shishkin (Corresponding Member of USSR Academy of Sciences)—*Theories Must Be Based on Facts*

We heard many uncomplimentary remarks yesterday and today about historical science, and many of them were true. As far as Leningrad's historians are concerned, we all realize that we must do better work so that historical science will take the place it deserves in the spiritual life of our society. Many episodes in Soviet history require thorough investigation with the aid of primary sources and archives, and several of our theories need to be reassessed.

Sometimes, however, people seem to equate history as a science warranting criticism with the society itself and with socialism in the stage during which the science developed, and this leads to incorrect judgments because historical science is probably connected more closely with the superstructure than anything else. I know this from my own experience after writing so many books about the history of the Soviet society: Not one of them was approved immediately; there were always difficulties. This is one of the distinctive features of our work, and the current change in the situation will certainly give us a much better chance to do good work.

Most of the historians in Leningrad, at least the academy and VUZ experts on the history of the USSR, have renounced the old way of thinking—the beliefs of the period of stagnation which some people are trying to renovate today. There is a strong sense of this in the atmosphere of our institute and city. The situation in Leningrad, however, is fairly complex: This process probably has its opponents, and its development will probably entail substantial difficulties.

I am personally always wary of this kind of situation. You know that when a progressive movement takes the lead at a major turning point in history and chooses the right road, people with no direct relationship to the current immediately tag along. Some run around and shout more than the rest, and others stay out of sight, sitting quietly at their desks and working in what might be the old way but looks like a new way. For this reason, we cannot judge whether a person is in favor of perestroika or secretly opposes it by his temperament; only his inner substance can tell us this. A person cannot change. It is inconceivable that a person was good or bad yesterday, before perestroika, and has become a different person today. It is hardly possible that I might have had dissident views and acted accordingly yesterday and then suddenly became a good person during the period

of perestroika. Therefore, we must not confuse words with actions and sincere intentions. We could be misled and not notice the influence of certain private or selfish interests.

I think we cannot say that history arrived here today naked and bare and brought nothing with it. Historians also had a training period which allows them to enter the present day boldly. I am judging by my own group, the Leningrad branch of the Institute of USSR History. More than half of us matured as scientists after the 20th party congress. We were young when we went to the archives and acquired a taste for basing theories on facts instead of basing history on theories. For this reason, the idea that we should start everything over from the beginning and give a young and inexperienced person the right to build new theories and some kind of new historical science is completely wrong.

And as far as our institute's work in the 1960's and the 1970's is concerned, I could cite the two-volume "Okt-yabrskoye vooruzhennoye vosstaniye v Petrograde" [The October Armed Rebellion in Petrograd] of the late 1960's as an example. This was an innovative work for its time, and we cannot be ashamed of it. Our work "Krizis samoderzhaviya v Rossii. 1895-1917 gg." [The Crisis of Autocracy in Russia. 1895-1917], an excellent work based on archives, came out in 1984. We cannot be ashamed of this work. It is innovative in its subject matter, conclusions, and theories. For this reason, it seems to me that we should choose our words more carefully when we say "we have no historical science." This could lead logically to the statement that we have nothing at all. Historical science is part of the fabric of our society, and whatever the society is—bad or good—the science will also be.

We often indulge in journalistic works. There is a real need for them because they are a form of quick response. Some historians cannot do this. Some do not have the talent for this or the audacity. There are discreet people who are not always able to do this. But the historian's function of publishing documents will be of future benefit to the writer and the historian. We are doing this, and we are doing it according to a plan—documents on feudalism, on the Soviet period, and on the partisan movement. More than 10 of our large collections of documents came out in the last 5 years. This seems important to me.

The writers had, they say, "works in reserve," and they are publishing them now. We also had "works in reserve," or works which were not published when they were written. We have several volumes of protocols and documents of the Petrograd Soviet that are almost ready for publication. We have included the first half in our current plan. These are first-class documents connected with the history of October. They are minutes of the Petrograd Soviet's meetings during the period of dual power. Even if the soviet was initially Socialist Revolutionary and Menshevik and even if some of the names in

these documents could not have been mentioned in print earlier, this is living history. This is what we need. We included this work in the plan ourselves, without seeking approval, and I would like to ask the History Department and the party agencies concerned to support us. We have compiled a work on the victims of the blockade of Leningrad. Our historians felt that the figure cited by the state commission (640,000) was too low and learned that more than a million people actually died during the blockade. These figures have never been published. Now they seem to be finding their way into periodicals and soon they will enter literature as well.

I will tell you about my own experience. I began a book, "The Price of Recognition," about the political and economic relations between Western countries and the Soviet Union from 1924 to 1929. I wrote about 10 sheets and then discarded them. I changed the book. I did not mention G. Zinovyev in the book but I did make a reference to the 18th party congress, where he presented the political report of the central committee. I also cited speeches A. Rykov had made when he was chairman of the SNK [Council of People's Commissars], calling them SNK reports and listing the appropriate newspapers and documents in the footnotes. Today I can simply use the names of these people, and there are so many of these in our history. Kh.G. Rakovskiy is quite prominent in the history of our foreign policy of that time. His name should also be reinstated. Therefore, today the important thing is to work now that we have the chance to do so.

I must say a few words about the relationship of history to literature. I agree that the historian should not approach literary genres with a yardstick. They have their own laws, but there is also the principle of historical authenticity and it should be observed in any work of literature. I will not even try to judge such major works as "Doctor Zhivago." This is definitely a special case, but we are encountering so many trashy works of literature which plug up the "gaps" in dubious ways. I once reviewed Ya. Ilyichev's novel "Turkish Caravan." The novel was based on a travel diary M.V. Frunze kept at the end of 1921 and the beginning of 1922 when he went to see Mustapha Kemal in Angora (Ankara). Incidentally, Frunze himself had superb literary credentials. Frunze wrote that the horse he was riding was startled by a camel spitting on the narrow path. According to Frunze, it was quite natural for the horse to start bucking, but the novelist turns this into something like an organized conspiracy against the Soviet delegation. The entire trip is described in this tone, as an unbroken chain of adventures and assassination attempts. I think that this is absolutely worthless from the standpoint of the historian and the writer.

Today the issue of nationality is arousing controversy, and we have not paid enough attention to the problem and the difficulty of solving it. We have a neat progression: from the right of self-determination to a politico-military alliance, to a political and economic alliance, to the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

But what really happened? We ignore the eighth party congress, where Pyatakov and Lenin argued about this. Pyatakov said that the right of nationalities to self-determination was not worth a hollow eggshell. Another factor which also influenced the outcome was the great-power chauvinism of tsarist Russia in the past. After all, our state did not emerge from a vacuum but grew out of tsarist Russia. And this did influence the situation. This might have been the reason for all of the over-reaction, the "Georgian affair," Ordzhonikidze's belligerence, and Dzerzhinskiy's arrogance, which made Lenin say that the non-Russian representatives were more likely to display great-power chauvinism. Chicherin's criticism of Stalin with regard to the national and colonial question just before one of the party congresses was printed in IZVESTIYA. Some of the initial stages in the resolution of the issue of nationality have not been analyzed in depth and are regarded as a simple progression. We must take a look at all of this and see if everything was done correctly or if decisions were made under the influence of leftist communist over-reactions on one side and great-power chauvinism on the other.

A.I. Ovcharenko (World Literature Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences)—*Extremes Are Beginning Not Only To Alarm Us...*

One of the speakers here said that we writers have our concerns and historians have their own field of research and their own sphere of judgments. Of course, he was right. Historians can work without relying on literature, but writers, literary historians, and critics cannot work freely in their own field without a knowledge of the past, without a knowledge of today and yesterday. This is why we in literature have a vital interest in making our exchange of opinions highly productive. This is necessary to us and to the new generation of people growing up today. Above all, it is virtually impossible to move forward if you feel that there is a black hole behind you.

Some of the speakers here said that they present lectures and talked about how difficult this is. I also present lectures, and it is probably no coincidence that mine are always attended by people who do not keep quiet but turn each lecture into a shouting match. For them a work of literature is only an excuse to analyze our past and present. They not only ask about Dmitriy Donskoy, but also about 1905, 1917, 1920, 1925, 1931, and 1937.

Today a student does not read our research. He walks up to my desk and hands me documents (the reports of the 10th, 11th, 12th, and 14th party congresses or the reports of sessions of the Central Executive Committee) and says: "Professor, how do you reconcile what we read in the press today with what these documents say? For example, who in our party substantiated the need for the Shakhty trial or the trial of the Industrial Party?" Or he asks: "How can you relate what you are writing today to the fact that in 1933 there was a terrible famine in our country, millions of people starved to death, and Kirov said: 'What a life. It makes you want to live forever.' He

said this at the 17th party congress when the famine had just ended and all of the bodies had not even been buried yet." Students also ask what we have been doing for the last 35 years, how we lived, what we built, and what kind of society we created. Was it the society people had been dreaming of?

I think that this question must be answered clearly and precisely. And if we spend another year or two or three finding an answer, we will raise a generation with no idea of what it will tell the next generation.... We have been living under the conditions of perestroika for more than 3 years and we cannot answer the most important questions—that is, today we have one answer, but tomorrow 5 or 10 magazines and newspapers will say something else: Everything we did was a deformity; we have no history and we do not know our history; and even if we have a history, it is the most falsified history in the world.

People have the right to express all of these opinions and discuss them today, but we must choose some kind of objective criteria in our life. Here, it seems to me, we should not display what Marx once called "the excesses of Tamerlane." Sixty years ago our great writer L. Leonov wrote a novel, "The Thief," which still is not really understood. This was a cautionary novel. Leonov was saying that if we forget even the slightest thing about our past, this will cause the gravest injuries in the soul of an individual, a generation, the entire population, and perhaps even all mankind. He was saying that we were planning to build a world superior in the spiritual sense but would not forget any part of our spiritual heritage. Today we must take great care not to lose or forget anything.

I would rather not say anything about disputes and arguments today. Yesterday there was an argument about LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, and someone said that there was nothing good about it. But let us frankly admit that the circulation figures of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA rose during the years of stagnation, and they did not rise because it supported this stagnation, but apparently because it had more to say about subjects which were not discussed in other newspapers and magazines. There are mistakes and omissions, but let us try to look at everything objectively. Yesterday someone else said in a sarcastic tone that people were looking back to the period before perestroika to find the initiator of perestroika. I believe that we launched great artistic satellites in the last 20 years—the works of Rasputin, Astafyev, Trifonov, and Belov, works which aroused public interest throughout the world. And after all, this did not happen because they were part of the period of stagnation, but because they were paving the way for the perestroika we are witnessing and trying to accomplish today.

I think we cannot write any works of literature reflecting our history accurately unless we get the necessary support from historians, unless they give us some genuine

points of reference: Was Sholokhov's portrayal of collectivization in "The Virgin Soil Uplifted" biased or not? I think that the work can be disputed, but I do not think that "The Virgin Soil Uplifted" is nullified by A. Platonov's "Chevengur." It is not surprising that Gorkiy had many positive things to say about the two authors after he had read these works. Life is so full of variety, and Sholokhov described some aspects while Platonov described others. It was the duty of politicians to consider both tendencies when they made political decisions on collectivization. Only historians can give us a firm basis for an understanding of these matters.

They say that there are two ideas of socialism in our society. In this case as well, we have fallen into the historians' trap. I also tried to study these matters and I counted five models of socialism which were proposed in our society. There was not only Bukharin's model, which is being publicized today. There was also Trotsky's model, which was different from Bukharin's. There was Zinovyev's model. There was Stalin's model. And there was what we must assume was the most authentic model, Lenin's model, a model differing from all the rest. After thoroughly analyzing this matter, we can stop dividing our literature into two categories and talking about the two trends in our literature—one obsequiously serving policy and another connected with the objective portrayal of reality, but sometimes contrary to policy. Literature suffered terrible losses because of this second tendency. But after all, our literature included "And Quiet Flows the Don," "The Life of Klim Samgin," and many other such works, right up to A. Malyshev's "People from the Backwoods."

We have scholars to whom we turn for advice and assistance. I would like to ask them to be completely objective in the interpretation and transmission of documents. Only objective narratives and studies of historical reality can ensure the success of historians and writers. The extremes we are seeing today, however, are beginning not only to alarm us but also to oppress us. If we cannot tell our people the truth about history and have to substitute renovated lies, this could have catastrophic effects.

The students who ask us questions today are certain that we will give them absolutely precise historical facts and tell them the real truth about our life. I think that we must satisfy their requests. Furthermore, we must satisfy it with absolute scientific impartiality. If they discover later that everything was quite different or even just slightly different, they will never believe us again. Only the strictest observance of the principle of historical authenticity can bring us the success we are hoping for, the hope which brought us all together here today.

Yu.L. Prokushev (Writer)—*Nothing But the Truth!*

It is good that historians and writers have gathered together here. Let us have many such meetings in the future. In addition to other things, they will help all of us

acquire the skill of scientific debate and discussion, because the main thing is the search for the facts, for the objective truth. Some of our arguments today have taken forms which we hope will gradually become obsolete. I am referring to the excessively irritable tone of the argument between Yu.G. Burtin and A.B. Chakovskiy. The first arrogantly said that some writers had the moral right to sign the letter in support of the PRAVDA editorial, while others did not have this right because they were "responsible" for the stagnant period in literature and simply could not have undergone restructuring so quickly, and that LITERATURNAYA GAZETA had promoted stagnation in literature and in life itself in the past. The second was justified in objecting to the essentially biased remarks about LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, but he also "crossed the line" in the argument.

Burtin, to put it mildly, is not quite right about the main thing: The letter to PRAVDA from the Union of Writers of the USSR was signed only by the members of its secretariat. If we begin arguing about which of them had the right to do this and which did not, this is hardly likely to assist us in our search for the truth. It seems to me that when we look back into our past and try to assess it objectively in the spirit of glasnost and perestroika, we are sometimes inclined to throw the baby out with the bath water and we occasionally replace one half-truth with another, either in the heat of an argument, or in a race for "sensational" discoveries, or in the hope of sounding "super-audacious." Do I have to remind you of the sad consequences of this kind of behavior in the past and of the threat it poses to our present and future?

During the course of perestroika all of us must strive for the objective truth and the exclusion of all half-truths from historical science and from literary scholarship. Our history is something that did happen, and it is important to portray it truthfully, with all of its sorrow, with all of its tragedies and repression, with its cult of personality, and with the indisputable labor and martial feats of the people. Everything that made the journey of our pioneers so difficult must be revealed honestly and dialectically. Our socialist nation and our people experienced many tragedies on this journey. It would be unethical for historians and for writers to conceal mistakes or avoid discussing them, especially now, at a time of perestroika. I think our propaganda and we—writers, historians, and economists—are doing something very wrong when we do not discuss unavoidable difficulties and unjustifiable losses "as loudly as possible."

We have written much, and with good reason, about the struggle for peace and about the peaceful sky over our motherland for more than 40 years. But we have said so much less about how much this clear sky "costs" in terms of huge quantities of material and human resources, advanced technology, scarce raw materials, and scientific potential, what kind of objective and tangible difficulties it entails, how much our people have to pay for just a single missile, a single modern military

airplane, and a single submarine, how much strength and energy we send into the army, and how all of this affects our economic development. For this reason, I am convinced that the tendency to view our journey, the 70 years since October, only as an unbroken chain of mistakes and misconceptions, without noticing the main thing, the constructive power of the people and socialism, is historically unfair and somehow immoral.

As far as the history of literature is concerned, it seems to me that some of the speakers here expressed the controversial, to put it mildly, opinion that we had a strictly "servile" literature and an "independent" literature. Statements like this again reveal the kind of extremes that obscure the truth. After all, a real artist always serves his people, or, to put it more precisely, he is the voice and the conscience of the people.

Some current works were discussed here: Rybakov's "Children of the Arbat" and Shatrov's plays. Some praise them and defend them in our press while others do their best to nullify them. I think that in this argument the truth lies somewhere in between. The author of "Children of the Arbat" was one of the first during the course of perestroika to write a novel about the cult of personality and to talk about how it came into being. It seems as though he was in a hurry to describe the experiences and the fate of his young hero, Sasha Pankratov, in the years when Stalin's cult was just beginning, and he does not always keep the narrative on a high artistic level or delve deeply into the historical events of those years. It would be impossible, however, to examine the cult of personality from all sides, artistically and philosophically, and in the broad historical context, without a description of epic scope of the events of that era and without a dialectical portrayal of the inner life of the people during those heroic and tragic years.

Someone said that Shatrov "simply" puts his plays together: He takes documents, including the records of party congresses and conferences, cuts them up with scissors, and pastes them together. This is another extreme! Shatrov's plays are of the documentary genre, and it has its own rules. In these plays the events almost always revolve around the document itself, and it becomes the main "hero," especially if it contains important information previously unknown to the reader and viewer, and this arouses legitimate interest. The weak point in almost every documentary play, however, is the absence of clearly individualized characters, heroes with an inimitable "spiritual dialectic" and eloquent speeches. For this reason, the opinion that Shatrov's plays about Lenin are highly artistic dramas and almost the height of international Leniniana is another extreme which is far from the truth.

Some books and authors are discussed extensively by critics, they are highly visible, and they are sought out by readers; other books and their authors are not pampered by the press and television, and the reader does not always hear about them in time. Besides this, even

during the period of stagnation, and not just now, there were new books based "completely on fact," however bitter or dramatic the facts might have been at times. In 1970 I established the Sovremennik Publishing House for Russian writers and then headed it for more than 8 years. Some speakers here mentioned V. Belov's novel "Eves." It was first published by Sovremennik. Was it easy to get it approved? No. I remember how happy B. Mozhayev was when Sovremennik published a separate edition of his novella "Alive" ("Fedor Kuzkin"). The same publishing house later published the first part of Mozhayev's "Peasant Men and Women." I also want to remind you of Ye. Nosov's "Banks," V. Rasputin's "Live and Remember," I. Akulov's "Kasyan Ostudnyy," K. Simonov's collected verses "Vietnam Diary," V. Tendryakov's novel "The End," A. Ivanov's novella "Hatred," V. Sorokin's book of poems "Fire," F. Abramov's novels "The Pryaslins" and "Home," V. Fedorov's poem "The Marriage of Don Juan," a book of poems by B. Pasternak, and V. Shishkin's book of short stories "Characters"—all of these works were published by Sovremennik in the 1970's.

I could continue the list of examples. Sometimes we had the feeling in the publishing house that "someone" "somewhere" was displeased. But literature lived. Truthful books were published, by Sovremennik and other publishing houses, and they were printed in journals. It is important to take all of this into account in our current discussions of the history of Soviet literature so that we will not go to extremes. Today Gorkiy, Mayakovskiy, Yesenin, and Sholokhov are being threatened. Who needs this and why? Mayakovskiy has probably received the worst treatment. In the inflamed imaginations of the pseudo-activists of perestroika, it appears that the poet almost paved the way for the cult of personality and the repression with his verses! These "activists of perestroika" have not forgotten Yesenin either: They are repeating the old legends about his "non-acceptance" of the new revolutionary reality, his scandalous behavior, and his "nationalism."

The unethical statements made by L. Sosnovskiy, A. Kruchenykh, and some other writers to desecrate the memory of Yesenin once contributed much to the birth of these legends. But in this respect we "owe" more to N.I. Bukharin than to anyone else. Let us recall his notorious "Angry Remarks," first printed in PRAVDA in 1927 and then in a separate brochure the same year. It is hard to believe that the person he refers to is a genuine national poet of Russia. Here are just a few lines from the work: "Ideologically, Yesenin represents the most negative features of the Russian village and the so-called 'national character': a bully with no self-discipline whatsoever who idolizes the most backward forms of social life."⁴⁵ The "Angry Remarks" served their purpose. In accordance with their author's wishes and under the banner of struggle against "Yeseninism," the poet's verses were torn away from the people, almost by force, for a long time. I will remind you that the author of "Angry Remarks" was a member of the Politburo of the

Central Committee of the VKP(b) and the editor-in-chief of PRAVDA at that time, and people in the party and the country paid attention to his opinions then. Obviously, in this case and later, in the biased and essentially negative assessment of Mayakovskiy in the report on poetry at the first congress of Soviet writers, Bukharin lacked a truly scientific Marxist understanding of the complex and contradictory developments of revolutionary reality and its reflection in literature. It was dogmatic thinking, undialectical view of the situation, and the "incomplete understanding of dialectics"⁴⁶ which V.I. Lenin wrote about in reference to Bukharin, that kept the latter from understanding and appreciating Yesenin's creative legacy. Bukharin "overlooked" the main thing: The poet's works were an artistic reflection of the era of the October Revolution with all of the objectively unavoidable conflicts and contradictions of that time, even if he did reflect it in his own way, "with a peasant bias."

Someone might ask whether it is worthwhile to stir up the past. After all, Bukharin suffered himself later and has now been vindicated posthumously. But what about the historical truth, the whole and objective truth? Or should we tell half the truth again, forgetting about the mistakes in Bukharin's literary legacy because it was too long ago, pretending that "Angry Remarks" never existed, or, if worse comes to worst, "writing it all off" as the result of his passions and "enthusiasm"? Half-truths, which are sometimes worse than lies, have cost us too much in irreparable moral damages and losses to confine our efforts to restore the whole political truth, including the truth about those who once suffered undeservedly, simply to finding new half-truths, even with the "best" intentions.

Some speakers said that the reports could have been more substantive and analytical. But I think they did reflect the state of affairs and the level of our science of history and literary history today. Taking advantage of the presence of administrators of the USSR Academy of Sciences here, I want to repeat what I said at the last plenum of the Writers' Union about the "elder brother." It is wonderful that, with his help, all of the union republics now have their own academies of sciences, but it is very sad that the Russian Federation does not have this kind of academy yet. I would also like to make a few specific suggestions. It is wonderful that multi-volume encyclopedias on almost all of the republics have been published, but why do we not think the time has come to have an encyclopedia on Soviet Russia? It is time to publish, as quickly as possible, encyclopedic dictionaries with completely unbiased descriptions of all those who restored our memory. Historians and writers could publish a journal for the "junior historian." Meetings and conversations with prominent writers and historians should be televised so that we can begin the broad-scale historical education and indoctrination of our people, especially youth.

K.I. Varlamov (CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences)—*We Must Strengthen the Revolutionary Spirit of the People*

We have gathered here to find ways of influencing perestroika, the attitudes of people, and the public mood.

I had to go to Kuybyshev in October, and I addressed a meeting of the Komsomol aktiv there. The meeting was attended by the first secretaries of raykoms in Kuybyshev Oblast. Here is what we did: We took the most famous works capable of causing reversals in the social consciousness. These were not only "Children of the Arbat," or "White Clothes," or Astafyev's works, but the most interesting works, about which so many interesting things have been said today. During the lecture I would ask: "All of you are raykom secretaries, leaders, and pacesetters, and you are expected to set an example for youth. Who has read these works?" One or two hands were raised. This was the case with each work.

It seems to us that we have already vulcanized the society and have turned everything around. This was discussed here by F.F. Kuznetsov. I do not think we should flatter ourselves. NOVYY MIR, a magazine read by the intelligentsia, is being printed in over a million copies, but the ideas discussed in this magazine are still not reaching millions of people. We have been told that perestroika has already become a national cause, but I have here a resolution of the Moscow party gorkom buro (on one of the neighborhoods in the capital), and it says that perestroika has not reached labor collectives, has not reached shops, etc. This is still an objective, but we are asserting that the matter has been settled.

Today someone here asked what has changed in the last 3 years. In his opinion, nothing has happened. This is not true. There have been changes in our way of thinking, the tone of our discussions, and our attitude toward life, the intelligentsia is waking up, and its conspiracy of silence has been broken. Anyone who denies this is completely blind and cannot see anything.

Today I conducted a seminar for party obkom section chiefs and secretaries. The topic was "The Leninist Ideological Heritage and Perestroika." The discussion was quite turbulent. One of the people who attended the discussion group was AUCCTU Secretary L.B. Kazakov, who headed a brigade of concrete workers just 2 years ago. He grew up without parents and was awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labor on the Baykal-Amur trunkline project. We were arguing about perestroika and asking when the trade union would become a genuine organization of the masses. The comrades at the seminar said: "You, Leonid Davidovich, are in danger of turning into a union bureaucrat."

History is not the only thing worrying people today. It would be wrong to say so. People are concerned about something else: They do not want anything negative to recur, and they do want their life to be better.

We should address workers' meetings more often. I know many professors who are afraid to do this because they have forgotten how to talk to the working class. When I spoke at the motor vehicle plant in Togliatti, one worker asked me: "Tell me, if something happens to M.S. Gorbachev, will they put another ogre in charge?" This question tells us two things. First, that people trust Gorbachev and associate their hopes for a better future with him; second, that they are quite anxious. We talk to them about the socialist self-government of the people and so forth, but they respond by asking anxious questions about the next person who will be "put in charge of them."

How can we influence the course of perestroika? Some are influencing it by producing more coal and oil. How can historians and writers influence it? There is a way. The main thing the party wants us to do is to strengthen the spirit of the people. This is our main function.

Our colleagues from the Academy of Social Sciences know that the word "spirit" has lost its meaning in our society and we sometimes do not know what it means. We do not have a single work on this topic, with the exception of Hegel's "Phenomenology of Spirit." I must also tell you that if you look at Hegel's work, you will see that it is based completely on history, on the belief that its absolute ideal and absolute spirit will be embodied in reality. Our dictionaries define spirit as the social consciousness, but after all, Lenin did not write that the proletarian struggle is inspired by the social consciousness of the "Communist Manifesto," but that the life and struggle of the proletariat of the entire civilized world are inspired by the spirit of the "Communist Manifesto." What is this spirit? I do not know if you will agree, but it is probably the particular sphere of the social consciousness that is connected with human hopes, plans, and faith.

When Lenin began his revolutionary activity, L.N. Tolstoy, to whom we have referred so frequently today, wrote a strong and accurate defense of faith. He wrote that if Russia should lose its faith, it would turn into a kingdom of money, vodka, and degeneracy. I am often told that Tolstoy was writing about religion, but he approaches it in a slightly different way than we might expect. The church excommunicated him. He did not believe in organized religion but he did have a firm belief in the strength of the people, and he had his own theories about faith and about our history.

What are we historians, poets, writers, and scholars lacking today? The ability to argue and conduct a scientific dialogue. I do not think we have mastered the skill of balanced dialogue. People talk about plurality, but what kind of plurality, what kind of profusion of ideas?

After all, there can be a profusion of ideas, but there is always only one truth. A plurality of truths does not and cannot exist. If it does, then there is no truth and the truth does not exist. What we must do now is not insult one another, but seek what can really be called the truth.

The art of polemics presupposes relentless tolerance, but we have not seen it today, even though this is a gathering of intelligent people. Even the chief editor of *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* could not restrain himself! When will we learn to speak to one another politely? Can this be called polemics? When Ye.A. Ambartsumov (an extremely interesting man whose articles I always read with great pleasure) spoke, he said that everyone was guilty. Someone recalled Golik from the Academy of Social Sciences. It has been so long that I do not even remember when he worked for us, and circumstances forced all of us to write in a different way in those bygone days anyway. Or take even S.P. Trapeznikov: I had to put up with so much from him, but I still feel that this is not our main area of concern today, it is not a matter of fundamental importance.

And of course, without doubts there can be no search for the truth. Today we must teach people to doubt; otherwise, the truth will be conquered by emotions.

P.N. Fedoseyev—*Concluding Speech*

All of our speakers had their own way of speaking and said things differently, but in general they were talking about the same thing: What perestroika means, what scientists and writers are expected to do, and what we should do for the revolutionary renewal of society. We have agreed that there are different judgments, areas of emphasis, and opinions in different areas, and we have gathered here not for the purpose of standardizing them, but to exchange our views in an open and frank discussion.

Two days ago members of the party committee of the USSR Academy of Sciences received some representatives of "Monument," an unofficial association. This fairly large group of researchers from various scientific establishments wants to erect a monument to the victims of repression. They said they decided to call their organization "Monument" because they expect the erection of a monument to erect a barrier between the unlawful acts committed in the past and the new era in which these acts should not and will not be committed. All of them stressed that the future of the country will depend on perestroika and that its renunciation or disruption would be disastrous. The monument would symbolize the irreversibility of the perestroika process. This is what these young people think.

It is true that perestroika marks the beginning of a new phase in history, and it is understandable that at this conference we have subjected the state of our social sciences to extremely serious and pointed criticism and have agreed to analyze our problems and the perestroika

in general in greater depth. This was the main thing, but I would still like to remind you that we have a solid foundation for the renovation and construction of social life, and its main elements are Leninism and the socialism we have built. There were deformities, there were distortions of socialist principles, there were additions to theory, and there were dogmatic precepts, but there was also Leninism, the party remained the guiding force, and socialism was built. And when we say we need more socialism, this means that the sociopolitical order we have established must be improved, renovated, and enriched with humanitarian content as part of the perestroika process.

I have a few things to say about historical science in this context. The state of this science was severely but justly criticized here. This criticism also applies to other social sciences: philosophy, economics, jurisprudence, etc. But when we criticize ourselves and our literature, we must nevertheless remember that formative processes, the accumulation and analysis of knowledge, continued. This is particularly true of Soviet literature. Pain and anxiety about the present and the future were alive in this literature even in the years of stagnation. It is true that books with major flaws, primitive ideas, and substantial defects were published and that many meaningful works were not published. On the whole, however, the socialist literature of the years of Soviet rule has been rich and varied.

As far as history is concerned, I agree completely that the facts of history, of real life in the 20th century, especially the Soviet period, were greatly distorted and suffered from gaping holes. But the Marxist theory of the historical process as a whole, of world and national history, was created and developed by many generations. There are many flaws and distortions in our historical science, and our writers have justifiably criticized historians for their failure to lay a solid foundation of knowledge, especially with regard to the Soviet period, and for all of the confusion and distortion they fomented. Nevertheless, it was Soviet science that substantiated the materialistic interpretation of history. Some of the people who did this were historians whose names and works were banned or forgotten. We must republish many of their works and the works of those who continued to move in the right direction but could not publish their findings. Therefore, we do have a foundation for our work, and there is a great deal of work to be done. We must not confine ourselves to mere words, exhortations, and appeals, but must reinforce our materialistic theory of history with real facts, real documents, and real meaning.

I must say something about a few fundamental questions. Above all, what is literature? What is art? Is this a matter of observation or ideology? This is how the question was formulated here. I must say that I do not see any special contradiction here. Science, art, and literature are reflections of reality. Different works of art reflect reality in different ways, sometimes objectively, sometimes comprehensively, sometimes partially, and

sometimes inaccurately. This means that literature and art do not have to be identified completely with scientific knowledge. Although science and literature have the same essential purpose—observations of the world and the individual—science, especially the social sciences, and art can and should have an ideological side. And we cannot contrast ideology to art. We evaluate works of art from the standpoint of artistic criteria and of ideological or class positions.

This brings us to the questions about socialist realism in literature and art. People here implied that socialist realism was used, in much the same way as Lysenko's methods, to the detriment of art. Literary experts tell me that some people believe socialist realism is something like Lysenkoism. They say that works of high value and quality were destroyed in its name. I think this line of reasoning is faulty. After all, Lysenko tried to pass his pseudo-doctrine off as a creative development of Darwin's theory. But what does Darwin's theory have to do with it? We know that Lysenko tried to pervert and subvert biology, but the fact that he made references to Darwin and his theory does not implicate Darwin or his theory at all. The same is true of socialist realism. If someone brandished a club in the name of socialist realism and railed against works of literature, socialist realism is not to blame. We regard M. Gorkiy as the founder of the literature of socialist realism, we respect him as one of our great classics and our national pride, and there does not appear to be any reason to depart from his tradition.

Why did the Revolutionary Democrats of the last century call literature realistic? The term "realistic criticism" was coined by N.A. Dobrolyubov. Realism and realistic criticism presupposed the correspondence and comparison of the work of art to reality. This did not offend or discredit anyone then. And socialist realism is an artistic current which needs serious elaboration and embodiment in literature and art. Some people ask whether or not it is a method. This is being disputed today, and the matter needs discussion. Method is essential in science. Science cannot be productive without a method. The method is a group of basic principles, and the scientist is strictly guided by them, even though he is not always conscious of this. Deviation from the method leads to failure.

Artists are somewhat wary of the very term "method," as if it implies a prescribed set of composition procedures or writing instructions. The term itself might need discussion, but this is not the main thing. I believe that socialist realism is the specific purpose, specific outlook, and specific philosophy of the writer with socialist convictions. There are no writers or artists without a specific philosophy, purpose, and outlook. The term used to define socialist realism may need discussion, but there is no reason to discard socialist realism on the pretext that someone once attacked good works of art in its name.

The objective and subjective factors giving rise to the cult of personality have been the subject of much discussion. They reveal different tendencies. Some authors feel it is all a matter of Stalin's political treachery and hypocrisy, his reliance on terror, and the crudity, impatience, and authoritarian inclinations V.I. Lenin mentioned in his letters. Others put the emphasis on objective conditions and regard them as something just short of a global historical pattern. This also requires closer investigation and more thorough analysis. There were objective circumstances and subjective peculiarities and inclinations. The way in which the short biography of Stalin was composed provides some idea of the role he played in the creation and reinforcement of his own cult of personality.

At the beginning of 1947 Stalin called a group of scholars together and said that it was certainly necessary to study the classics, but so many volumes had already been published and not every individual could read so many books. Biographies of Marx, Engels, and Lenin would have to be written. He did not mention himself, of course, but in a day or two we were officially informed that biographies of the classics, including Stalin, were needed. Within 3 or 4 days we were already being asked how the work on his biography was going. We quickly put together a team of writers, and within a few days we sent the first draft to Stalin. He sent for the group of scholars again for a stern reprimand: "The narrative is almost Socialist Revolutionary, it is too subjective. What have you written here: Stalin did this, Stalin did that, Stalin did just about everything. And if Stalin dies, what will you do?" The scholars said: "We will make the necessary corrections with a view to your comments." He replied: "No one knows what you might do. I will try to do it myself." Our draft was returned to us 3 or 4 days later. It was basically the same, but it did contain about 20 new sentences which we found absolutely astonishing.

Someone here, at the conference, said that the biography defined Stalin as "the great commander of all eras and peoples." It is true the biography says this, but he wrote this himself, just as he wrote many other sentences, including one justifying his lawlessness. Here, for example, is something he added to the biography: "It should be considered one of Comrade Stalin's great services to the motherland that he was able to select, train, and promote the new military leaders of the Patriotic War who carried the entire burden of the war with Germany and its allies." He realized that people would remember the obliteration of the former Soviet military leadership, and this is why he included this sentence. Something was also said here about the high price of our victory, and he realized this too, and this is why he wrote: "Comrade Stalin deduced and thwarted the enemy's plans with brilliant insight. The battles in which Comrade Stalin commanded the Soviet troops were outstanding examples of the tactical art of warfare." These examples provide enough evidence of the role Stalin played in his own glorification and the creation of his cult of personality. The same can be said of the film "Victory," the one

in which Stalin emerges from the airplane in Berlin looking like God Almighty, emanating radiant beams of light, and is met by a crowd of worshipping admirers.

There is one other matter. Andreyeva's article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA accuses an academy philosopher of abandoning his class position because he said that peaceful coexistence cannot be interpreted as a form of class struggle. It is true that on 8 January this year, at a CPSU Central Committee conference of mass media personnel, I said that the interpretation of peaceful coexistence as a form of class struggle is inaccurate, that it is not included in the new edition of the CPSU Program, and that this has given our foreign policy, the policy of peace and public security, new momentum and flexibility. The author of the article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA rebuked me for writing something else several decades ago. But in my report I had already explained why we upheld and publicized this interpretation earlier and why we believe it is inappropriate today.

Of course, the peaceful coexistence of states and the priority of general human interests in world affairs do not preclude class struggle and national liberation struggle in the non-socialist world. There are still deep-seated socioeconomic differences between the two world systems. Ideological confrontation has not been curtailed, and sometimes it is even exacerbated. The class approach to international relations is the alpha and omega of Marxism, but we must draw clear distinctions between peaceful coexistence, "cold war," politico-military confrontation based on an arms race, intervention, and war. These are all forms of intergovernmental relations. And they must not be confused with one another!

In the opinion of most of the people here, this conference has been helpful in general. Of course, some people expressed dissatisfaction with the reports and some of the speeches, various emotions were expressed, and there were polemic attacks as well as responses to them. All of this happens at every conference.

On the whole, the organizers of the conference are pleased that we have begun the important and useful process of cooperation by writers, historians, literary historians, and literary critics. We hope that this good work will be continued in the same constructive spirit in which we began it.

Footnotes

1. PRAVDA, 10 April 1988.
2. N.M. Karamzin, "Predaniye vekov," Moscow, 1987, p 28.
3. V.I. Lenin, "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 27, pp 195-196.
4. Ibid., vol 47, p 219.
5. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 18, p 57; vol 17, p 5.
6. Ibid., vol 17, p 553.
7. PRAVDA, 22 January 1953.
8. V.I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 26, pp 107-108.
9. PRAVDA, 19 February 1988.
10. V.I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 39, p 67.
11. "K. Marx and F. Engels on Art," vol 1, Moscow, 1976, p 23.
12. G.L. Smirnov, "Revolutsionnaya sut perestroyki" [Revolutionary Essence of Perestroyka], Moscow, 1987, p 210.
13. NASH SOVREMENNİK, 1988, No 4.
14. MOSKVA, 1988, No 4.
15. LITERATURNOYE OBOZRENIYE, 1988, No 3, p 18.
16. VOPROSY LITERATURY, 1987, No 12.
17. Ibid., 1988, No 3, p 18.
18. PRAVDA, 10 April 1988.
19. K. Marx and F. Engels, Op. cit., vol 12, p 736.
20. I.V. Stalin, "Soch." [Works], vol 10, Moscow, 1952, pp 196-197.
21. Ibid., pp 255-256.
22. Ibid., p 259.
23. Ibid., vol 11, p 15.
24. Ibid., p 320.
25. Ibid., vol 13, p 325.
26. Ibid., vol 12, p 299.
27. Ibid., vol 11, pp 176-177.
28. Ibid., vol 10, p 43.
29. V.I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 36, p 476.
30. PRAVDA, 15 July 1987.
31. This is most likely LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's error.

32. V.I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 11, p 328.
33. Ibid., vol 20, p 19.
34. Ibid., vol 1, p 436.
35. M.S. Gorbachev, "Izbrannyye rechi i statyi" [Selected Speeches and Articles], Moscow, 1985, p 223.
36. PRAVDA, 8 October 1965.
37. Ibid., 30 January 1966.
38. I.V. Stalin, Op. cit., vol 13, pp 89-101.
39. Ibid., pp 69-72.
40. M.N. Smit, "Teoriya i praktika soverskoy statistiki. Sb. st." [Theory and Practice of Soviet Statistics. Collected Articles], 2d ed., Moscow-Leningrad, 1931, p 5.
41. "Protiv istoricheskoy kontseptsii M.N. Pokrovskogo. Sb. st." [Arguments Against M.N. Pokrovskiy's Theory of History. Collected Articles], pt 1, Moscow-Leningrad, 1939, p 9.
42. "The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences, and Plenums of the Central Committee," 7th ed., Moscow, 1954, pt III, p 316.
43. V.I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 29, p 53; vol 49, p 57.
44. Ibid., vol 26, p 96.
45. N.I. Bukharin, "Zlyye zametki" [Angry Remarks], Moscow, 1927, p 9.
46. V.I. Lenin, Op. cit., vol 45, p 345.
- COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda." "Voprosy istorii." 1988.
- 8588

'Disillusionment' of Soviet Jewish Emigres with Israel Described

18000013 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 17, 19, 21 Aug 88 p 3

[Serialized article by S. Sandler under the "Returning from Far-Off Lands" rubric: "A Trip to Israel"]

[17 Aug 88, p 3]

[Text] *The author of these lines recently visited Israel as a member of a delegation of the Soviet Society for Friendship and Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries (SSOD). Since 1971 such delegations have been making annual visits, by invitation of the Israel-USSR Friendship Movement, to take part in meetings dedicated to the Day of Victory over Fascist Germany.*

It was 10:00 PM, 12 May 1988. The Romanian airliner landed at David Ben Gurion Airport in Lod. We exit the airplane and find ourselves in unbelievable heat. The Khamsin—a dry wind which blows in early summer off the Arabian desert—heats the air to over 40 degrees. Those who met us told us later that there had not been such a heat wave for over 50 years. "Most likely you've brought it with you from Siberia," they joked.

We go through visa and passport check, and customs inspection. Most of the Soviet citizens who arrived with us came to visit relatives who have taken up permanent residence in Israel. We had learned in the waiting room at the Bucharest airport that there were among the passengers two families of new emigrants—"Olim," who had chosen Israel as their permanent place of residence. I ask, "Is it really true that only two families received visas from OVIR for travel to Israel?" "No," replies the head of one family. "There were in addition several dozen people with us at the Netherlands Embassy. We were told that over 100 people had received visas. But the remainder chose to travel via Vienna, and from there they would set out for Canada, or to the USA, or to Austria or somewhere else." (Owing to the lack of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel, the interests of the latter are represented in Moscow by the Netherlands Embassy.)

And so, two families to Israel, and the rest to wherever they could, only not to Israel. According to the latest figures, they currently comprise 90-95 percent of those departing.

I was soon convinced that the question of the so-called "neshirim" (literally, those who "fall away" from emigrants to Israel) is one of the most topical and painful questions, and is regularly debated in the Knesset, Israel's parliament, on radio and TV, and in the Israeli newspapers. Subsequently, we too shall attempt to answer this question.

But for now, we are in the midst of the joyfully excited crowd of people greeting their relatives. Exclamations, hugs, kisses, tears, noise and commotion—all one would expect after long years of separation.

We were met by representatives of the Israel-USSR Friendship Movement and by the omnipresent correspondents. Right then and there we held the first press conference, and...there was not a single question about the "persecution" of the so-called "refuseniks," about the "prisoners of Zion," and the obstacles which allegedly held up their departing the USSR for Israel. Yes, it was a surprise, inasmuch as previously any representative of Soviet society at all was attacked abroad with just such questions. I must note that subsequently, for the duration of our stay in Israel, no one raised the question of the "refuseniks" at any time. On the other hand, at this press conference, as incidentally in subsequent conferences, there were endless questions concerning the prospects of restoring diplomatic relations between Israel and the Soviet Union.

Responding to questions from the correspondents, the leader of our delegation, Vasiliy Pavlovich Osnach, a deputy of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, recalled the causes leading up to the break in diplomatic relations in 1967, and on the numerous statements by the Soviet leadership about the fact that Israel's decision to take part in the International Conference on the Near East could open the way to the establishment of normal relations between Israel and the USSR. In their dispatches, the journalists placed special emphasis on the words of the leader of our delegation, which refuted the slanderous falsifications about the alleged "principally hostile attitude of the USSR toward Israel and toward the Israeli people." "The leader of the delegation," wrote the newspaper AL-GAMISHMAR on 13 May, "stated that the Soviet Union had voted in favor of the creation of the State of Israel in 1947, just as it voted for the creation of an Arab State of Palestine, and it has not changed its attitude to this day."

It's not easy to tear ourselves away from the surrounding correspondents. They continue to ask questions, make recordings, and take photos. As I look on I'm thinking that our OVIR's certainly acted properly: in one stroke they removed all pretext for the various big talkers who hold forth about the "refuseniks" and the "prisoners of Zion." For now it turns out that those wishing to emigrate to Israel are not so numerous, and they are not even coming here. And the Israeli public is more interested in important things, questions of vital importance to them, such as peaceful resolution of the chronic and dangerous Arab-Israeli conflict, which is fraught with such bloody consequences.

The press conference is over. Accompanied by representatives of the Israel-USSR Society, we drive to Tel Aviv. Along the way we pass through the ancient city of Jaffa. Until recent times Jaffa had been mostly an Arab city, while Tel Aviv sprang up early in this century as its

suburb. At the present time, following the expulsion of a significant portion of the Arab population from Jaffa, both cities have blended together. Currently over 300,000 people are living here.

On the morning of 13 May we drive to the Dead Sea to rest before traveling about the country. On the streets the Khamsin holds sway, and the temperature is 43-44 degrees in the shade. The warning is issued on the radio and in the press: "Drink at least 15-20 glasses of liquids per day! Do not allow your body to become dehydrated!" And we drink. Water, juices, and chilled beverages. The busses, as almost everywhere else—taxis and establishments, and the more substantial houses—are air-conditioned. Here they are an absolute necessity. But, as we soon became convinced, in the suburbs, which are populated by immigrants from the Asian and African countries, by Moroccan, and quite often by "Russian" Jews, air conditioners are not such an accessible luxury item; to say nothing about Arab farmers and workers.

We drive past Jerusalem to the south along a wide modern road. The main highways here are maintained in exemplary condition; after all, these are roads for military purposes. And the country has been in a state of heightened mobilization readiness for 40 years now. During this time there were wars in 1948, 1953, 1967, 1973, and 1982. Even now, with the participation of the Israeli Army, the flames of war are licking at neighboring Lebanon and the Bekaah Valley. And in the intervals between the "larger" wars there are ceaseless armed clashes, military actions for suppressing uprisings in the occupied territories, and preparations for the next militaristic adventure. War, war and more war... The dead, the wounded, the missing... The huge military industry, the billions for arms, the universal military obligation for men and women; the annual month-long and two-month assemblies for all reservists; the huge expenditures for establishing special militarized settlements for young people in the border regions; the "Nakhal" settlements; the "Gadna" paramilitary organizations for young men and women ages 14-18—all of which creates a special climate of continuous alert and tension, which like a malignant cancer hangs over the heads of the populace and clouds the life of all citizens regardless of their nationality, religious or class membership. O roads, roads: Where are you leading us?

Two-and-a-half hours later we drive up to the Dead Sea. All around is sand and sun-baked desert. We drive by the Ein Gedi oasis. According to Biblical tales, it was right here that the young David, the future king, hid from pursuit by his old enemy King Saul. On the right, not far from the road are the Qumran Caves. Here, in 1945, were found ancient 2,000-year old scrolls, containing priceless information about an ancient Judaic sect of Jews which had lived here—the ancestors of the first Christians.

The bus descends lower and lower on a steeply-inclined road, and here we are on the shores of the Dead Sea, the lowest body of water on Earth—elevation, 392 meters below the level of the Mediterranean Sea.

In spite of the Khamsin, there are quite a few people gathered around. Mostly they are tourists. Our friends from the Israel-USSR Society escorting us, propose that we examine the excavations of the ancient fortress of Masada before bathing. We ascend the mountain on a cable car and there before us are the ruins of the fortress, partially excavated by archaeologists, partially restored at present. Masada was the last stronghold of the Judeans who revolted in the 2nd Century A.D. against the Roman conquerors. It is famous as well for the fact that the insurrectionists who had been defending it, convinced that the fortress would soon fall under the pressure of the Romans, made the bitter choice of death at their own hand, and committed mass suicide. Only two women and several children remained alive. And they later told the world of that tragic event. Many pages of the ancient manuscripts of Josephus Flavius were dedicated to its description, as in later times the well-known works of Leon Feichtwanger, "The Judean War."

We descend by the same means, and set out for the beach complex. The surface of the Dead Sea is about a thousand square kilometers, one-fourth of which belongs to Israel. The water in this huge lake contains up to 33 percent salt. Naturally, in such a solution there are no fish whatsoever, nor any other living things; hence the name—the Dead Sea. At the same time the waters possess many healing properties, owing to which a number of clinics and sanatoria have been built here. We, of course, did not miss the opportunity to go swimming, or more precisely, to lie on the surface of the water: it is so dense that it supports a person on the surface, regardless of whether or not he knows how to swim.

As we are preparing for our return journey, we meet for the first time with servicemen of the Israeli Army. Sitting on the ground in the shadows, a pair of youths have fortified themselves. They are in swim suits, but their machine pistols hang on their shoulders. We strike up a conversation.

"You are soldiers?"

"Yes."

"Why are you half-naked?"

"It's hot."

"And is that really proper? It is permitted?"

The soldiers look at me with amazement.

"And what difference does that make? Who are you, a foreigner?"

"I'm from the Soviet Union."

Their eyes betray their curiosity.

"And are you going to tell me that in Russia soldiers always walk around everywhere in full uniform, with all buttons done up?"

"Well no, but in any case they don't look like you."

The lads disagree strongly.

"Well, no. It's not like that with us. The main thing with us is to completely master your specialty. You see, we are signal troops. Our main mission is to provide good communications, and make sure they operate in all conditions. As far as everything else goes..." (a scornful wave of the hand).

"May I take your picture?"

"Go right ahead."

So there you are, without a shade of suspiciousness or hostility, or guardedness with respect to us, to these "Soviets." Skipping ahead, let me say that for the whole time of our visit we (apparently unlike other delegations who were here before us) met with no anti-soviet attacks or provocations whatsoever. It's possible that this is a matter of chance, but I think that the fact of the matter is, that anti-sovietism is not a natural phenomenon; it does not exist naturally among the common people, Jews or Arabs. Anti-soviet feelings are manifested solely as a result of specially-organized propaganda "from above," or if you will, from the right; propaganda which has nothing in common with the actual interests of the ordinary people. I scarcely believe that the anti-soviets, who live here in great numbers, have become ardent sympathizers of our country. It is not they who have changed, of course, but the situation: the improved relations between the USSR and the USA and the growth in the prestige of our peace-loving policy on the one hand; and the growing isolation of Israel in the international arena and the negative attitude toward its aggressive policy with respect to its neighboring states and to the Arab population in the occupied territories on the other—all of this forces the ruling circles of Israel to dampen their tone and to refrain from overt attacks against our country. Moreover, both of the contesting parties of the Likud bloc, headed by Prime Minister Shamir, and the Marakh, led by Minister of Foreign Affairs Peres—are trying to establish contacts with the representatives of the USSR in the UN. Each of the meetings of these figures with E.A. Shevardnadze is given wide publicity, and is considered the play of a trump card in the pre-election campaign.

In the morning we drive to Jerusalem to take part in an all-Israel annual meeting in honor of Victory Day. It has been established as the first non-work day (here, Saturday) following 9 May, so that everyone who wishes, from all parts of the country, may take part. The gathering place is the Soviet Army Forest. It was planted more than 30 years ago outside Jerusalem as a gesture of gratitude to our heroic army in the crushing defeat of the

German-Fascist monsters. The Israel-USSR Friendship Society published a special brochure in honor of the 43rd Anniversary of the Victory, under the title, "Friendship—Yes!" Joram Gozhanskiy, general secretary of the society, writes in the introduction: "The victory over Fascism had exceptional significance for all the nations of Europe, saved thereby from national slavery and persecution, and for the Jewish people as well. The victory was of great significance to the nations who were threatened by the danger of Nazi invasion, including the peoples of the Near East, which was threatened by invasion by Rommel's hordes, which were already located in North Africa. And they, including the peoples of Israel and Palestine, were saved as a result of the victory of the Soviet Army at Stalingrad. "This year," writes I. Gozhanskiy, "we mark two significant dates: the 43rd Anniversary of the Victory, and the 40th Anniversary of the Independence of Israel. The connection between these two dates is not coincidental. What would the fate of the Jewish people and Palestine in the 1940's, if it were not for the victory of the Soviet Union? I think there is no doubt as to the answer. First of all, what would have been the fate of the state of Israel, if it had not been for the principled position taken by the USSR in the UN in resolving the question of the future of the then Palestinian Mandate in November 1947? It was namely the Soviet Union in the person of then representative A. A. Gromyko, which waged a stubborn struggle, and spoke out for the creation of two states for the two nations of that country—the Jews and the Palestinians."

The brochure presented excerpts from the foreword by M.S. Gorbachev to his book on perestroika; documents and facts on the position of the USSR on questions of peace and security for the Israeli and Palestinian people, commencing with 1947 to this very day; verses from the first chairman of the Israel-USSR Friendship Movement, the well-known poet M. Avi-Shaul; a photo essay on Soviet artists and cultural figures, who had visited Israel in recent years; on the Romen Theater, headed by N. Slichenko; about Alla Pugacheva, Bulat Okudzhava, and the Omsk Siberian Ensemble.

The grassy areas of the woods in front of the central square were filled to overflowing with busses and motorcars in which the participants in the meeting arrived, Jews and Arabs from all ends of the land. In the central square, on a high hill, a monument has been erected—a huge block of granite, on which the words are chiseled, "This forest was planted by the citizens of Israel in honor of the Soviet Army. 1950."

The thousands of people situated themselves in the shade of the trees, in families, groups, and one by one. Among them we can see former Soviet citizens as well—veterans of the Great Patriotic War. We recognize them by the medals on their breasts.

At ten o'clock the solemn ceremony begins for laying wreaths at the foot of the monument. The first wreath is laid by our delegation; then a wreath from the Soviet

consular group, temporarily stationed in Israel, and by other embassies; by the Israeli Communist Party Central Committee; by the Combatants' Society; by representatives of Arab municipalities; by the Israeli Komsomol; and by women's and other social organizations.

On the hill, decorated with the flags of Israel and the USSR and with slogans in honor of Victory Day, Jewish and Arab orators spoke in the Ivrit, Arab and Russian languages. All of them, speaking of the lessons of the past war, passionately called for a struggle for a nuclear-free world, and ardently support the peace-loving initiatives of the USSR, to include the Soviet proposal for peaceful resolution of regional conflicts in the Near East. The speech of the representative of our delegation brought a stormy ovation. The gathering declaimed in Ivrit, Arabic and Russian: "Long live Soviet-Israeli friendship! Down with the occupation of Palestine! Peace for the Near East! Freedom for the Israeli soldiers who refused to serve in the occupied territories!" When the members of our delegation, soloist of the Bolshoy Theater V. Malchenko and singer Yekaterina Shavrina performed Russian and Soviet songs, the entire woods sang for them, "Moscow Nights" and "Katyusha" for them. There were tears in many an eye.

The meeting is over, but they do not let us go. We are surrounded by dozens of former Soviet citizens.

[19 Aug 88 p 3]

[Text] Yes, the meeting is over, but they do not let us go. Surrounding us are dozens of former Soviet citizens. They are people who, having come face to face with Israeli reality, were disappointed, and complain that they were subjected to Zionist propaganda and now they are bursting to go back. They beg us to do them a favor and help them return to their Motherland. They press upon us letters addressed to the CPSU Central Committee, to Gorbachev, to Gromyko, to Ryzhkov, OVIR and so on. All of our explanations, that we are not authorized representatives of the Soviet government, that they should appeal directly by address, do not convince them. They insist that letters addressed to Soviet authorities would be held up by Israeli censors, and their authors would then not be able to avoid unpleasantness on the part of the bureaucrats here, as well as from their neighbors and fellow-workers.

And so once again we encounter problems concerning former Soviet citizens. We shall cite certain figures. About 100,000 of them have settled in Israel. Another 150,000 or so set off from Vienna or Rome for the USA, Canada, Australia and other countries. At the present time, as Prime Minister Shamir declared in the Knesset, of every 100 people departing the USSR on an Israeli visa, only 17 arrive in Israel (Zionist Newspaper EDIOT AKhRONOT, 17 May 88). There is data which shows that most recently the number arriving in Israel has fallen to 5 to 10 per 100.

Why are the Jews not coming to Israel? A symposium on this subject was organized by the General Workers' Organization of Israel, a Zionist organ, and by the newspaper DAVAR. Here is what was said by former activists among the "refuseniks" and "prisoners of Zion"—people whom one would not suspect of a negative attitude toward Israel. All of them indicate that the reluctance to go to Israel is connected with the difficulties which the Olim encounter when they begin their new lives in Israel. "Many people who do mental work go to the USA and not to Israel. It is very difficult for people with higher education to establish their lives here." Josif Begun, well-known past leader of the "refuseniks": "Matters are very difficult with respect to organizing one's life in this country. Even people who possess modern specialties remain unemployed." Lev Albert adds: "Jews aged 50 years or more are unable to find work. They suffer most of all and need help" (All quotations are from DAVAR of 1 April 1988).

In order to better understand why emigrants from the Soviet Union are not coming to Israel, one should take into consideration the fact that Israel has already laid off 800,000 Jews—native citizens, born in this country (Israeli Zionist newspaper NASHA STRANA of 2 May 88). Knesset Deputy Katz-oz, who represents a movement to cut off emigration from Israel, lists among the reasons for which native Israelis leave their Motherland, "the impossibility of providing oneself with an apartment; the ridiculously low wages; the impossibility of finding a job; the bureaucratic apparatus; and the rudeness of civil servants of all ranks (Newspaper NASHA STRANA of 2 May 1988). One should say, however, that a very great role, if not the principal role, is played by lack of confidence in the future. The endless chain of wars and armed conflicts; the diversion of enormous financial and human resources for military purposes; the endless military assemblies and retraining for reservists—all of these place a heavy burden on the Israeli population, which is made worse by the difficulties in the economic and social system which already exist. The situation has deteriorated even more in recent times in connection with the military adventure of the Israeli military clique in Lebanon, and the continuing uprising of the Palestinians. The well-known Israeli military commentator Zev Shif writes on this regard in an article entitled, "These are not Disturbances, but a War of Attrition": "The territories (The West Bank of the Jordan, the Gaza sector and the Arab part of Jerusalem—S.S.) are a burden, which gets heavier and heavier, year after year... Putting down disorders is not and cannot be a victory, if talks with the Palestinians are not begun first. Otherwise, a new war will erupt, more dangerous than the previous one, and in the final analysis the Arab states will be drawn into another war against us" (Newspaper NASHA STRANA, 19 February 1988). Deep apprehension permeates the statement of well-known Israeli public figure, Professor Yeshayau Leybovich: "I have no confidence in whether or not Israel will continue to exist for another 20 years. If a government is established which, while pursuing a peace-loving policy,

agrees to division of the country between the two nations, then there is hope that Israel will continue to exist. Otherwise, Israel has no chance whatsoever to existence" (Zionist newspaper 7 YAMIN, 5 February 1988).

It would of course not be correct to assert that all former Soviet citizens have fared badly in Israel. Some of them, who arrived here 10 or 15 years ago, enjoyed the help of their relatives and the privileges of those days, and were able to adapt to the new conditions. The more prosperous among them were in a position to absorb the rather large expense associated with inviting their relatives to stay with them. It is natural that their guests quite often based their judgments on life in Israel on their impressions of the way of life of this prosperous stratum, while listening to their tales of the "wonderful" life in Israel.

But a good half, and then some, of the settlers from the Soviet Union, for a number of reasons (not knowing the language, lack of prosperous or influential relatives, age, difficulty in finding work, and so on) have been unable to find a place for themselves in this society, which is strange for them, and many dream about returning to their Motherland.

However, hanging over them and others, regardless of their material situation, as over the entire population of this country, like a Damoclean sword, is the threat of another war. Here is a brief illustration: I was greeted by my old acquaintances, a man and his wife. They had been in Israel for about 10 years now. Both graduated from our VUZes and received a good contemporary specialty. And both are capable, energetic workaholics. They were lucky—they received good-paying jobs, and bought a house and car. Materially they are well off. They describe their life. I listen, then I say, "I know that you are satisfied with your situation, and that materially you are living well. But tell me, isn't there something with which you are dissatisfied here?" In response she says: "Everything is fine, but I have two sons, two future soldiers..." And she fell silent. And I too fall silent. Everything is clear without further words. And in the eyes of this mama, there is fear for the fate of her future soldiers.

From the Forest of the Soviet Army we travel to Jerusalem. Awaiting us here are meetings with representatives of Jewish organizations and movements, who are opposed to the militaristic policy of the ruling circles, are against repression with respect to the Arab population, and are for peaceful resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Prior to 1967 the city was divided into a Western sector, ruled by Israel, and an Eastern, Arab Jerusalem, under Jordanian administration.

During the "six-day war" of 1967, the Israeli Army occupied the Arab sector of Jerusalem, and in August of 1980, the Begin Administration pushed through the

Knesset a law on official annexation of this sector of the city, and in violation of the UN resolution, announced the "unification" of Jerusalem in an attempt to make it the "eternal, undivided capital of Israel." Throughout this entire period the Israeli Government, under various pretexts, took measures to remove the Arab population from East Jerusalem and to replace it with Israelites. Construction was begun of an integrated system of apartment housing for Israelites, surrounding the Arab sector, for the purpose of isolating this part of the city from the adjacent Arab territories.

To a certain extent this created the appearance of the final unification of both parts of the city under the authority of Israel, and the mayor of Jerusalem, Teddy Koley, was able to boast that the Arab population had allegedly acquiesced to the fact of the existences of an undivided Israeli state, with a "unified eternal capital."

However, quite soon both the mayor and the government were forced to admit that they had taken the desired for the actual, and that the "acquiescent" Palestinians had no intentions of giving up their rights. The flames of a nationwide uprising against Israeli occupation began to flicker on the streets of East Jerusalem, as in the entire occupied territory. Continuing for almost eight months now, it has in fact become nationwide. The entire Arab populace, including women, old men and, chiefly, children and youths aged 10-18, day after day fill the streets with protest demonstrations; organize strikes; refuse to pay taxes; and are resisting the Israeli military powers who are trying to pacify the uprising with force.

We too were soon made to feel the tense situation in the city. At the entrance to Jerusalem we encountered reinforced details of Israeli soldiers. They directed our bus along a bypass road to West Jerusalem, warning us that entrance to the Eastern part is forbidden—they were expecting a mass demonstration by Arab citizens against the occupation.

And so, we are in the Israeli sector. Since it happened to be Saturday, the streets were empty, and the stores, restaurants and establishments closed. In accordance with religious instructions, all kinds of production and service activity is forbidden on Saturdays. From time to time one gets a glimpse of passers by, which include priests.

Jerusalem is one of the fundamental centers of Judaic clericalism. It is in the clerics, represented by rabbis of various sects and turns of mind, that the Israeli governments find their staunchest allies. Religion is considered a reliable means of opposition to assimilation, a means of implanting a "national Jewish consciousness," and for inciting anti-Arab chauvinism and inflating war hysteria.

The highest religious authority in the country is the Chief Rabbinate. Its influence is not limited merely to questions of the cult. It reaches out to politics, education, and many other aspects of secular life. The members of the

chief rabbinate and several hundred rabbis are considered a part of state service. There is also an institute for military rabbis, who are responsible for the religious education of military service personnel. They are headed by the chief military rabbi. Only rabbis have the authority to officially register civil acts (such as marriages, divorces, birth certificates and the like).

Clerics are actively involved in the areas of culture and education. There is a special religious censorship in the country. Every day programs are broadcast on radio and TV on religious topics, and passages from the Bible and the Talmud are read. The Ministry of Education and Culture, which for ten years has been headed by representatives of religious parties, has established school programs in which religion is tied-in not only with special lessons but also in more than half the lessons on history, literature and other humanitarian subjects.

The religious principles fixed in Israeli legislation, which have been implanted in the life of the Jewish populace with the force of law, are a concession on the part of the Zionist leaders to the religious groupings on whom the support of their policies depend in parliament.

At the same time it must be stressed that there is in Israel a movement for limiting the authority of the rabbis and their influence on politics. Many political and social organizations are speaking out against clericalization of Israeli life, against mandatory observance of religious instructions, and against the intensification of the political role of the clerics.

The principal goal of our trip to Jerusalem was to meet with representatives of the Israeli antiwar movement. Its participants include people of a great variety of political convictions—Zionists and non-Zionists, liberals and conservatives, communists and socialists, believers and atheists. This diversity testifies to the fact that there is a desire among the most varied political currents, to seek out new ways for peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Arab conflict. In a friendly conversation, which was made easier for me by my knowledge of the Hebrew language, activists of the "Peace Now," "There are Limits," "Enough Occupation," and the "Women Against Silence," movements described to us the history of the rise of these militant movements, and their activity, which is aimed at bringing the occupation to a halt and withdrawing the Israeli troops from the captured Arab territories.

Here it is already 21 years since the Arab people of Palestine were subjected to the fiercest kind of persecution. Immediately following the aggression of 1967 the Israeli authorities set about "assimilating" the captured lands. They based their policy on quotations from the Bible and on history. However, there are more earthly and economic reasons behind their refusal to free these lands. The occupation of these territories is economically

very profitable. The Israeli capitalists are utilizing the occupied territories and their populace as a source of extra profits. Our interlocutors acquainted us with the following facts.

For 21 years the occupiers, under various pretexts, have followed a policy of confiscation of Arab lands. Large sections are declared "state" property and are taken away from the local residents. Other regions are declared "restricted zones" and are confiscated, either for alleged considerations of security, or for "economic needs." Many lands are transferred to Israeli owners as a result of all sorts of falsification of documents, pressure and threats. About 60 percent of the lands on the West Bank and the Gaza sector are now in the hands of the occupiers, and their previous owners have been changed into landless peasants, or into a source of cheap manpower. About 100,000 Palestinians are working in Israel, and comprise 7.3 percent of the total number of employed workers. They are utilized for the most part for carrying out the most difficult and low-paying jobs in construction, in agriculture, in paving roads and the like. The wages of an Arab worker from the occupied territories, who has received work in Israel through the labor bureau, amounts to only 48 percent of the wages of an Israeli worker. And the thousands who have come to Israel in an unofficial capacity receive even less for their labor.

[21 Aug 88 p 3]

[Text] Israeli commercial manufacturing companies are interested in the occupied territories as a market for sale of their products. At the same time, they utilize these territories as a kind of "staging base" for moving Israeli goods beyond the borders of Israel and Palestine, into Jordan and other Arab countries. These ends are served by the so-called policy of "open bridges," a policy in which the exchange of goods is accomplished by means of the bridges over the Jordan River from the West Bank into Jordan. From an economic point of view the occupied territories have been transformed into a genuine Israeli colony.

There is nothing surprising about the fact that the Israeli rulers, in violation of all international laws and UN resolutions have no intention of giving up these advantages, and respond to every manifestation of protest with brutal repression. Such methods as collective punishment, imposed on whole cities, regions, and refugee camps; mass arrests and confinement in concentration camps and prisons; banishing public figures from the country; demolition of houses which fall under suspicion; closing of Arabic schools and other academic institutions; dispersal of Arab municipalities and designating them Israeli, etc., have become systematic. Armed citizens, the residents of armed Israeli settlements, specially created on the lands taken from the Arabs, have been enlisted to assist the army and police force.

The activity of the Palestinian National Front, an authorized representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, as well as activity of the Communist Party of Palestine, are forbidden and their activists are subjected to brutal repression. Many trade union, student, youth, and women's organizations have been dispersed. The Israeli occupiers are more and more often resorting to declaration of curfew hours and a state of martial law. There is a steady increase in the number of Palestinians who have perished as a result of use of weapons for dispersal of demonstrators; however, the populace of the occupied territories has not relented in its demands. Here, specifically, is what Leyla a Shaava, daughter of the former mayor of the city of Gaza, said in an interview with the Zionist weekly newspaper KHA-DASHOT SHEL SHABAT (Saturday News), in the 20 May 1988 issue: "We as Palestinians cannot agree with the fact that someone who has come here from Brooklyn (USA) has a right to come and take our land from us. As a Palestinian I cannot agree with the fact that what had belonged to my family has been taken away from us by emigrants coming from Poland, Germany or Africa. You will not convince me with quotations from the Bible and God's will; God does not concern himself with legal questions and real estate. The statement of your government on the fact that they do not recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization as the representative of the Palestinians is stupid and absurd. After all, during the entire period of the occupation Israel has permitted no one, nor any social movement, to organize. After all, you have in fact deprived us of any right to unite and organize. And so, all we can do is support the PLO. Many Israelites will probably say that Arafat is a terrorist. But what was your Begin then? And what was your Premier, Shamir? Just imagine: at the entrance to Gaza stands Meier Kahane with a megaphone and shouts at the Palestinians: 'There is no Palestine!' and 'Down with Palestine!' Who gave him the right to do this? My family has been living here for hundreds of years. I want to feel free in my own country, and walk the streets without being afraid that someone will suddenly demand my identification card; I simply want to live. Why have I been deprived of that right?"

And here the national uprising of Palestinians for the right to live freely in their own country has been going on for eight months now. The Israeli government in the person of Defense Minister Rabin has responded to the uprising with an "iron fist" policy. Additional contingents of armed forces have been introduced to the occupied territories. The army has been ordered to disperse the demonstrations with clubs and rifle butts, to break the arms and legs of those bold enough to chuck a stone at the Israeli soldiers, and to use fire arms if necessary. And here are some of the results of this "strategy." According to data published in the Israeli newspaper GAARETs on 20 May 1988, during five months of the uprising there were 150 Palestinians and two Israelis killed; 1,410 Palestinians and 470 Israelis injured; and 7,525 Palestinians arrested.

According to more recent data, over a six-month period the number of Palestinians killed has exceeded 200, and more than 10,000 were arrested. The uprising continues, which proves the hopelessness of the "iron fist" policy conducted by the occupiers with respect to the Palestinian people. The newspaper AL GAMISHMAR, the organ of the Zionist pseudo-left party MAPAM, wrote in this regard on 20 March 1988: "Those who are conducting this policy do not understand that even if they throw the entire population of the occupied territories into jail, they will nevertheless be unable to force the Palestinians to give up the struggle for their national liberation."

Moreover, among the Israeli public there is increasing conviction that continuation of the occupation is fraught with threatening consequences for Israel itself, for its security and for the system of parliamentary democracy. The Palestinian uprising has brought about polarization of the social forces in Israel. Along with increased activeness of chauvinistic supporters of the occupation, more than 50 different groups and organizations have sprung up here, speaking out for Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories and for peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Arab conflict on the basis of setting up a sovereign Palestinian state on the West Bank of Israel, in the Gaza sector, and in the western part of Jerusalem.

The popular antiwar movement in Israel sprang up for the first time during the war in Lebanon. The openly aggressive policy of the Lebanon adventure, the cruelty visited upon Palestinian refugees in the camps, and the large number of casualties among the Israeli soldiers and officers has forced many Israelis to rethink their attitude toward the aggressive policy conducted by their government. Among the soldiers and officers as well as the public in Israel itself, various antiwar committees and organizations have been set up; such as, "The Committee Against the War in Lebanon," "Parents Against Silence," "Soldiers Against Silence," "Women Against the War in Lebanon," and others. Active antiwar activity was taken up by the "There are Limits" young-people's movement, as well as the "Peace Now" movement, headed by Israeli university professors. Thousands of citizens signed an appeal calling for rejecting military service in Lebanon; hundreds of soldiers and officers did in fact refuse to serve, and more than 160 of them were sentenced to prison by military tribunals. In June 1982, on the initiative of the Communist Party of Israel, a "Committee Against the War in Lebanon and for a Just Peace between Israel and Palestine," was formed in Nazareth. Under the leadership of this committee, as a sign of protest against the tragic events in the Sabra and Shatila Palestinian refugee camps, a 30,000-strong demonstration was held in Nazareth, and a general strike by the Arab populace of Israel was organized. The 400,000-strong protest demonstration held in Tel Aviv in September 1982, demanding investigation of the circumstances of the barbaric slaughter of Palestinian refugees in the Sabra and Shatila camps, has had broad repercussions both in Israel and abroad.

The uprising in the occupied territories has energized the activity of previously-established organizations and led to the appearance of a number of new organizations, speaking out for the withdrawal of Israel from the occupied lands of Palestine. A number of committees and organizations consisting of servicemen and reservists have been particularly active. Over 2,000 officers, including 500 with rank of major or above, have expressed their disagreement with the policy of the Israeli government toward the population of the occupied territories. We shall cite the statements of certain officers.

Yoshofat Kharkabi, a general, former chief of intelligence on the Israeli Army staff, stated in an interview given to the magazine REVOLYUSION: "I am very apprehensive about what the future will bring. If we do not achieve resolution of the Israeli-Arab conflict, then all of us expect a hell on earth. In something like 20 years, the majority of the citizens of 'Greater Israel' (that is, Israel together with the occupied territories) will be Arabs. And then Israel will have two possibilities: either we give the Arabs political rights—in which case our state will no longer be Jewish; or we refuse to give them rights—which will lead to civil war, in which case the Palestinians will be supported by the entire Arab world." In answer to the question, whether the natural growth in the size of the Arab population will be offset by the emigration of Jews from other countries, the general responded: "I have no faith in that. The number of Israelites departing from Israel is increasingly exceeding the number arriving in Israel. Zionism promised the Jews a secure asylum in Israel, but now Jews feel more secure in any place other than Israel. With a deteriorating situation the arrivals will become fewer and fewer. For them it would be better if they remained where they live now. Certain people believe that it is possible to chase all the Arabs out of 'Greater Israel.' But that is not realistic. Therefore, I am speaking out for our withdrawal from the occupied territories. I know that I am proposing something bad, but we are forced at this time to choose not between good and evil, but between bad and worse" (Austrian VOLKSSTIMME, 20 October 1987).

The Israeli newspaper DER WEG, reported on 21 June 1988, that Dov Jirmiyau, a colonel in the Israeli Army, was arrested and subjected to interrogation in connection with his letters published in the newspapers DAVAR, KHADASHOT and ZO GADEREKH. In his letters, Jirmiyau calls upon soldiers and officers to refuse military service in the occupied territories, where "the army of Israel has been turned into a terrorist instrument of oppression."

In a statement for the press, Col Jirmiyau asserts that mass refusal of military personnel would force the government to put a stop to its policy of occupation, with is ruinous both for Israel and for Palestine.

On 20 May, the day of our departure from Israel, the newspaper GAARETs published a full-page statement explaining the position and demands of Israeli anti-occupation organizations, united under the title, "The Twenty-First Year." The statement points out that, "The year of the 40th Anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel is at the same time the 21st year of the occupation. For more than half of its existence, Israel has existed as an occupier. The seizure of foreign territories has become a characteristic feature of the essential social system of Israel. Israel is losing the features of a democratic state. The presence of a parliament is only a fig leaf covering the shamefully unequal relations between the dictatorship and its subjects in the occupied territories. The Army is subject to the goals of the occupation, and the economy is more and more based upon exploitation of Palestinian workers. The educational system is based on a hypocritical, sanctimonious dual morality—acknowledging the democratic rights for Israelites within the country, and denial of all rights for citizens of the occupied lands. Statements of protest are mere verbiage. Israelites of splendid character are shooting, weeping, and protesting—and continue to cooperate with the occupiers... There are already enough verbal protests against murder and torture. We must struggle with any and all manifestations of the occupational regime by means of personal participation in this struggle." In this statement the "21st Year" organization is appealing to the Israeli public to make the transition from words to concrete actions. "Refuse to take tourist excursions and trips into the occupied territory; do not be uninvited guests. It's no good to seek cheap markets there or places for relaxation under the protection of Army bayonets. Do not take part in the dishonest exploitation of Palestinian workers. Expose and boycott enterprises where Palestinians have been deprived of humane working conditions and the respect they are due; and do not ignore incidents of insults to Palestinians on the streets of our cities. Take all measures to put a stop to such insults and to eliminate such events from our lives. Do not put up with insults, or tormenting, or the destruction of human dignity which take place in the occupied territories; do not pass by incidents of arbitrariness, collective punishment, illegal arrests, or acts of force and violence. Pursue all of these and protest, to include personal involvement at the place where these take place. Do not purchase goods produced by the residents of Israeli militarized settlements on these territories; boycott them and do not support any economic contacts with them whatsoever. Be vigilant and do not allow yourselves to be deceived by demagogic attempts to present the struggle of the Palestinians against the occupation as a manifestation of Arab terror; do not subject yourselves to orders to take part in patrolling and actions for pacifying the occupied territories. Refusal to cooperate with the occupiers is our moral duty to the Israeli people, and is the guarantee of our purity of conscience. We shall fight to achieve a situation in which Israel, both in theory and in practice, and in everyday life, abandons the policy of occupation, and takes up a policy of peace."

The newspaper printed the names of all 1,500 people who had signed this statement, and also printed an appeal to the readers to notify the newspaper of their agreement with the statement. I hope the readers will forgive me for such a lengthy quotation, but it contains the essence of the demands of the Israeli antiwar movement, the representatives of which we met in Jerusalem.

The appeal by "21 Years" generated a broad response. We had already returned home when we learned that in June, on the day of the 21st anniversary of the start of the "six-year war," that a many-thousand-strong protest demonstration occurred in Tel Aviv. Leading the protest were women garbed in black, carrying huge slogans calling for the end of the occupation. Many young couples walked along with their small children, thereby expressing the desire that their children not become cannon fodder in future wars. Columns of graduates from secondary schools, who would soon receive their draft notices for the Israeli Army. They carried slogans saying: "Refuse to serve in the occupied territories," "Down with the occupation!" "Bring our soldiers home!" "Do not shoot and do not cry!" and "For Israeli-Palestinian Peace Right Now!"

Following the demonstration there was a mass meeting, at which Col Dov Yirmiyau, Doctor of Sciences Miryan Marai, a psychologist, and citizen Nazareta Aspaniol spoke. Arab poet Salem Dzhabran stressed in his speech that the Palestinian uprising was not directed against Israel and the Israeli people, but only against the policy conducted by the current Israeli government. "The security of Israel," he declared, "will be guaranteed only when the security of the Palestinian people is guaranteed; when it will establish its own state next to the State of Israel, on the territories which will be liberated from the present Israeli occupation."

The ideals and the activity of the Israeli antiwar movement have found positive response among the Jewish public in other countries, to include those circles which had until now been pro-Israeli. For example, 45 committees and groups have been formed in the USA, speaking

out for halting the occupation and withdrawal of the Israeli Army from the Arab lands seized in 1967. The representatives of one of them, "Jewish Union for Peace," established in 1982 in the USA, recently visited the occupied territories. At a subsequent press conference they declared that broad social circles among Jews in the USA and in Western Europe have changed their attitude toward Israel and severely censure its policy with respect to the Palestinians.

We return to Tel Aviv late at night. The meeting in honor of Victory Day in the Soviet Army Forest; the meeting with representatives of the Israeli movement against the occupation and for Israeli-Palestinian peace—all of this made an indelible impression on us. And we were convinced anew that Israel has not only ministers with an "iron fist," and supporters of their policy—neofascists like Kahane, and religious fanatics; there is also another Israel, the best representatives of which are already struggling for peace, for the true good of both nations in this ancient land.

09006

AzSSR MVD Minister Meets With Journalists

18300123 [Editorial Report] Baku BAKINSKIY RABO-CHIY in Russian 2 Oct 88 carries on page 2 a 400-word article detailing a meeting between Azerbaijan's Minister of Internal Affairs, A. Mamedov, and local journalists. Among topics discussed were recruitment underway of new cadres, purging the MVD ranks of "influences of stagnation," changing the structure of the MVD administration and increasing the role of local subdivisions. Mamedov also remarked on difficulties among the ranks coping with the new "high standards which are becoming routine in the work of the militia." He acknowledged the increase in the crime rate and the fact that "serious concern is rising regarding the state of security on [public] transport." Representatives of the MVD answered journalists' questions and said that such meetings with journalists are likely to take place regularly.

UD/363

Armenian CP Central Committee 27 September Meeting on Armenian Situation

Arutyunyan Addresses Central Committee
18300048 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 28 Sep 88
p 1

[Armenpress report: "To Enforce Firm Order and Discipline"]

[Text] On September 27, the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee held a meeting in which leaders and secretaries of party organizations of industrial enterprises and associations, ministers and state committee chairmen took part.

First Secretary of the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee S.G.Arutyunyan spoke at the meeting.

It was noted that a situation in the republic raises workers' concern.

It was emphasized that due to measures taken by party, soviet and economic entities the economic situation in the republic has improved. Irresponsible calls for strikes have not been finding support among the broad masses of workers, the majority of whom condemn the activities of agitators calling for strikes. Yet, at some enterprises in Yerevan, Abovyan and Charentsavan work stoppages have occurred. The disruption of enterprises' work schedules causes damage to the republic's economy.

It was pointed out that labor collectives are striving to make up for the lost time, fulfill their contract obligations to customers and establish steady economic relations with partners. The meeting mentioned that prompt normalization of the situation is a question of honor for every labor collective, every team, production and office worker and communist; it is their duty before the republic and the country.

It was mentioned at the meeting that thanks to measures taken by the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee, information about events in the NKAO has improved considerably, mass media have noticeably intensified their activity in the republic and party and soviet officials have been conducting regular meetings with labor collectives. Forces of law and order have begun to act more decisively.

The meeting's participants expressed their firm determination to do everything possible to normalize the situation, ensure steady functioning of enterprises and enforce socialist laws and public order.

The meeting featured speeches by Chairman of the ArSSR Council of Ministers F.T.Sarkisyan and Secretary of the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee K.A.Gambaryan.

Sector Director of the CPSU Central Committee V.A.Kondratyev took part in the meeting.

Buro Reviews Events
18300048 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 28 Sep 88
p 1

[Armenpress report: "At the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee"]

[Text] On September 27, the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee held a meeting.

The meeting approved the plan for priority organizational, political and propaganda measures to implement the decisions of the September 1988 Plenum of the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee.

The meeting decided that it was necessary to discuss the plenum's final documents at buro and staff party workers' meetings, at rayon and city party committee plenums and in labor collectives, at workplace meetings of shops and sites, teams, farms and units. Particular attention must be paid to the discussion of goals set by the plenum during the ongoing reporting period and elections to grassroot party organizations. It should be done in the spirit of determined struggle to implement the plenum's resolutions. Workers' efforts must be focused on active participation in the work to overcome stagnation in the economic and social spheres and improve the ideological and moral climate in the republic.

City and rayon party committees were instructed to draft practical measures to implement the decisions of the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee, to achieve qualitative improvements in the political and organizational work of rayon and city party organizations and to raise it to the level demanded by the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th Party Conference and appropriate for the present stage of perestroika.

The comprehensive management plans of the republic's Ministries of Bread Products, Land Reclamation and Water Resources and Trade, as well as the administrative structure of the ArSSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, of the ArSSR State Committees on oversight of industrial safety and of mountains, labor and social problems and of the ArSSR Council of Ministers' committee for reception and settlement of ethnic Armenians returning from abroad, were discussed and approved.

The procedures for coming into force of the CPSU Central Committee's instructions on handling documents at grassroot party organizations were approved.

The meeting of the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee buro discussed priority goals of party and soviet organizations in the task of normalizing the situation in the republic. On this subject, it heard reports

by First Secretary of the Yerevan Armenian Communist Party Gorkom M. Minasbekyan and ArSSR Minister of Internal Affairs U. Arutyunyan.

The Central Committee buro meeting stressed that, compared to the preceding week, the situation in transportation and at industrial enterprises has improved and the city's vital services are functioning smoothly. In a large measure, this was due to the Appeal by the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee, the ArSSR Supreme Soviet's Presidium and ArSSR Council of Ministers to the communists and workers of the republic, as well as by the ArSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's resolution, both of which expressed serious concern over the existing situation, which could trigger severe consequences, and delineated ways to resolve the crisis.

In this situation, party and soviet entities and social organizations have been using all political means at their disposal to promptly normalize the state of affairs and to restore normal living and working conditions. It was declared useful for full and candidate members of the ArSSR Communist Party's Central Committee, as well as the entire staff of party workers, to meet regularly with workers at labor collectives and conduct the necessary explanatory work.

The meeting also discussed other pressing problems related to social and economic development of the republic.

12892

Armenian Education Officials Appeal to Teachers, Students for Order

18300050a Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
29 Sep 88 p 2

[Letter of appeal to teachers and students signed by 13 ranking officials of ArSSR higher educational institutions: "Appeal of ArSSR VUZ Rectors to Workers and Youth of Higher Institutions of Learning in the Republic"]

[Text] Dear Comrades!

The recent dramatic events in Nagorno-Karabakh have once again aggravated the situation in the republic, arousing in us confusion and anxiety. At this time of trial for our labor-loving and constructive people, it is required of each one of us that we persistently display a high sense of dignity, restraint, and maturity of mind, soberly deliberating upon and correctly conducting ourselves with respect to the circumstances, and choosing the right path towards the realization of our just demands.

The experience of the movement on behalf of a just resolution of the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh, as it has unfolded over the past eight months, indicates that

our civilized people, as possessors of statehood, can resolve the historical problem with which they are confronted only on constitutional grounds.

There can be no doubt that our youth have maturity, and that they are endowed with broad understanding and a high sense of social consciousness. But young people must continuously bear in mind that the basis for fulfilling their sacred duty to their own people and homeland is their intellectual and scholarly potential. Under current conditions of the scientific and technical revolution and the swift progress of creative thought, each hour of lost study means a loss of the intellectual potential that we share in common.

The disruption of studies that is occurring in the VUZes of the republic at the present time serves no good purpose and will ultimately inflict damage upon the development of the Armenian people, weakening its intellectual power.

Our wise forebears studied and wrote books by torchlight with a sip of water and a crust of bread, aware that the future fortunes and the power of the people would be founded on their store of intellectual wealth. They bequeathed to us the wise behest that "Man does not live by bread alone." In these dark days this saying acquires a deeper meaning. We urge you to bear it in mind as you labor creatively and energetically to become a means of support to the people in their rightful activities now and in the future. Ours is a responsibility for which we must answer to future generations.

Dear students!

Your youthful inspiration and passion are close to our hearts. But we are attempting to instill in you principles of morality, together with knowledge and spiritual sustenance, and we are obligated to continually stir in you thought in relation to your activity. In making our appeal to you we are fulfilling our duty as teachers, regarding each flight of fancy, each mistake of yours, as one of our own. We are not preachers, but your counselors and guides, and you have no reason not to trust our word. We therefore call upon you to take your places in the study halls. Share with your teachers what stirs and excites you. Acquire knowledge tirelessly. And arm yourselves with intellectual values, mindful of the present and the future. Then it will not be difficult to restructure your lives in a spirit of justice and democracy, and to turn the aspirations that today grip your souls into reality. [Signed] S.A. AMBARTSUMYAN, rector of Yerevan State University and member of the ArSSR Academy of Sciences; M.A. GYULKHASYAN, rector of the Armenian Agricultural Institute, Hero of Socialist Labor, professor and doctor; V.P. AKOPYAN, rector of the Yerevan State Medical Institute, professor and doctor; M.C. MELKONYAN, rector of the Yerevan Institute of Livestock Veterinary Medicine, professor and doctor; B.A. MKRTCHYAN, rector of the Yerevan Institute of Theatrical Arts, professor and doctor; L.Ye. BARTANYAN,

rector of the Yerevan National Economic Institute, professor and doctor; P.G. EDOYAN, rector of the Kirovakan Pedagogical Institute, professor and doctor; V.A. BAYBURDYAN, pro-rector of the Armenian State Pedagogical Institute imeni Kh. Abovyan, professor and doctor; K.A. SARKISYAN, acting rector of the Yerevan Polytechnic Institute and docent; K.P. OVSEPYAN, rector of the Leninakan Pedagogical Institute imeni M. Naldanyan and docent; I.I. ARAKELYAN, acting rector of the Yerevan State Pedagogical Institute of Russian and Foreign Languages imeni V. Bryusov and docent; E.A. DAYAN, pro-rector of the Yerevan State Conservatory imeni Komitas and professor; and G.G. TOPALYAN, rector of the Armenian State Institute of Physical Culture and docent.

12889

Professor, Writer Spar Over Armenian Secession Issue

18300050b Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
29 Sep 88 p 2

[Statement signed by three faculty members of Yerevan State University with postscript bearing the initials of one of them: "We believe in the People"]

[Text] Over the past eight months we have fallen into the habit of saying "...around Nagorno-Kabarakh." Such a tense and explosive situation among us in Armenia, however, can hardly be explained by the words "around Nagorno-Karabakh." Not around, but within: It is from here that both the drama of the situation and the native character of the movement and its boiling passions arise. Despite this the people throughout have basically demonstrated a high sense of civic purpose as they have stood up for their constitutional and human rights. The people even now, as the situation once again becomes intensified, are maintaining a sense of dignity and reason. Karabakh can and must be free to exist—under conditions of freedom and democracy. A creative and peaceful existence must be guaranteed for those who reside in Armenian Karabakh. The national dignity of a people must not be debased. On this, the most important issue, we are all united.

Yet utterances have been made at public meetings (and whether or not they have been sanctioned is not the point) by madmen of sorts, or perhaps they were by provocateurs. What we know is that declarations advocating that Armenia secede the USSR, and that Armenians should put their trust in outside powers, were met by the people as a whole with anger and indignation. Nevertheless, we need to root out the very possibility of such utterances, even though they may occur in only isolated instances, whether made by those who allow themselves to lose possession of their faculties or simply by enemies of the Armenian people. Yes, enemies.

We believe in the people and their native genius—people who for more than a thousand years have created and earned their bread by their own labor, both in times of peace and in times of national upheaval. Our people know how to value genuine feelings of friendship, and they know how to live in peace and harmony with other people. And today the people yearn—all of us yearn—for peace and harmony.

[Signed] Members of the faculty of Yerevan State University: Edvard Agayan, member of the ArSSR Academy of Sciences; Gurgen Saakyan, member of the ArSSR Academy of Sciences; and Levon Mkrtchyan, professor.

P.S. On 26 September, at a gathering of the administrative staff of Yerevan University, attended by faculty deans, party organization secretaries, and lecturers—about 50 persons in all—I read aloud the paragraphs that appear above. The statement, which, by the way, aroused no objections on the part of those present, had not yet been submitted to the editors. On 27 September I learned with surprise that V. Siradegyan had made a made a speech at the meeting protesting against the statement read. In doing so Siradegyan mixed up the names of the authors. I am grateful that my name was not mixed up. For what it is worth, he might have treated me with proper respect (and not only me), refraining from regarding himself as the only one who is a hundred percent correct, and put up with those of us whose thinking is not precisely as he might have wished. Has not the time come to set aside petty squabbles about who in a given situation is the most progressive and advanced? As far as I am concerned, I have always regarded Siradegyan the writer with respect, and I deeply regret that I cannot speak in a similar manner today of Siradegyan the public figure.—L.M.

12889

ArSSR: New Commission to Investigate Masis Mass Poisoning Case

18300052a Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
30 Sep 88 p 1

[Unattributed report entitled: "Announcement"]

[Text] The ArSSR Prosecutor's Office continues the investigation into the criminal case stemming from a mass poisoning at the Masis branch of the "Garun" sewing production complex.

In order to establish the facts of the incident and determine what chemical agent caused the mass poisoning, general forensic medical, forensic chemical and chemical investigative tests had been ordered by leading specialists of the ArSSR Ministry of Health, the ArSSR Ministry of Justice's Forensic Test Research Laboratory, the USSR Ministry of Justice's Forensic Test Research Institute, the USSR Academy of Sciences' Experimental

Institute of Chemical Physics and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs' All-Union Research Institute; yet, no exhaustive or final conclusions on the subject have been reached.

As a result, another test has been ordered, to be conducted by a comprehensive commission which includes noted scientists of the USSR Ministry of Health, the USSR Ministry of Justice, the USSR Ministry of Defence and the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The ArSSR Prosecutor's Office is doing everything possible to ensure that truth is discovered and the perpetrators are brought to justice.

Armenian Party Officials Hold 28 September Meetings with Workers

*18300052b Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
29 Sep 88 p 1*

[Armenpress report: "Meetings at Labor Collectives"]

[Text] On September 28, Second Secretary of the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee Yu.P.Kochetkov visited the Yerevan knitwear and glove factory; Secretary of the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee K.A.Gambaryan visited the "Armelektropribor" production association; Secretary of the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee T.A.Dilanyan visited the ArSSR Ministry of Bread Products' bread baking production association; First Secretary of the Armenian Communist Party's Yerevan Gorkom M.S.Minasbekyan visited the "Armelektrodvigatel" production association; First Secretary of the Armenian Communist Party's Leninakan Gorkom M.L.Mkrtchyan visited the Leninakan sewing factory No.2; President of the ArSSR Trade Union Council M.K.Arutyunyan visited the "Armaviakompleks" production association; First Deputy Chairman of the ArSSR Council of Ministers L.G.Saakyan visited the Sovetashenskaya knitwear factory; Director of the Organizational Party Work Department of the Armenian Communist Party's Central Committee R.Ya.Akopyan visited Yerevan's Leninskiy rayon, meeting residents in their homes; Yerevan City Ispolkom Chairman E.P.Avakyan visited the "Yerpromstroy" construction association; First Secretary of the Armenian Komsomol's Central Committee G.G.Akopyan visited the Yerevan canning factory; Deputy Chairman of the ArSSR Council of Ministers S.S.Avetisyan visited the Yerevan bent furniture plant; Deputy Chairman of the ArSSR Council of Ministers, ArSSR Gosstroy [State Construction Administration] Chairman V.B.Artsruni visited the "Araratpromstroy" construction association.

The republic's workers showed great interest in measures being carried out by the leadership of the republic and expressed their approval and support for the line taken by the September 1988 ArSSR Communist Party's Central Committee Plenum to overcome stagnation in the

economic and social spheres and to improve the ideological and moral climate in the republic. The idea was expressed at the meetings that strikes and gatherings are not a way to resolve the problems of Nagorny Karabakh; they only soil the reputation of the hard-working Armenian people. It was stressed that the Nagorny Karabakh question can be solved only by constitutional means. The meetings suggested that this problem should be raised at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

In addition, labor collectives offered suggestions on how to stabilize the situation and overcome delays caused by lengthy strikes.

The full and candidate members of the Central Committee and the members of the Central Committee Buro did not conceal their concern over the dangerous situation in the republic and difficulties in overcoming the situation; they provided information to the people on measures being taken to lead the republic out of the crisis and answered numerous questions impacting vital interests of the people.

12892

Yerevan Students Explain Support for Protests, Seek Armenian History, Language Instruction

*18300054a Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
24 Sep 88 p 2*

[Article by G. Gevorkyan, KOMSOMOLETS correspondent: "We Didn't Go Through This..."]

[Text] In the past 7 months which have elapsed since the start of the "Karabakh events," we have seen so much, learned so much, and gotten used to so much that, it seems, we can no longer be surprised at anything. And yet, the appearance of students in the very thick of the events—at meetings and demonstrations, and their active participation in them—has turned out to be an unexpected occurrence and has forced many of us to be concerned during these days. Another reason for concern was the fact that part of the young people, a rather significant part, stopped attending classes and announced a school strike—the so-called "dasadul."

We met the students, frankly speaking, just where we expected to find them—at Theatre Square, although the occasion, we might add, was the most "timely." The students, who, as it turns out, were from the Oktemberyan Schools No 2 and No 5, eagerly answered our questions.

"How many days have you not been attending classes?"

"Today is the first, although we had meant to do this earlier. We simply weren't able to get out from under the watchful eye of our teachers, who had set up cordons around the schools and threatened us with expulsion," answered Vartanush Ovsepyan, a 10th grader at school No 2, speaking for all the students. "And you should not

hang on us the accusation of simply not wanting to sit through the lessons. I don't know how convincing this sounds, but we could not stand aside from what was going on. Ultimately, we want a fair solution to the 'Karabakh question' no less than the adults. You can consider that, in coming here, the students are doing their part for this cause."

"But children, you can do your part without interrupting the lessons in schools. Particularly since you have been asked repeatedly by your teachers, as well as by the meeting participants themselves, to return to your classes. And your mothers are, no doubt, worried too?"

"Our mothers are worried, and how. It is true, they don't know that we have come here today, or they wouldn't have let us. As for the rest, in school we are removed from life," said Ishkhan Khachatryan. "We don't know what is happening and how it is happening. The teachers avoid discussions on these topics. 'It's not your business,' they say. 'Your business is to learn.' Where can we get information if it is scanty in the press and not always accurate and truthful? Now we would like to know how our peers in Karabakh live, what concerns them, and how we can help them in this difficult time. Our director offered to send them books in Armenian. But is that enough? We want to establish contact ourselves, but we don't know how."

"I might add that as yet we have not mentioned one other reason that is very important to us, and which has forced us to take to the streets," Suren Davtyan chimed in. "That is the students' demand to increase the number of hours of instruction in the history of the Armenian people. Today we study this subject for only half a year—in the 4th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th grades—one hour per week. This is much too little to get to know our history as we should."

"I attend a Russian school, and our problems are even greater," added Arsen Ovsepya, a 9th grader from School No 5. "As for history, aside from increasing the hours for its instruction, it wouldn't be a bad idea to have the instruction conducted in Armenian. Unfortunately, we have a better knowledge of the Petrine era, for example, than of the most important periods in our native history. We also know Russian literature much better than we do our own. We can also probably do something about this. For example, the classes during Armenian language and literature instruction have been divided in half, and it has become much easier."

The problems related to instruction in the history of the Armenian people, and in the Armenian language and literature in school are very important, current, and at the center of attention of teachers, students, and writers. Our editorial staff has prepared a series of articles on this topic. The first of them—"White Spots" in the 'Black

Box'" you will be able to read in this issue of KOMSO-MOLETS, on page 3. We believe that this article will help to find an answer to many of the problems which worry the students regarding the study of their native history.

We had one other meeting. This time it was with the director of the Yerevan Palace of Pioneers and Students imeni G. Gukasyan, Yerevan City Council Deputy **Laura Samvelovna Avetisyan.**

"Today there are many students in the streets and squares who have left their studies and have gone head-long into the whirlpool of events which concern all of us. Naturally, for me, a teacher with 25 years experience, as for many people, this phenomenon evokes serious concern—due to the unpredictable consequences which are quite probable when young people take to the streets, with their inherent maximalism and instability of conviction. We could subject such actions by the children to sharp criticism and condemnation. However, we must not forget that the ideas of perestroika and democratization of our society also could not help but touch upon school life and penetrate into the consciousness of the students. Having awakened from their apathy and lack of faith, they have finally felt an interest in what is going on in society, and have expressed the desire to take an active part in it. Unfortunately, the school is not yet ready to deal with its students on such a level. It has not been able to become the vehicle of their increased activity and spiritual demands. This is why the young people have taken to the streets with their demands. However, the teachers should not have shut the doors in the student's faces or placed cordons around the schools during these days. Rather, they should have had an honest and open discussion with them, pointing out to them the way to real, beneficial action, which would have become for them a viable alternative to participation in meetings and demonstrations."

I appeal to you, students! Listen to the voice of your teachers, your parents, and all the people speaking out in the press and on television who are concerned by your actions. You have already proven your maturity and your lack of indifference by sharing the concern and pain which is common to all of us. However, for now the main thing in your lives is learning. After all, everything that is happening today is being done in the name of the future, which you will have to build and perpetuate. Go back to your classes. Study the history of your native people, their language, and other important and necessary subjects. Justify our hopes. That is how you can express your true patriotism.

ArSSR: Teachers, Officials on Revising Armenian History Textbooks

18300054b Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
24 Sep 88 p 3

[Article by G. Rubinyan, KOMSOMOLETS correspondent: "White Spots" in a 'Black Box.'" Several interviews on what the new Armenian history textbook should be like.]

[Text] This question, particularly now, seems to be no more than rhetorical, since on the very threshold of the new school year the Yerevan publishing house "Luys" has published the next textbook on the history of the Armenian people for the 9th-10th grades covering the period from the beginning of the century to the present day. This text abounds even more than the others in the so-called "white spots" (authors—Ts. Agayan, Sh. Arutyunyan, and A. Mnatsakanyan). It is true that this is not an entirely new text, but rather its third, re-worked edition, which today's school children will use to study the events of past and present times.

We had hoped that in this textbook our history, which is rich not only in its heroic past, but also in its complex, contradictory, and at times tragic collisions and errors, would be presented as it was—without retouching or omission. However...

...“In the 2nd Five-Year Plan, the Leninist national policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet government was successfully brought to life. Its goal was the elevation of the formerly backward oblasts and republics to a high level of economic and cultural development. Clear proof of this was the fact that in the 2nd Five-Year Plan the average annual growth of industrial production in the USSR comprised 17 percent, while in Armenia it was 26 percent.”

This is a quote from this very textbook on Armenian history, still smelling of fresh printer's ink. It is no accident that I have cited it. After all, we are speaking of a time which people will later call the years of the cult of personality, a time characterized primarily by repressive national policy, a time of triumph for Stalin's ideas of supercentralism and of the repression of the rights of the republics in exchange for their sovereignty. We know of Lenin's letter in which he spoke out against Stalin's plan for autonomization, as well as other lines written by the party founder after the 1st All-Union Congress of Soviets: “It seems, I am guilty before the workers of Russia for not having intervened energetically and firmly enough in the infamous question of autonomization, which is officially called, I believe, the question of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics...” To look for all this in the textbook is a fruitless labor. There are only laments regarding the fact that “the achievements of Soviet Armenia would have been much more significant if gross violations of legality had not been allowed in 1936-1937 as a result of the cult of personality...”. We might add that no one had any intention of questioning

the achievements of those years. However, to glorify them without making any mention of the great loss inflicted by the years of authoritarian rule which today has turned into these same national problems—that is immoral at the very least. We need the whole truth, without any omissions, not some prejudiced or half-truth as it is presented in the textbook, regardless of whether we are speaking of the presentation of events of the NEP, the period of military communism, the cult of personality, or the years of stagnation.

Least of all we pursued the goal of viciously fishing out quotes taken out of context. But no—a large portion of the text is based on just such triumphant statements and bold figures, which would do justice to any reporting speech in the sad memory of past years. We might add that this fact is also noted by those for whom this textbook is specifically intended—the students. Here is a letter sent to the editorial office by 10th grader Nina Petrosyan.

“Every day in the press there is some sensation, as if history is being rewritten. You discover names, people, and events which are new to you. Finally, the truth has resounded, which even for our parents was hidden away behind 7 seals. But then I take the 9th-10th grade textbook on Armenian history in my hands, and there are the same triumphant lies and rhetoric. They write about the work of Charents. Yet there is not a word about his fate, just a few lines about ‘the unjustifiably repressed portion of the best cadres, leaders in science, art and literature’. Who needs such ‘history’?”

In all fairness, we must note that the compilers of the textbook did nevertheless pay tribute to the times. They mentioned the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the 27th Party Congress, and the new party line toward democratization of our society and economic and social reorganization. Although they are mentioned in passing, they are nevertheless mentioned. It is a pity that they forgot to point out what caused these new directions to emerge. After all, prior to that, judging by the textbook, our society was developing in a superb manner.

However, we will let the specialists—teachers and scientists—have their say. What is their opinion of the textbook, and how would they ideally visualize it?

A. Sanosyan, head of the department of history and social sciences, Yerevan City Institute for Teacher Training:

We can argue forever about the author stylistics of a certain textbook and about the interpretation of certain facts. However, one thing is indisputable and not subject to any doubt—it must examine the process of our society's development as it was, and not as we would have liked it to be, with embellishments or omissions of the facts which “do not fit” into the “light pages” of history. Aside from all else, truth in lessons, the rejection

of apologetic axioms—this is the most important prerequisite for educating an independently thinking person and individual. Is the emergence of such prerequisites realistic today? Alas, no.

After all, no matter how much we speak about the role of the teacher as a creative individual in the lesson, about how bad the teacher is who teaches only from the textbook, the fact remains: teachers of history, and not only this subject, who are searching, who possess their own point of view, who are capable of analyzing, comparing and predicting (and why not?)—such teachers are few and far between. Thus, for now the textbook remains the primary instructional aid on which the teaching process is based. I will say right now that the new textbook, although it differs significantly from the previous one, cannot satisfy us in any parameters. Its greatest shortcoming is that it does not correspond to the existing program on the history of the Armenian people. It gives no detailed picture of the transfer of power to the Bolsheviks (referring to the agreement of 2 December 1920). It entirely omits information on the Turkish-Soviet agreement of 16 March 1921, which in fact resolved the territorial questions of the Armenian Soviet Republic. It makes no mention of the errors and miscalculations in the policy of military communism, collectivization, and the NEP. There is nothing easier than to proclaim the Gayduk movement in Armenia as being anti-popular, as was done in several works (we might add that this same movement in Bulgaria was for some reason evaluated in a diametrically opposite manner). Nothing is easier than to keep quiet about the repressions and the reasons which led up to Stalin's cult of personality. Such a history is very easy to write. However, it evokes sincere protest in the young people, as well as lack of understanding and, at times, mistrust.

S. Khachatryan, teacher of history at Yerevan School No 149:

We, the teachers, are faced with this every day. It is a great dilemma— to use meaningless figures, facts, and names with which the textbook is overloaded as our instructional aid, or... Although, we really don't have much of a choice. The school is literally suffocating from the shortage of literature, maps and atlases. We have no anthology on history.

That is on one hand. Yet on the other—we don't have enough time to teach the children even that minimum which we have at our disposal. After all, in the 7th-10th grades there are only 17 hours set aside in the curriculum for history instruction, while in the 8th and 9th grades there are no provisions for it at all. History is studied as an elective course. I might add that elective courses may be offered under three conditions: the desire of the students themselves, the presence of a competent specialist, and an appropriate material-technical base. What

an absurdity this is—half of history is mandatory, while the other is not. What if the children lose the desire to study the history of their people under such an approach?

A. Sanosyan: I agree with you completely. It is finally time to think about this seriously. We spoke about the textbook for the 9th-10th grades, yet the situation with the 7th-8th grades is far worse. After all, the history studied in these classes includes a period beginning with the third century A.D. and up to the end of the 18th Century—and all this must be covered in only 17 hours, which are not even enough to simply list the major events of this time. I believe the primary need today is to introduce into the curriculum specific hours for the study of history, and in the 7th-8th grades to hold weekly lessons for the duration of the entire school year. And if we speak of prerequisites, then the newly organized republic Ministry of Public Education must, among the other matters associated with reorganization of secondary education, think about increasing the number of hours for instruction in Armenian history.

And, of course, we need a new textbook. The one we have is not satisfactory either for the teachers or for the students. It is true that as a supplement to the textbook our office has compiled a series of topics enriched and reviewed on the basis of new materials. Short-term courses on retraining history teachers have been introduced. However this, you must agree, is not the best way out of this situation. A new textbook, from which students will not only learn, but which will be used to bring up a generation—this is the persistent demand of the time, and scientists and methodist pedagogs must work on its development together, hand in hand, in order to avoid lack of coordination and discord in the programs and textbooks.

Our next interview was with the chairman of the republic's Academy of Sciences, ArSSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, director of the ArSSR Academy of Sciences History Institute and, we might add, the editor of that very same 9th-10th grade textbook on the history of the Armenian people, **G. Avetisyan.**

I don't deny that the textbook is still far from being perfect, although its 1987 edition presents many facts in a new way: for example, the activity of the Armenian revolutionaries of the Transcaucases and other regions of the country, and the formation of the Armenian Communist Party. The general pathos of "victory" is replaced by a more realistic evaluation of the year 1937, and the entire period of "developed" socialism is written up from new positions. Times change with amazing rapidity. Why, even 3 years ago these chapters might have been considered frank revelations, while today we complain about their understatement. Well, that is the property of our progressive time, which presents its own demands. A new moral-ideological atmosphere is being formed in our country. It demands a re-evaluation of values, their creative re-interpretation, particularly since

a significant portion of the scientific and popular scientific literature relating to various periods in the history of our society tends toward an embellishment of reality, a smoothing over of the conflicts, errors and difficulties. Nevertheless, we still have no general work on the 67-year history of Soviet Armenia. The history of the years 1960-1987 remains entirely unilluminated, while the history of 1921-1960, written in the multi-volume history of the Armenian people around 20 years ago, bears the imprint of a stereotype and is diverse with "victories" and "radical turnovers." So historians, too, as you can see, have an abundance of work to do.

The creation of a new school textbook which responds to the times is their first priority and immediate task, as it is also the task of the pedagogs. As trivial as it may sound, the only criterion in the compilation of this text must be the truth—without any extremes or sensations, the truth which comprehensively and deeply exposes the historical facts. To conceal its tragic pages means to disorient the youth. After all, we must illuminate not only the heroic past, but also the "gaps," the miscalculations, the errors and the difficult days of our history. That, in my opinion, is what comprises the lessons of history which allow us to avoid similar errors in the future.

It is strange that the role of Stalin was at times discussed in the press. The monstrous repressions and the total voluntarism can be evaluated in only one way—as a crime. We might add that Stalin must have known that all 7 of the Armenian CP Central Committee first secretaries who served from 1921 through 1937 were arrested. Of them, 6—Gevork Alikhanyan, Sarkis Lukashin, Gayk Ovsepyan, Aykaz Kostanyan, and Agasi Khandzhyan—were executed. Only one, Ashot Ioannisyanyan, who spent 8 years in camps, survived by some miracle. Many military leaders, Komintern and Youth Komintern leaders, poets, writers and scientists were also executed. Today their honest names have been restored, and everyone must know about them. And it is not only the "Stalinist" period, but all the others which require a radical review through the prism of new facts. This, in my opinion, is the task facing the creators of the new textbook. I have one other wish: that pedagogs work in close cooperating with scientists on its compilation. This would only serve the good of the common cause.

Nevertheless, despite the obvious desire of both sides—pedagogy and academic sciences—to cooperate, the secrets of the "white spots" of history are still securely stored in the "black box" of various circumstances and problems. Yet time passes, and history does not slow its pace.

When will the next textbook be ready, and who is working on it? We presented this question to the chief of the Program-Methods Administration of the ArSSR Ministry of Public Education, A. Danielyan, and asked him to comment on the problems presented in the article.

Enough has been said about the fact that the existing textbook cannot meet the requirements of the present day. Last year the republic's Ministry of Education and the Armenian SSR Goskomizdat announced a competition on textbooks in the history of the Armenian people. According to the conditions, pedagogs, scientists, as well as anyone who can meet the requirements set for a school textbook is eligible to participate in this competition. Unfortunately, I cannot tell you the names of the authors, since the competition is a closed one. I will say only that it will be completed by November of next year, and the best textbook—there might even be two or more—will be approbated directly in the schools. It is teachers and students who retain the last word. It is for them to decide which of the textbooks most fully, clearly, truthfully and convincingly interprets the historical facts. As for an anthology on the history of the Armenian people—work is also being done on it, and, I might add, scientists and pedagog-methodists are successfully cooperating in the author's collective. And literally a few days ago the Ministry concluded an agreement with the State University on the creation of a two-part atlas on the history of the Armenian people.

"Ashot Shakarovich, the participants in our discussion mentioned the obvious inadequacy of the hours scheduled for the study of Armenian history. We might add that the increase in these hours was one of the demands recently presented by hundreds of students who had taken to Yerevan streets..."

"And they are quite right. Under the conditions of the limited number of hours which exist today, an in-depth study of national history is impossible. Today we must make specific efforts to increase the number of hours scheduled for this subject. For example, we might do this by increasing the instructional day in the 8th-9th-10th grades—with mandatory study of Armenian history for the entire school year, and not just half a year as had been previously proscribed. I must say that work in this direction is already being performed. Instructional plans and programs are being reviewed, so that the demands of the students, I believe, will soon be met."

"One last question. Judging by everything, the new textbook will be ready only in a year. The old one—and of this, I believe, there is no longer any doubt—has been standardized, and is full of shortcomings and gaps. So what should the current students do—remain ignorant of the facts of their national history?"

"Why no. There are already developments which require topic review, and there are teacher retraining courses."

Quite recently, both in UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA, and then later in the local press—translated into Armenian—a thematic plan on USSR history and social sciences was published. It also included a list of supplemental literature. I believe it will serve as a necessary aid to teachers and students in studying history—until the programs can be reviewed and new textbooks developed.

Armenian Papers Provide Updates on Stepanakert Events

27 September Situation Report

18300049 Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
29 Sep 88 p 2

[Unattributed report: "The Situation in the NKAO"]

[Text] On September 29, in Stepanakert, measures were carried out to achieve work resumption at enterprises and construction sites.

Taking into account the upcoming height of the grape harvesting season, preparations for processing the harvest are being completed at the local winery, where a majority of employees reported to work.

On orders of the military governor of the special district Major General V. Roshchin, servicemen are being used to unload and transport food, which will help improve the delivery of flour, bread, cereals, butter, vegetables and other alimentary products to the population.

Measures are being carried out to confiscate weapons and enforce passport regulations. In all, 1,175 weapons have been confiscated. In the past 24-hour period, no criminal acts have been reported in the NKAO.

The inquiry into the September 18-21 mass disturbances are continuing; results will be announced in a very near future.

28 September Situation Report

18300049 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 29 Sep 88
p 1

[Armenpress report: "Stepanakert, September 28"]

[Text] The Soviet and economic organizations of the republic continue to provide assistance to citizens whose homes and property were damaged in the September 18-21 disturbances. Residents have started to return to the abandoned neighborhoods.

In the past 24-hour period, no criminal acts have been committed in the NKAO and Agdamskiy Rayon. Measures to maintain order, confiscate weapons and enforce passport regulations have been carried out on an ongoing basis. In all, 257 weapons have been seized, including cut-off rifles, home-made pistols and 16 Molotov cocktails; 20 individuals have been detained for questioning for violating passport regulations.

All vital services, schools and transportation facilities are functioning normally.

29 September Situation Report

18300049 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 30 Sep 88
p 1

[Report by Armenpress: "Stepanakert, September 29"]

[Text] No criminal acts have been reported in the NKAO in the past 24-hour period. Measures to confiscate weapons and enforce passport regulations are continuing. Since the imposition of the curfew in the oblast and Agdamskiy Rayon, over 1,500 firearms have been seized.

General, vocational and technical schools are open in the oblast. Agricultural work is carried on at kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

At a number of Stepanakert's industrial enterprises, labor collectives met to discuss work resumption.

Curfew violations have declined considerably.

12892

KOMMUNIST Provides Stepanakert Situation Report for 25-26 September

18300046a Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian
27 Sep 88 p 2

[Unattributed report: "On the Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast"]

Stepanakert, 25 September

[Text] Measures are being taken by party and Soviet authorities and the economic leaders of NKAO and the city of Stepanakert, aimed at resuming the work of enterprises, construction sites and schools. The number of buses on city transportation routes has been increased.

Public catering and trade enterprises and agricultural workers have not ceased working. The city's water supply has been fully restored, in order to raise the reliability of which deep pumps and pipelines, part of which have been delivered to the oblast, have additionally been allocated. The population's relations with servicemen are being improved.

Not a single crime has been registered in the territory of NKAO in the past 24 hours and the situation in rayons adjacent to the NKAO has been taken under control.

For violating passport conditions and curfew in the NKAO and Agdamskiy Rayon, 241 people were detained for verification, of which eight were arrested.

Two hundred seventy-seven weapons and four bottles of incendiary mixture were confiscated.

Since the special conditions were introduced, 753 weapons have been confiscated overall, including rifles and pistols.

Law enforcement authorities are decisively stopping violations of the special conditions.

Employees at the prosecutor's office are investigating criminal proceedings which have been instituted.

Stepanakert, 26 September

Today, classes resumed in all Stepanakert schools. The number of buses and fixed-route taxis on city streets has increased significantly. Steps are being taken to load wagons at railroad stations with food products for rapid delivery to stores. The supply of fruits and vegetables from oblast kolkhozes and sovkhozes has also been improved.

In the morning, meetings with workers were held in the city's leading enterprises. The practical problems of resuming work in labor collectives, which continue to insist on the withdrawal of NKAO from the AzSSR, were discussed at these meetings.

Major General V.P. Roshchin, military commandant of NKAO and of Agdamskiy Rayon in the AzSSR, in accordance with requests by a number of enterprise leaders and the executive committee of the city's soviet of people's deputies regarding the creation of conditions necessary for workers' unimpeded appearance on the job and for preparation for full-fledged labor activity in the first shift, decided to reduce the curfew to 5 am, as of 26 September 1988.

As before, the problem of resettling Azerbaijanis who have left the Armenian SSR remains urgent.

Not a single crime has been registered in the last 24 hours in the territory of this particular rayon. The authorities for preserving public order are carrying out measures to confiscate weapons and control the observance of passport conditions. In the night from 25 to 26 September, 243 people were detained for verification, for violating passport conditions and curfew in the NKAO and Agdamskiy Rayon.

In the past 24 hours 102 weapons have been confiscated. The overall total of weapons confiscated in NKAO and Agdamskiy Rayon is 855 items.

Yu. Khitrin, special representative of the USSR Prosecutor's Office, state justice counselor 3rd class and senior aide to the USSR prosecutor general, arrived in the NKAO and related the goals and tasks of his work in Nagorno-Karabakh in a speech on local television.

Agencies of the prosecutor's office are continuing investigations in previously instituted criminal proceedings for the arson of houses and construction sites and for mass disorder, as well as to reveal those guilty in the death of A. Shakhramanyan.

13362

Armenian CP Officials Meet with Workers on 26 September

18300046b Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
27 Sep 88 p 1

[Article: "Meetings in Labor Collectives: Reassuring Signs"]

[Text] Things are troubled in the Armenian capital: many industrial enterprises are not operating and VUZ classes are being boycotted. However, in comparison to the previous week, the transportation situation has noticeably improved and the city's vital support services are functioning effectively.

Since morning, tens of thousands of people have been going to meetings in Theater Square. The demands are the same as before: the convocation of an extraordinary session of the republic Supreme Soviet, the withdrawal of NKAO from the AzSSR and the granting of guarantees for the security of the Armenian population in Azerbaijan.

Outwardly, Yerevan does not look like a city on strike. The stores are open, cooperative workers are trading vigorously and the multifaceted, many-voiced markets are rich with a wealth of autumn gifts from the Ararat Valley. To a large extent, all of this has been contributed to by the recent Address of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers to the communists and working people of the republic, as well as the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium resolution, which expressed alarm over the situation which is taking shape, fraught with serious consequences, and outlined ways to resolve the crisis.

The goal-oriented work by the republic party organization for stabilizing the situation is ever more noticeable in this difficult situation. Today, you will not find party workers in offices. They are in the thick of things—at plants, construction sites and institutions. Work is being done with literally every person who has yielded to emotions and irresponsible appeals. Members and candidate members of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Buro and government leaders are meeting with people directly at their places of work. Yesterday, S.G. Arutyunyan, Armenian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, visited the shops and production sections of one of the largest industrial enterprises—the "Zakavkazkabel" Association. The wave of absences from work did not bypass this collective, which lost 15 work days at the beginning of

July 15. Today, the cable workers have not only made up for the lost time, but, according to the 8-month results, have also produced beyond the plan by 1.5 million rubles.

"We," said R. Khalatyan, OTK controller at one of the shops, "are discussing the strikes. This is no way to solve our most painful problems and, I think, far from all workers have yielded to the emotions which lead us away from the path to a constitutional solution of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem. It seems to me, the wild events in Sumgait were generally an inter-national dissension. I believe that sober and healthy forces are capable of returning life in my republic onto a normal track."

The present situation, of course, as noted by the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum, has also been influenced by years of unsolved social problems—corruption, bribery, speculation and injustice—said workers T. Yegiazaryan, A. Melikyan and R. Akopyan. The strike is of little help and the working person does not need it.

It is an unpromising task to predict the degree of charging of emotions and feelings in Armenia today. However, positive signs are already being shown in the thoughts, deeds and actions of many of the republic's residents, and these are reassuring.

The same day, G.M. Voskanyan, Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, visited the Kanakterskiy Aluminum Plant; F.T. Sarkisyan, ArSSR Council of Ministers chairman—the Armenian "Elektron" Atomic Plant and Production Association; Yu.P. Kochetkov, Armenian Communist Party Central Committee second secretary—the Tram and Trolley Bus Pool; G.A. Galoyan, Armenian Communist Party Central Committee secretary—the "Armelektromash" Production Association; G.A. Gambaryan, Armenian Communist Party Central Committee secretary—the Machine-Tool Building Plant imeni Dzerzhinskiy; T.A. Dilanyan, Armenian

Communist Party Central Committee secretary—a confection and macaroni combine; M.K. Arutyunyan, Armenian Trade Union Council chairman—the "Gidroprivod" Plant; M.S. Minasbekyan, Armenian Communist Party Yerevan Gorkom first secretary—the Institute of Physics; M.L. Mkrtchyan, Armenian Communist Party Leninakan Gorkom first secretary—the Leninakan Spinning Factory; V.M. Movsisyan, ArSSR Council of Ministers first deputy chairman and republic Gosagroprom chairman—the Yerevan Tobacco Combine; L.G. Saakyn, ArSSR Council of Ministers first deputy chairman—the "Ayntap" factory in Masisskiy Rayon; E.P. Avakyan, Yerevan city ispolkom chairman—the "Yerevanstroy" PSMO; G.A. Martirosyan, ArSSR People's Control Committee chairman—the Charentsavan Plant; S.S. Avetisyan, ArSSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman—the "Almaz" Plant; and V.V. Artsruni, ArSSR Council of Ministers deputy, visited ZhBK No 5.

At the meetings, the republic's working people discussed the appeals for strikes, supported the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee line aimed at stabilizing the situation in the republic, and expressed readiness to invest maximum efforts for rapidly eliminating the consequences of the strikes and normalizing life in Armenia. At the same time, they sharply discussed the one-sided coverage of events in Armenia and in Nagorno-Karabakh by certain central press agencies and the "Vremya" program. Labor collective representatives once again demanded a return to the discussion of the Nagorno-Karabakh problems in the USSR Supreme Soviet for the rapid constitutional solution of this matter.

The talks were principle-minded and frank in nature. Many questions were asked on problems of a social and moral nature that are troubling people. They received honest and frank answers.

These meetings have received a positive response from the working people and are useful for the leaders themselves.

13362

10

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.