



**FOREIGN  
BROADCAST  
INFORMATION  
SERVICE**

# ***JPRS Report***

## **Soviet Union**

### ***Political Affairs***

19980616 108

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

# Soviet Union

## Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-048

### CONTENTS

26 OCTOBER 1988

#### CULTURE

OKTYABR, ZNAMYA Editors Describe Publishing Plans [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 27 Jul 88] .....	1
YUNOST, MOSKVA Chief Editors Describe Publishing Plans [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 10 Aug 88] .....	3
Stalin, Solzhenitsyn Depicted in Glazunov Painting [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 23 Jul 88] .....	6
Azeri Literary Group Revived in Iran .....	10
Iranian Azeris Found Literary Newspaper in Berlin .....	10

#### SOCIAL ISSUES

Independent Structure for Investigative Apparatus Promoted [Yu. Feofanov; IZVESTIYA, 26 Aug 88] ....	12
'Pamyat' Organization Documents Presented, Criticized [I. Sidorov; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 3 Sep 88] .....	14
Charges of Soviet 'Negative Attitude' to Jewish Culture Rejected [V. Magidson; VECHERNAYA MOSKVA, 9 Sep 88] .....	20

#### REGIONAL ISSUES

Estonian 'International Movement' Challenges 'Popular Front' .....	24
Estonian Nationalism Criticized [V. Ivanov; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 21 Jul 88] .....	24
Popular Front Leader Responds [E. Kekelidze; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 21 Jul 88] .....	26
Readers Lament Loss of Slavic Values, Support New Balto-Slavic Society [A. Bure; SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, 23 Jul 88] .....	27
LiSSR Council of Ministers Reviews Proposals for Economic, Educational Autonomy [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 1 Sep 88] .....	28
Party Aktiv Assesses Political Urgency of Lithuania's Education Reform [ELTA; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 5 Jun 88] .....	29
Lithuanian Restructuring Movement Views Republic's Nationality Relations [G. Afanasyeva, et al; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 3 Sep 88] .....	37
Lithuanian Decree on Teaching, Study of Native Language, History [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 20 Aug 88] .....	43
Academician Examines Proposals for Lithuanian State Language [V. Lazutka; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 22 Jul 88] .....	45
Lithuanian Historians Tasked with More Objective Study of Recent History [K. Navitskas; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 5 Jul 88] .....	47
LaSSR: Sup Sov Official on Popular Front, State Language, Flag Issues [V. Semenov; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 15 Jul 88] .....	49
LaSSR: Pugo Views Republic's Political, Economic Issues [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 27 Aug 88] .....	51
LaSSR: Nationalities Commission Recommendations on Bilingual Education [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 7 Sep 88] .....	54
Latvian Roundtable Examines Role of Popular Front Movement [A. Grigoryan, et al; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 29 Jul 88] .....	55
GDR Organization Viewed as Model for Latvia's Popular Front [V. Selyevskiy; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 26 Aug 88] .....	61
Belorussian Rayon Official Describes Stalinist Purges of His Village [V. Leshkovich; SELSKAYA GAZETA, 21 Aug 88] .....	63

## OKTYABR, ZNAMYA Editors Describe Publishing Plans

18000613 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in  
Russian 27 Jul 88 p 7

[Interview with Anatoliy Ananyev, chief editor of OKTYABR, and Grigoriy Baklanov, chief editor of ZNAMYA; date and place not given; published in section: "What Do You Have?"]

[Text] It may be said that we editors experience daily avalanches of interest in what the "thick" journals are publishing. "I would like you to print an interview of the chief editors of the literary journals relative to their plans for 1989," writes reader V. Malkov from Mytishchi of Moscow Oblast. We receive many letters requesting that we bring back last year's "What Do You Have?" section. We are starting to publish these materials in today's issue. Below are two interviews as conducted by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondents.

(Anatoliy Ananyev, chief editor of OKTYABR)

[Question] Anatoliy Andreyevich, the readers of OKTYABR can look forward to being introduced to new works and new names for the rest of 1988, but for you and your journal colleagues the year is practically over. Work on the last issue—the twelfth—is nearing completion. Are you satisfied with the past year? Have you accomplished all that you intended?

[Answer] As you know, this has been a difficult and very important year for our country. Journals, and ours in particular, have been trying to look at everything within the framework of the problems which could be brought up at the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

First of all, I would like to discuss V. Grossman's novel "Life and Fate" (Nos. 1-4). The background is well known and I do not want to repeat it. I will say merely that after reading the novel I was deeply impressed with its importance, the topics broached, and extremely high mastery of artistic personification, and with the novelistic genre worthy of Tolstoy. I would rank Grossman with such authors as Gorky, A. Tolstoy, Bulgakov, Sholokhov...I would say that "Life and Fate" will become one of the ten best novels in the literature of our Soviet period.

We also attach great importance to D. Volkogonov's "Triumph and Tragedy" (which will be published in the last part of this year and the beginning of next year). It is a political portrait of Stalin which may be interpreted approximately as a triumph for the person and a tragedy for the people.

Readers can also become acquainted with A. Prokhorov's novel "Six Hundred Years after the Battle," I. Filolenko's tale "Special Expedition," the very interesting and unique memoirs of famous actress N. Mordyukova, and S. Mikhalkov's play "A Mess."

I would also like to mention some works already printed: verses by A. Galich in the "Literary Heritage" section; stories by B. Akhmadulina, N. Shmelev, L. Frolov, V. Mussalitin, V. Mussalitin; G. Pryazhin's novel "The Slavic Woman's Farewell," and V. Zuyev's tale "Rules of the Game."

Something I consider important for us to publish is V. Pomerantsev's novella "There Is no End Yet" ("Itoga, sobstvenno, net...") from the author's past output.

[Question] Much is being said about social and political journalism and literary criticism assuming prime importance over other literary styles, and that certain famous authors have set aside manuscripts of their novels to pursue social and political journalism as a means to resolve the most important problems of contemporary life.

[Answer] Social and political journalism has indeed made a leap forward by having raised and continuing to raise a number of pressing questions. However, all literary styles have risen to a qualitatively new level in our time, and it is difficult, even unnecessary, to give preference to any of them. This is because there is no prose without social and political journalism, and there is no criticism without the social and political journalism style. However, if social and political journalism per se is not artistic—I might say even romantic, this is not true social and political journalism. It seems to me that we can include in this category articles we have published or plan to publish, those by G. Shmelev, M. Kapustin, V. Novikov, Yu. Nagibin, A. Bocharov, Yu. Burtin, L. Saraskina...We are offering readers highly diverse opinions, and I believe that this is something the journal has attained.

Furthermore, we can now add another style to social and political journalism: the epistolary. Our journal receives many letters, and they are so interesting, so amenable to social and political journalism in the artistic sense, that they simply must be published. We have started to publish a new section in our journal: "Letters from Readers." The flow of letters is increasing, with letters being received in answer to other letters, which is also a new and extremely interesting phenomenon. In some cases the letters are better than essays or felyetons: those small sheets of paper reflect life itself.

[Question] What pleasures will your journal bring next year?

[Answer] First of all, let me say that we of course do not want to slacken the pace or lower our aim, which, according to reader response, is quite high. We do not want to take a step backward in artistry, truthfulness, or social and political journalism. All this is a difficult matter and does not always depend just on the editors. But the fact that we have already made our selections for the coming year does keep our spirits up.

As far as prose is concerned, we intend to publish V. Grossman's tale "Freely Flowing." It will be difficult to work on the manuscript, since the author made several revisions. I cannot easily say when it will be finished.

Crossing over into 1989 will be a work by I. Volgin—a novel about Dostoevsky. F. Koluntsev has handed the editors his "Light of Winter," a new novel which I think will interest many readers. Also to be published are two new works: R. Kireyev's "A Feast for One" and A. Kurchatkin's "Vesnyanka." We also hope to publish "Matrosskaya Tishina," a play by A. Galich and his description of the play's dress rehearsal, and stories by A. Platonov and V. Nabokov.

[Question] What about the poetic side?

[Answer] We plan to continue acquainting the reader with the creativity of poets Yu. Morits, B. Akhmadulina, A. Kushner, D. Samoylov, K. Vanshenkin, I. Kashezhheva, I. Savelyev, and Ye. Vinokurov.

[Question] Are there plans for publishing the "restored authors?"

[Answer] We want to print the memoirs of N. Berberova and verses of poets who for one reason or another have been residing in foreign countries; an example is Naum Korzhavin. I am sure that sooner or later the literature which is spiritually valuable will be restored to our people. The sooner this is done, the better it will be.

[Question] Your journal has already gathered a circle of your "own" authors. How do you discover new talent?

[Answer] The truth is that OKTYABR always did have a tradition of discovering new talent. We can and will continue to expand on this tradition. Every year we dedicate the twelfth issue to young writers. After announcing a contest, we started to receive some interesting works. I must admit that not all the young authors we publish continue to write, but we believe that the effort is worthwhile even if one author out of ten remains active.

Next year's twelfth issue is also earmarked for young writers. We will start working on that issue as early as 1 January.

(Grigoriy Baklanov, chief editor of ZNAMYA)

Let us start with prose. We have been promised new works by B. Mozhayev, A. Adamovich, D. Granin, I. Drutse, Ye. Rzhetskaya, A. Pristavkin, and S. Yesin. We are preparing to print A. Avdeyenko's book "Punishment Without Crime." At one time—in the 1930s—his novel "I Love" was read the world over. Few young readers know this author. The new book—of long suffering, depth, and remarkable interest—is autobiographical. We are publishing chapters from F. Iskander's book "Sandro from Chegem," a tale about K. Ikramov's

father, and the first half of "A Lion in the Grass," an unfinished novel by V. Lipatov. In my opinion, this is his best piece of work. We had planned to publish this year Marina Vlady's book "Volodya, or the Interrupted Flight" in issues eight and nine. We obtained the author's permission. But the Fayard publishers, after learning that there were a half million copies involved, decided that we should pay five times as much as Progress Publishing Office. M. Vlady took it upon herself to secure an agreement with the publishers. And, indeed, just the other day we were notified by telephone that the publishers give their consent. Of foreign authors, we have accepted Christa Wolf's novel "Patterns of Childhood." This very sensitive and timely work reflects the psychology attending the rise of fascism. We also have plans for certain books penned by former countrymen who for one reason or another have been residing in foreign countries. The poetry of Aleksandr Galich has been returned to us; the decision to exclude him from the Union of Writers has been rescinded. This unfortunately took place posthumously. I repeat that we have definite plans; I do not want to discuss them in detail just now.

[Question] Grigoriy Yakovlevich, anticipating your relating what the journal is printing from the literary heritage, I would like to ask a question which begs to be asked: What will you do after you publish everything you have in your backlog?

[Answer] I am sure that there are other works. I say this not on the basis of its being in our backlog, but because for the first time people have the opportunity of making sense of the times and their lives. And people are doing this now, not putting it off into the future. A. M. Bukharina handed us her book "The Unforgettable." Such a book could have been written only from the vantage point of years lived, of sufferings, and reflections. We will publish a large part of Roy Medvedev's enormous "Stalin and Stalinism," F. Raskolnikov's "My Notes from the Underground," the diary of A. Tvardovskiy (which we announced last year but did not publish), B. Pilnyak's novel "Salt Warehouse," B. Grossman's stories and Armenian sketches "Best Wishes," stories by V. Shalamov and V. Nabokov, and V. Tendryakov's "The Hunt."

[Question] What new social and political journalism will ZNAMYA subscribers be reading?

[Answer] Until the end of the year and beyond we will continue to do what we have been doing, namely helping the party in what to us is a very important endeavor: contributing to changing society's thinking, since without this there can be no perestroika. We want more than anything else to make sense of events that are occurring in the country. This is a matter of printing the truth about the past and the present, since a tree does not grow without roots. We published "The Break" by O. Latsis. This is the level of social and political journalism to which we aspire. The work, devoid of sensationalism, reflects deep investigation. Last year the object of our

particular interest was economics. We are currently involved with expanding the circle of problems to include articles on problems of medicine, law, etc. Our authors are: N. Shmelev, V. Selyunin, Yu. Chernichenko, Yu. Kaleshchuk, A. Levikov, G. Popov, A. Strelyanny, Yu. Feofanov, i.e., those who reign over the minds of people that read social and political journalism.

We also attach importance to international social and political journalism, especially memoirs written by diplomats who have a knowledge of life in foreign countries. We must also see ourselves as others see us. Last year we published Ambassador V. N. Vinogradov's essay "Egypt: A Time of Trouble." Interesting writing on France is also available. We intend to print the memoirs of Military Procurator B. A. Viktorov. Last year we wanted to publish in the journal Ts. Kin's "Benito Mussolini"; we will do so without fail.

[Question] Your journal always published works dealing with the Army and Navy. Will you continue this tradition?

[Answer] Absolutely. I will mention only a few works we consider the most significant. We will print V. Karpov's book "Marshal Zhukov," I. Dubinskiy's tale "Special Reckoning," and General N. G. Pavlenko's "The Army before the War." We also plan to publish memoirs authored by the daughter of Ya. B. Gamarnik and the daughter of I. P. Uborevich.

[Question] This is the age of social and political journalism. One hears less and less about poetry. Nevertheless, many issues of ZNAMYA have poetry selections in front. What names will we see in the journal?

[Answer] Poetry devotees will be able to read new works by G. Aygi, M. Aliger, B. Akhmadulina, T. Bek, A. Voznesenskiy, A. Zhigulina, S. Kaputikyan, M. Dudin, Yevg. Yevtushenko, V. Kornilov, Yu. Kim, A. Kushner, V. Leonovich, S. Lipkin, I. Lisnyanskaya, Maro Markaryan, B. Okudzhava, O. Chukhontsev, D. Samoylov, and others.

[Question] In the last two years the journal has discovered many interesting new authors. Do you intend to continue offering journal space to young writers?

[Answer] Yes, we do. We will publish new tales and stories by L. Dmitriyev, A. Velikin, L. Mironikhina, and V. Moskalenko. Now about young people. In last year's first issue of ZNAMYA we published L. Shorokhov's tale "Volodka - Osvod." The work may not be consistent, but you get the feeling that the writer is gifted. That is why I was surprised to read in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA what I consider to be an unobjective article by another young writer, V. Kunitsyn, one written rather poorly, at that. Neither youth nor old age confers the right to write poorly. Should there not be objectivity in evaluating a beginning author, a gifted person?

[Question] If I am not mistaken, I believe that you were the first to print extensive general reviews of two polemicizing writers. Also interesting is the section "Recommended Reading." It maintains a general tone. Will the journal continue to highlight the literary life of the country?

[Answer] We would prefer a somewhat different form of review, but it is too early to speak about that. In the "Recommended Reading" section we will continue to review what we believe are deserving works from all journals. This does not mean that ZNAMYA does not have its own opinion. We have in the past and will in the future continue to counter anything which distorts our history, our reality, the aims of perestroika. Critical articles and reviews will be written by Yu. Burtin, I. Dedkov, I. Zolotusskiy, Yu. Karyakin, N. Ivanova, T. Ivanova, V. Ognev, V. Novikov, S. Rassadin, A. Turkov, S. Chuprinin, and others.

13005

#### **YUNOST, MOSKVA Chief Editors Describe Publishing Plans**

*18000640 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Aug 88 p 7*

[Interview at the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA readers' request with the chief editors of literary-fiction journals MOSKVA, Mikhail Alekseyev, and YUNOST, Andrey Dementyev, under the rubric: "Literary Panorama": "And What Have You Got?"]

[Text] [Question] Starting the conversation about publishing plans for 1989, one cannot forget the largest publishing undertaking of your journal this year. "An undertaking not quite usual for our times," as N.M. Karamzin himself called "The History of Russian State." Today, the readers of MOSKVA have the opportunity to verify that this assessment has not become obsolete at all after more than one and a half centuries that have passed.

[Answer] Yes, now after each next issue is published, the editorial board receives daily enthusiastic letters from the readers. This convinces us that the decision of the editorial board to publish the outstanding work of the great Russian patriot was correct. Next year this work will be continued and completed.

[Question] Developing the culture of historical knowledge and liquidating its blank spots necessarily affect not only the destiny of the State, but also the history of literature.

[Answer] Of course. In 1989 we will continue publishing works of the cultural heritage. Much has to be done in this field. For example, N. Gumilev has already established himself in the readers' minds as an outstanding Russian poet, the 20th century classic. However, only very few know that he was also an outstanding prose

writer. We have prepared for publishing his story, "Memoirs of a Cavalryman." It is a peculiar diary of a Russian officer, the WWI participant. We will publish the previously unpublished poems of N. Gumilev. After many years of suppression, the works of Ye. Zamyatin are coming back to readers. Two years ago the critic and specialist in literature, O. Mikhailov compiled and wrote a commentary to the single volume of his prose. The book was published in Voronezh, rather than in the capital; however, it immediately became an event in our public life. Publication of Zamyatin's anti-utopia "We" in ZNAMYA became an original continuation of this trend. Next year readers of MOSKVA will find his story "God's Whip." I am convinced that it is the best creation of Zamyatin.

The editorial board is looking at the novels and stories of V. Nabokov, I. Shmelev, and I. Surguchev. The name of the latter one is almost forgotten, but he was a brilliant master of style highly thought of by Bunin and Gorkiy. To return Surguchev to the bosom of native literature (he also belongs to the writers-emigrants) is an obligation for our publishers. In addition, the rubric "From the Creative Heritage" will bring to the readers the unknown poems of P. Vasilyev and previously unpublished letters of B. Pasternak and V.D. Prishvina.

The next year marks the 190th anniversary of A.S. Pushkin's birthday. We have already started the preparation for this anniversary by preparing for publishing little known memoirs about Pushkin and other materials dedicated to the great Russian poet.

[Question] Today the peak of the readers' interest is quite naturally directed mainly at the works created during the more or less distant past. However, the development of the contemporary literature is not stopped. . .

[Answer] I would like to start with the work, which with regard to the time it was written, belongs both to the past and the present as if connecting them together. This is the novel "Amor" by A. Tsvetayeva, which will be published in our journal. The novel has a complicated fate. Its author, the sister of M. Tsvetayeva, worked on this book in a prison camp and later in exile more than 40 years ago. The manuscript was being sent from camps using various intricate methods and during this process its text was substantially damaged. In the 80's, A. Tsvetayeva, who, by the way, was writing for MOSKVA for many years, has restored the missing chapters and partially rewrote some of them anew. The action in the novel takes place at BAMlag in the 30's and 40's, but the readers will not find there any heart-chilling details. This work is about the fates of people suddenly taken away from the usual way of life which they were accustomed to, from their occupations, and dear ones; about people who even in the inhumane conditions preserved their dignity, kindness, and ability to take care of one's neighbor in spite of the instinct of self-preservation. "Amor" ("Love") is both an individual and a social

feeling, a strengthening force which helped prisoners to save their lives and to obtain a new sense and a profound understanding of life. The novel is also interesting in that it includes poems written by A. Tsvetayeva during those difficult times.

Last year our journal had published the first volume of the novel "Renunciation," the concluding novel of the P. Proskurin trilogy. At the present time, the author is working on the second volume of this novel, which also will be published in MOSKVA next year. We will publish 3 more novels. First of all, it will be a novel "Mortals" by N. Gorbachev, the concluding part of his trilogy "White Waters." The two other novels are written by young Moscow prose writers. One of them, "First Ones and Last" by V. Isayev, is dedicated to the analysis of stagnation phenomena in our science. The other novel, "Site of Fire" by S. Rybas, describes the joining of the revolution by such privileged layers of the Russian officer corps as military pilots, who shared together with people their sufferings and difficult fate. Among the stories being prepared for publishing in our journal, I would like to name "Laughter Behind the Left Shoulder" by V. Soloukhin who is searching for the causes of the tragic events in the Russian countryside during the twenties and thirties and is seeing them as the roots of today's disasters and mistakes; and the story "Anton Pavlovich" by G. Golovin describing the fate of an unsuccessful writer and, in general, the tragedy of a man, who in the beginning of his life had selected the wrong occupation. The publicistic work "Celebration at Volkhov" by V. Astafyev will return readers to the days of national festivities honoring the 100th anniversary of Christianity at Rus. The documentary story "Mahatma Gandhi," by R. Rybakov, is dedicated to the outstanding figure of the national liberation movement in India. By this publication the journal is continuing the theme of the Soviet-Indian friendship, which was declared earlier by such works as "Seven Days in the Himalayas" and "Bridge Over Stream" by V. Sidorov, selections of poems by Indian poets, etc.

Poetry in the next year's issues will be represented by the poems of Rygor Borodulin, O. Dmitriyev, Ye. Isayev, V. Kazantsev, T. Kuzovleva, E. Nizharadze, N. Palkin, A. Prelovski, G. Registan, N. Tryapkin, T. Smertina, V. Firsov, and G. Emin. The peculiarities in the development of the modern literary process will be discussed in articles of the specialists in literature and critics Yu. Barabash, V. Bondarenko, V. Bushin, T. Glushkova, P. Gorelov, A. Gulyga, G. Yegorenkova, V. Kozhinov, S. Kunyayev, V. Kurbatov, A. Lanshchikov, V. Lukyanin, P. Paliyevskiy, S. Semenova, K. Sultanov, V. Chalmayev, and others.

[Question] It is probably impossible to find today a journal which is interested only in literature and its problems. . .

[Answer] We are preparing for publishing letters of the Marshal K. Rokossovskiy, memoirs of generals A. Ponomarev, V. Shatilov, and other participants in the Great

Patriotic war. Ideological, educational, and economic problems of perestroyka are the subject of articles by M. Antonov, N. Korzun, and A. Ryabinin. The name of our journal itself requires us to pay especially close attention to describing the problems of protecting the historical heritage of Moscow and the cultural and public life of the capital. Articles by V. Desyatnikov, V. Kiprin, N. Moleva, and G. Shalyapina, are dedicated to these subjects.

Works of well-known artists will be published on the insets of the journal.

[Question] Andrey Dmitriyevich, the literary year of 1988 is marked by a sharp competition not only among the newspapers, but also the journals, which have published very many important works that became real events. However, YUNOST which did not advertise during the previous subscription campaign either "Doctor Zhivago" by B. Pasternak or "Life and Fate" by V. Grossman, or other not less anticipated works, did manage to preserve the love and affection of its readers.

[Answer] Yes, we indeed have found ourselves in a complicated situation. Nevertheless, the number of copies sold did not drop. But the journal has not changed today. Two years have already passed since we have changed the attitude toward our publications and defined our tasks in a more demanding and exacting way. Besides, these years were very instructive for us. Watching the operation of other journals we were catching ourselves constantly assessing it, namely, this material would be very good for us, or this material we would never publish, but it is good that it was still published.

I think that such a mood is typical for all involved in the publishing of journals.

We have already published and will publish before the year ends practically everything we have scheduled, even those works which for different reasons were not advertised but were included in the editorial board's plans. Thus, for example, we did not advertise the story "City Strolls" by V. Nekrasov and his letter sent to the editorial board of YUNOST from Paris, which was probably the last letter Viktor Platonovich had written (YUNOST, No. 7). We consider this publication to be our great victory and joy for all who love the real literature, the literature to which the author of the story "In the Trenches of Stalingrad" had the honor to belong.

[Question] What are the editorial board's plans for the future?

[Answer] You know, in my memory, and I am working here already the 17th year, there was never anything like that. The editors portfolio is literally going to pieces from the number of manuscripts. And there are very few of them which one could put aside. However, if we receive something outstanding even for such a background, we are changing the plan of an issue and are

trying to give this work using a new type-setting. We had such occurrences quite often. There is competition in the good sense of the word. For example, we had just announced in our ads our intent to publish the stories of A. Chayanov, when they were immediately published by a newspaper and a journal. As to us, we were left with the ad.

Due to the abundance of good manuscripts a quite alarming situation took place in the publishing house because on the one hand, we want to print the most interesting works as soon as possible, and, on the other hand, we see it is impossible to do both for physical and polygraphical reasons.

[Question] What have you selected?

[Answer] First of all we selected the book of the well known historian R. Medvedev, "They Surrounded Stalin" (the contract is already signed for 3 issues). We intend to publish the story of V. Voynovich, "Life and Unusual Adventures of the Soldier Ivan Chonkin." The story has an introductory interview with the author who during his time left the country, and we are trying to follow and to understand his reasons for leaving the Motherland. Readers will find the continuation of L. Razgon's book, "The Uninvented," a new documentary story by Yu. Shcherbak about famine in the Ukraine during the early 30's, and "Pages of Experience" by I. Tvardovskiy. A. Antonov-Ovseyenko, the son of the famous revolutionary, has brought to the board of editors a documentary story "Beriya." Is it interesting to our readers or not? And is not there a certain distortion? I think that the real citizens of the Fatherland are always interested in the history of their peoples. However, this history must be truthfully told. People have an urge to study the past through concrete historical events and concrete historical figures even when these figures left bad memories about them. And no distortion will take place if only the truth is told.

Of foreign authors, we will publish the works of Philip Dik and Alfred Bester.

The readers will be able to get acquainted with the second book of A. Bitov's novel "Instructor of Symmetry." This work is unusual and difficult for understanding, but reading is a work of the soul and not just entertainment. I have on my desk right now a very interesting manuscript by O. Volkov "Handful of Ashes." N. Shmelev promised his new work. Stories by A. Iskander are being prepared for print.

I think that the readers will also notice the chronicle "How Iosif Brodskiy Was Tried," a story by V. Amelinskiy "In March, 1953," and the memoirs of V. Bokov about B. Pasternak.

[Question] What about the poetry?

[Answer] We will publish the poem "Russia" by M. Voloshin, poems by A. Nesmelov, N. Korzhavin, B. Okudzhava, V. Sokolov, V. Retsepter, O. Chukhontsev, and B. Chichibabin. In addition, we will continue to publish young poets under the rubric "Test Bench." Opening this rubric, we know that by publishing poems which sometimes are somewhat paradoxical, we, to a degree, are calling fire onto ourselves. And at the same time, this fire is nothing compared with the great wave of trust we experienced from many readers.

[Question] Do you think that your readers have changed?

[Answer] They have probably changed, but to the same degree as the readers of the whole country have changed. YUNOST is a journal for young people, and, at the same time, which is quite strange, a family journal, that is, the interest toward the journal is passed from one generation to another. And if one of the older people in the family subscribes to YUNOST for many years, later this relay is carried by the younger people. The sociological studies which we are at the present time carrying out support my words.

Our readers, judging by their mail, become more active and the problem of feedback is not quite as acute as earlier. The feedback today became the norm of life. And especially it is true for such columns as "20th Room," culture, and critics. Our readers do not stand for passing issues anymore. For this reason, we had to cancel the publishing of several works for which we had already signed contracts. Good works that yesterday looked normal, natural for reading, today literally "fall through." Therefore, we are using extreme measures, paying for breach of contracts, and taking risks.

[Question] What will the policy of the journal be in the fields of social and political journalism and literary criticism?

[Answer] We will continue the struggle on the pages of the journal with conservatism, bureaucratism, clannishness, etc. We are planning to publish in the "20th Room" dialogs with the readers on the following problems: "Alternative to Komsomol: Delirium or Reality?" "Information Hunger and Independent Press," "For All That: Is it Tver or Kalinin? Mariupol or Zhdanov?" and others.

As to the criticism department, it became, in my opinion, very professional since such authors as B. Sarnov, N. Ivanova, V. Lakshin, A. Turkov, and talented young critics joined the journal. The department will be working mainly on the problems of the modern literary process. We decided not to publish any kinds of review because they are of very little interest to most of the readers.

[Question] It seems that there is no danger that the interest of the readers will drop.

[Answer] I do not know about the readers' interest because for me, for example, it is difficult to imagine how the same V. Nekrasov will be accepted by the young readers. We in the editorial board are reading him with excitement, for us his return is a celebration. Will it become a celebration for the young people? I am sure that if they feel the work, and if they treat literature with trepidation, it will become one. We hope for such celebrations in spite of the understanding of how difficult it is to make each issue exactly the way both we and the readers want to see it.

13355

### **Stalin, Solzhenitsyn Depicted in Glazunov Painting**

*18000599 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 23 Jul 88 p 6*

[Interview with Ilya Glazunov by unidentified SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent: "I Have Given My Life To That Which Is Called Restructuring"; date of interview, which took place in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA editorial offices, is not given; first two paragraphs are source introduction; boldface as published]

[Text] The current exhibition of the works of USSR Peoples Artist Ilya Glazunov, which recently opened in the Moscow Palace of Youth, served to prompt this meeting in our editorial offices. In a discussion with our correspondent, the artist shared his thoughts concerning contemporary fine art and its problems.

We present I. Glazunov's responses in stenographic transcription.

[Correspondent] **Ilya Sergeyevich, we congratulate you on the opening of your exhibition in the Palace of Youth. In connection with this, we have several questions for you. And the first question is a general one: What do you think, would such an exhibition have been possible before April 1985?**

[Glazunov] I am happy to answer. It seems to me that enormous changes have taken place in the social and cultural life of our society during the past two years. I am completely in favor of restructuring. For my entire life, I have served what today is called restructuring. I am talking about the preservation of monuments, and about a protective attitude toward our traditions, monuments, architecture, and antiquities. I am talking about a striving for high realism, understood as an expression of the inner world of man through the truth of the objective world, through the idea of a struggle of good and evil, where the field of battle is the heart of man.

We are now seeing an enormous advance and, I would say, a total freedom in various spheres of life, including art. The new policy of glasnost, of democracy, is for me an unusually joyful one, and I entirely support the policy of our party and government leadership.



Every artist has a right to choose his own path and to take the creative path which his conscience and heart dictate to him. However, at the same time, it seems to me that in fine art today there are fewer changes than elsewhere which we could characterize as restructuring. Most frequently, in fine art, restructuring is being understood to mean a return to the bosom of the 1920s, to the ideas of avant-gardism, to a time which, from my point of view, later led to stagnation, when, in "official" culture, there was a great deal of social falsehood, of social demagoguery. Moves into new apartments, parades, a featureless exaltation of featureless social mannequins. I think that the resurrection of the avant-garde today and the total permissiveness accorded avant-garde tendencies, from my point of view, is a game with a single set of goal posts. And where is the portrayal of the truth of life, with its real conflicts, with its tragic history?

I want to say, in promoting the avant-garde—I think that those who like it, have the right to like it—we should at the same time also promote other traditions. Malevich, as Nadya Lezhe told me, gathered his pupils together in Vitebsk and said: "The proletariat has no need for art. Everything that I have done, this is the end of art. I made a square on a black background, and a white square—on a white one. Get out of here! Go make stools, things, water glasses! The proletariat needs things, and not art, which is dead."

And today, when our audience expects penetrating answers to the questions which have been posed by the times, to offer him a combination of squares, if I may, as the "philistine" says, a "daub," something that deviates from life—this, it seems to me, is wrong. All the more so, because the basic tendency today, both in all of European and in Russian culture, is a search for spirituality, a search for a vital image, as Marx said, a thinking in images. And they are proposing that we reject the picture. As one avant-gardist said to me, and from their positions she is absolutely right: "Well, why now again the pictures of Nalbandyan, of Yefanov?" Indeed, this is what things have come to: in concept, a picture is regarded as being a pile of lies, which young people cannot accept. But, after all, a picture—this is also Repin, and Ivanov, and the "Prodigal Son" of Rembrandt; this is Raphael, and Titian, and Caravaggio, and Botticelli...

The highest judge, from my point of view, is the people; they react clearly to lies and to truth. And today, What I would like to see in fine art is a quest for high realism, for vital truth, for the merciless realism, which today distinguishes the quest in literature and in television.

And so, the quest for a harsh vital truth in fine art, it seems to me, is not a distinguishing mark of the present day. Out of all the trenches, from all the official high ground, we are being beset by a revival of the avant-garde of the 1920s. I consider that this is not the idea of restructuring. And the people are responding by ignoring

these exhibitions. There was a young people's exhibition, where many talented, good artists were represented. But, indeed, not many people came to see it. But here a base, insidious, predatory idea comes to the aid, one which is growing everywhere, both with us and in the West. The idea that there is an elite art and an art for the masses.

I want to ask: For whom did Rembrandt paint, for the elite or for everyone? For whom did Surikov paint—for the elite or for everyone? For whom did Dante write? For whom did Rublev write?

And so, I think that we are talking about images today, about the truth and, take note, even on the Arbat, about which so much is being spoken and written, people stand in line for the one whose drawing of their Sereshka or Miska will bear the best likeness. Although there are signs there, advertising that "I will draw the anatomy of the soul for 5 rubles." Even there, people chose what they like. I want to say that elite art and art for the crowd—this is an invented problem. In art, every person understands as he understands, a beautiful woman or one who is not beautiful, good weather or bad. Naturally, there's no arguing about tastes.

Art is directly opposed to science. Science can be incomprehensible; a song, a dance, a painting, poetry must be understandable, always and to everyone. Civilizations may die out, peoples may disappear from the face of the earth, but we form judgments about times past from the Roman portrait, from the Greek portrait, from the Russian portrait of the 18th Century. But to be a high realist, in my view, a school is necessary, one which is now being eroded in every possible way, and we need to introduce the concept of self-expression, in great as in lesser art. The artist should undergo school training. A school—this is where the knowledge accumulated over the centuries is passed on to the young artist.

This is why I am very grateful to restructuring also for the fact that, today, a decision has been reached to establish a new institute, one which will rise from the ruins on the basis of the former school of sculpture and architecture where such great artists as Savrasov, Levitan, the Vasnetsov brothers, and Serov worked. For me, it is a great honor that the rebuilding and organization of a new institute has been assigned to me and my friend Petr Petrovich Litvinskiy. We want to create the kind of school where young people will be able to learn in a school which, to a maximum degree, is similar in type to the old Academy of Arts. Not everyone wants to drive around on motorcycles, not everyone wants to paint his hair blue and green. Many want to enjoy Bach, to study the monuments of art and the ancient past, to know the history of their motherland.

[Correspondent] Ilya Sergeyevich, your answer, as I understand it, does not by any means indicate that you stand for any kind of monopoly in art. Monopolies in art have always led to sad consequences. For example, your defense of truthful art, of realistic art, is also to my liking.

At the same time, many young people are testing themselves in the most varied styles, including the avant-gardism. Is it necessary for us, as in the 1920s, to "stand them at the rail" and toss them from the ship of modern time? Life, indeed, is varied, pluralistic, and time and the audience will put everything in its place.

[Glazunov] I agree absolutely with this, and it is therefore that I have friends who work in various styles. And, of course, it would be wrong to forbid avant-garde exhibitions, it would be wrong not to show Chagall. And it is good that, today, we are pulling many artists out of semi-obscurity. But my point of view is, as I have already said, an expression also of a definite tendency. And so, I may once again remind you here that it is also possible not to like the ideas that are contained in my own modest work. I am not changing and not restructuring myself, because I have given my life to what today is being called restructuring. And just as they used to badger me personally, they are still badgering me up until the present. I do not have any kind of privileges. For example, they have black-balled me six times in the USSR Academy of Arts. I do not have a single State Prize, because this is not a prize of the state, but of a particular group in the Artists Union, which confers the prizes.

But, the matter does not lie in prizes and in ambitions. And you can imagine how difficult it is for young artists who do not think "the right way." There is no need of monopolies. Right now, a monopoly is being thrust upon us, a monopoly of the avant-garde. And I am for pluralism. Thus, the young artist D. Blyukin has painted an excellent picture, "The Death of Pushkin." He goes to the exhibition. And his colleagues just like him, young ones, are not exhibiting it.

I want to say in conclusion that it is, precisely, about true pluralism that we should be talking today. That is, about the development of various tendencies. But each of us should have an appreciation of what is good and what is evil. I think that we need to create the kind of moral climate in which every artist enjoys respect, so that his critics help him and do not consider it their obligation, as one well known critic proudly told me, to teach the artist. Here you have a stagnant concept! How can it be so—the impotent will teach the productive? It is the god-given lot of the critic to understand the artist, to give his own assessment. But our criticism, most often, is a blow with a club to the head of a dissenter.

[Correspondent] I would like to clarify something before asking the next question. This concerns the historical concept of a series of pictures. However, you have, in part, already formulated your view of history, in any case of the history of culture, in your previous answer. Here I am interested in clarifying the question: The 1920s, what are they, in your understanding? Would you say that the 1920s are little more than the very start of an era of illegal repressions. And then of stagnation. Or that the 1920s, or in any case their first half, were, precisely, a flourishing of freedom of expression in culture, of freedom of creativity

in art? Indeed, this was a time of many great artists, in theater art, in literature, as well as in the fine arts. Some people say that a return to the 1920s would be a return to Lenin. How, overall, should the revolution and culture be correlated in the light of the modern day?

[Glazunov] When I was in Paris, this was in 1968, I saw Paris burning. They were cutting down the hundred year old lime trees at the Sorbonne, lighting fires, throwing tear-gas grenades, carrying the portraits of Trotskiy, Mao Zedong, Lenin, Stalin, Che Guevara. The forces of the right had been aroused, those of the left... And I thought then—who has depicted our troubled, our 20th Century, who has depicted the revolution, the social storms, the catastrophes? And thus was born the idea for creating my picture "The Mystery of the 20th Century." I worked on it for two years—both while abroad and at home. In my work, I wanted to show certain philosophical ideas, which had been expressed in the struggle of certain historical figures, and I approached the matter like a director. And the reason that it is called a "Mystery" is that only the will of an artist is able to unite on a single canvas so many different figures, who lived at various times and who never met one another. It begins with Lev Tolstoy, Stolypin, Nicolas the Second, Rasputin, the fall of religion, the fall of empire, and between the past and the future stretches the barbed wire of violence, on which sits the eagle of national socialism. This wire, like the nerve of our times, is to remind us, in my view, of the countless victims of our camps.

At the center of the work, I consider, is the main event: Lenin is greeting the new era, and I have highlighted him out especially in the glow of giant fires and of the awakening revolutionary movements of the 1920s. Then comes the Great Fatherland War. This is a world war. And therefore atop the Brandenburg Gate, on which is written "We are from Stalingrad," "For the Motherland," "We are from Orel...from Kursk," the generalissimo lies in his grave. I wanted to show the red colors which, like the glow of a fire, like a sea of blood, turn him crimson.

We know that the war took millions of victims. In the center is the idea of victory, of eternal heaven, the idea of Nika Samofrakiyskaya, soaring above the world. Further comes Mao Tse Tung, who is applauding himself (I did this work long ago) and who says that although, in the future, nuclear war will destroy two thirds of mankind, the remaining one, under the direction of Mao, will build communism... Charlie Chaplin, a small man who held out and won in this war, Adenauer, Khrushchev, Martin Luther King, "The Beetles," kolkhoz women dancing—a young with an old one—because so many men were killed in the war, and, next to them, somebody's daughter being sold, her beauty, a striptease... Next comes a very important stage—Nasser, the sphinx, Golda Meir, Moshe Dayan. This is a particular time, a remarkable one for many, the moment of the creation of the state of Israel. ...In the corner is Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in a

prison camp robe, above him—Mukhinaya's "Union of Workers and Peasants," still higher—the symbol of our civilization, Christ, who has departed Earth but is invisibly present in the haze.

By the way, three avant-gardists, having seen this work, said "Dear Man, so you are an avant-gardist!" For them, this was a high compliment. I am not an avant-gardist; I would like to be a realist. When I wanted to show this work at my own exhibition, the jury, headed by D.A. Nalbandyan, fell upon me and said that it is politically mistaken; why is Stalin in a puddle of blood, who paints Lenin this way, what kind of cast of characters is this, with whom have you coordinated it, what gloom, take down the picture at once and open the exhibition. But this picture is a part of my life; in it, as always, I remain a Russian artist, a Soviet citizen, and I did not take down this work... For several days nobody called me.

I did not change even one dot in my work. All my life, I have followed my own conscience as an artist. You can like my work or not, but I am happy that today I am able to show this picture of mine. And, indeed, they predicted to me that it would never see the light of day. And that my "career" as a Soviet artist was ended once and for all.

And now, with the greatest nervousness, I am submitting to the court of our audience a work which has stood for 15 years in my workshop, one that has provoked false rumors, insults, hatred, and scandal. I would like to say one thing, that what I was happiest to hear at this exhibition was that this picture is alive and contemporary.

[Correspondent] Ilya Sergeyevich, you have explained everything well. Tell us, however, why figures that were key ones for the 20th Century have not been included in your historical conception, why Sholokhov, Shostakovich, Tvardovskiy, Kurchatov, Vavilov, and Eysensteyn were not included, why you passed them by. Are they immaterial to you, or do they mean less than Solzhenitsyn and the others?

[Glazunov] In the first place, I ended it at a particular time. In the second, it is indeed necessary to choose. Your question is a very legitimate one when you speak, let us say, of Sholokhov. But I must say that, although I like "Quietly Flows the Don," I would be happier to hear the question of why Bunin and Rakhmaninov are not here, who, in my opinion, carry far more weight and are greater in terms of genius than the people you have enumerated.

[Correspondent] I cannot agree with you here. For me, there is nobody of greater genius in the culture of the 20th Century than Sholokhov. This is my viewpoint.

[Glazunov] Yes and, precisely therefore, I can make you happy; as soon as the exhibition closes, I am beginning a large work which will be called "70 Years" and in which all the figures—of the party, of politics, and of art—will

be depicted. This pertains, for example, to Shostakovich, Prokofyev, and Mayakovskiy. And when I painted a wall for UNESCO, I was then proceeding from a different problem—of showing the contribution of the people of our country in world culture. It was a gift to the USSR and to UNESCO. It is still at UNESCO. So, and there, independent of my views, I try to be objective, as you have said—a pluralist, having included both Prokofyev and Shostakovich... Although Shostakovich is also a genius, his art does not however excite me. I repeat, the music of Shostakovich does not excite me, but he occupies a central place in my seven-meter long composition at UNESCO.

Once again, I am grateful to the organizers of my exhibition, who assumed the boldness to display my picture. I have been proud to read the book of comments by various people that this picture reflects their point of view, forces them to think, and is contemporary, even though it was painted 15 years ago. But nobody ever talked about this.

...Pierre Cardin sent me an invitation. Two weeks before my arrival, an article appears in the journal "Thursday's Affairs"—"Glazunov is against Gorbachev, a financial backer and organizer of the Pamyat society—a fascist, racist, anti-semitic organization." I take it to court, because this discredits me. Two days ago, they tell me that a refutation has been published...

[Correspondent] This is very important, what you are saying, because your name is persistently linked with the Pamyat society.

[Glazunov] I declare that I have no connection to Pamyat.

So, now, works of mine have been bought at Sotheby's auction, and already they are saying that none of mine were purchased. LIBERACION printed this. I decided that, now, any insinuations and slander will be pursued through the courts, both here and abroad. Enough of patience! Sotheby's and Soviet experts came to me and proposed that I take part in the auction. Unfortunately, I was unaware that this was an avant-garde auction and, as is known, I am not an avant-gardist. They bought four of my works for 92,000 pounds sterling.

[Correspondent] Tell me, is there a connection between the picture "Mystery of the 20th Century" and "One Hundred Centuries," as you say, renamed "Eternal Russian?"

[Glazunov] None, other than the principle of portraying certain philosophical, social, and cultural ideas through concrete persons. There, I have figures from history and culture.

[Correspondent] And another question, which we overheard at the showing of "Mystery of the 20th Century": Stalin in his grave, how is this to be understood—that

**Stalinism is dead, or is the artist inserting some other meaning? On the other hand, Hitler is standing above Stalin's grave. What does this mean; that our victory in the war is not exactly that which we talk about and in which we take pride? And what does all this mean?**

[Glazunov] Hitler was also a fanatic of an idea. Churchill and Roosevelt are smirking, one seems to be saying: "O.K., Stalin is dead," but he is celebrating "Victoire." I think that the death of Stalin was a watershed in the history of the 20th Century. The death of the generalissimo, the conqueror of German national socialism and Italian fascism.

But speaking simply, like a tour guide—here is a clock, a door, a window—I am saying only that Stalin is at the center of the picture, but one American journalist has written: it is true what they say about Glazunov, that he is a Stalinist; he painted Stalin at the center of the picture. Of course, it is also possible to interpret it in this way. I want to note that, in his time, Pushkin wrote that, if you want to hear foolishness, ask a foreigner what he thinks about Russia. I did not even think about whether Stalin was alive or dead. I simply wanted to assert that he was at the center of the 20th Century. Let us be frank. Victory in the Great Fatherland War changed the map of the world, as it remains to this day.

But, for me, he lies in a sea of blood, he bears the guilt for this blood. You can write this or not. I consider that Stalin spilled a sea of blood and, having killed Trotskiy, carried out his program of destroying the Russian countryside. I do not consider Stalin a genius, and this is my view. I said this 15 years ago, and they almost stifled me! Stalin is lying on a catafalque made of the Brandenburg Gate, on which there are inscriptions by our soldiers: "We are from Stalingrad," and "Orel... Kursk...". And these small lights, disappearing into the heaven—these are ruined souls, this is an accusation of Stalin. So they are wrong in reproaching me for having depicted Stalin as a victor. I was thinking about our apocalyptic, troubled times, about the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

[Correspondent] **And a final question: what excites you now, what are you dreaming about?**

[Glazunov] I have long thought about how to help the tendencies which I share. And now a cooperative is being created, the decision has already been made, which will be called "Grad Kitezh": They have promised to assign me space there. We want to create exhibition halls there and to establish a fund to assist young artists, whose motto will be tradition and truth. They can be of any nationality, of any age, but mainly young, because we are responsible for the young.

I think that now, as never before, there is a question of supporting artists, but I am against artists bribing artists. We give state money to a group of artists and they divide this state money among themselves. Why is my present exhibition important? In the history of the Soviet Union,

it is the first cost-accountable, philanthropic exhibition, with deductions. I would like for the artist to bring a benefit to society, and not struggle for a piece of the pie.

It is now necessary to change the forms, to allow groups to have the right to cooperatives, to cost-accountable exhibitions; let them compete—the avant-gardists and the realists. And, by this, it is necessary to help the young people, let them be diverse, so that things are not such that bureaucrats and the functionaries sit and distribute state funds among their acquaintances. This is a disgrace.

13032

### **Azeri Literary Group Revived in Iran**

18310025a [Editorial Report] Baku AZARBAYJAN MUALLIMI in Azeri 15 June 1988 carries on page 4 a 500-word article by M. Manafi headlined "Literary Council in Tabriz" announcing that an association of Azeri writers and poets which had been established after the founding of the Islamic Republic but had been inactive has been revived under the aegis of Iran's Ministry of Islamic Culture and Guidance. "At meetings of this council, which was established by Yahya Sheyda who is one of Southern Azerbaijan's leading poets and writers, lectures and talks are given on certain literary subjects and genres in order to provide guidance to young poets and writers." Manafi cites an article in VARLYG (Tehran) by Firuz Sumarani who attended one of the meetings. He reported that "close to 50 writers and poets" were present. They read their poems in Azeri. Manafi says that "we sincerely hope that the program of the organization expands further and becomes more enriched so that it will provide a worthwhile service to the literature and culture of the Fatherland."

/12232

### **Iranian Azeris Found Literary Newspaper in Berlin**

18310025b [Editorial Report] Baku AZARBAYJAN MUALLIMI in Azeri 15 June 1988 carries on page 4 a 1000-word article by Seydagha Onallahi, Dr Hist. Sci., headlined "The newspaper GAYNARJA [Boiling Point]" on the goals of GAYNARJA, "the central organ of the 'Azerbaijan Culture Union'" which is located in Berlin. The newspaper commenced publication in October 1987. It set forth the goals of the Azerbaijan Culture Union in a lead editorial "...We, a group of Southern Azeris, founded the Culture Society in order to attain our national, cultural and historical desires and to unite in one place the scattered movements of past years." Onallahi points out that "the Azerbaijan Culture Union justifiably views the basic reason for the national privations and other difficulties of the Southern Azeri people as the rule over Iran by capitalists, imperialists and reactionary groups." The newspaper has defined its function as "an independent and democratic newspaper

that will be able to reflect the point of view of the majority of Azeris living abroad on literature, culture and national existence." An article in its fourth issue by A. Yazda describes Iran as a place in which "the people's language and existence is enchained and not one school

in the mother tongue of the 18 million strong [Azeris] has been opened in Azerbaijan." Literature published by Gaynarja includes works by Soviet Azeri authors.

/12232

### **Independent Structure for Investigative Apparatus Promoted**

*18000630 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Aug 88 p 3*

[Interview with Lt Gen V. Novikov, chief of the USSR MVD Main Administration for Investigations, by IZVESTIYA commentator Yu. Feofanov under the rubric "Legal Dialogue: Preliminary Investigation"]

[Text] In the resolution "On Legal Reform," adopted by the 19th Party Conference, reference was made to the feasibility of establishing an independent structure for the investigative apparatus. How will this be realized? Lt Gen V. Novikov, chief of the USSR MVD Main Administration for Investigations, discusses the subject with IZVESTIYA commentator Yu. Feofanov.

[Question] The press has noted this anomaly for a long time. The point is, if an investigator is subordinate to the procurator, what sort of supervision does he get? If subordinate to the chief of the militia, how independent is he in terms of judicial procedure? And will the reform give to the investigator full independence? Vasilii Georgiyevich, what is your opinion in this matter?

[Answer] In my opinion, removing the individual from the organization is quite impossible. No matter what reforms we may fashion, an unscrupulous professional will always find ways to get around the law. But if we discuss the matter in terms of organization, then it is our business to be mindful of history.

The profession of investigator in Russia has been in existence for more than 120 years—ever since the judicial reform of 1864. Prior to this, there was an arbitrary process of inquisition in which the function of investigator and judge came together in one person. However paradoxical this may seem, over this entire period the role of investigator was unable to find a permanent place of refuge. Before the revolution investigators were attached to the courts. Thereafter, they were obliged to move about a bit; they were transferred to the jurisdiction of the provincial courts, then to the People's Commissariat of Justice, and then to the office of the procurator. Since 1963 the internal affairs organs have been given authority to conduct preliminary investigations.

Everything, however, was done with half-way measures. The idea appeared to be a good one. The militia, as an organ of preliminary investigation, and the investigator have a single task—to uncover crime quickly and completely, to expose the guilty, and thus maintain the inevitable consequences of criminal liability. So it was thought necessary to unite them, and it was assumed that the judicial status of the two services would serve as a guaranty against their merging.

So it was supposed. And how did it turn out? Altogether differently. You be the judge: How can an investigator require something of a chief of militia to whom he is

directly subordinate? As a result the investigative apparatus fell under the influence of the operational services, and a premium was placed upon swiftness of response, while legality became of secondary importance. Things reached a point where investigators were sent on patrol duty and given pointless tasks, such as investigating the alleged killing of four chickens by a neighbor's dog. It took almost a quarter century to become convinced of the pernicious nature of such a form of organization.

[Question] At last, we are convinced. But what now? What will happen to the investigative process?

[Answer] Investigative subdivisions must be taken out of local and republic internal affairs organizations and independent investigative staffs must be established. In other words, within the MVD system the militia and the investigative function must be independent of one another at all levels, except for overall supervision at the very top by the minister. It is proposed to abolish the preliminary investigation as an independent form of fact-finding inquiry. In order to see how all this would prove in practice, in September of last year we started an ongoing experiment in Belorussia and Estonia, in Volgograd and Sverdlovsk oblasts, as well as in a number of rayons in Moscow. Even the preliminary results attest to the soundness of the changes I have noted. The responsibility and the motivation of investigators have risen markedly. Coordination between the operational services has been put on a sound footing. The most significant result of the experiment, I believe you will agree with me, has been a sharp reduction in cases of unjustified detention, arrest, and legal action for civil and criminal complaints. At the start of the year the experiment was extended within the investigative staffs of union republics and a number of regions of Russia.

[Question] It is no longer an experiment really, but standard practice. But I find one circumstance confusing. The investigative process all the same remains within the MVD system. However the services may be separated, the chief of operations, although far removed, is still one and the same person.

[Answer] I agree, this is a half measure, and perhaps a temporary one. It occurs to me that the best option would be to develop a single investigative commission with its own local bodies. It should be accountable to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Such a decision has been proposed repeatedly by both scholars and practical workers, but for various reasons has not been implemented. As far as the priority measures are concerned, these, I believe, have been incorporated into the experiment that I was describing. The soundness of such a decision has been recognized as well in the resolution "On Legal Reform" of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

[Question] You were saying how for more than a century the investigative function "traveled about" the area of judicial authority. Does not this very fact tell us that it is not merely a matter of organization and reorganization? The specific nature of a preliminary investigation, of course, lies in its remaining secret. And this means that the investigator has enormous power over the person suspected of committing a crime. Even with an attorney and the sustained monitoring of public opinion, the investigator nevertheless is capable of using his authority for evil purposes. We know how evidence is obtained by unscrupulous investigators, and how a person may be forced to admit to something he did not do. Is the reorganization as proposed capable of countering this?

[Answer] You are correct to a certain extent. With respect to repressive measures in the conduct of investigations, I should like to point out one fact—the specific character and complexity of investigative work. The investigator is obliged to take every measure, as the law states, "to carry out a comprehensive, thorough, and objective investigation of the surrounding facts, disclosing facts tending to prove both the guilt and innocence of the defendant and both extenuating and incriminating circumstances." You don't find any contradiction, do you, in simultaneously seeking incriminating evidence and extenuating circumstances? Psychologically, it is extremely difficult. There are allegations, there are suspicions, there are different versions. And there is the presence of a slight doubt. Not to go beyond it, not to discard it—for this the investigator requires courage. In recent years we have significantly narrowed the sphere of activities for using arrest as a preventive measure and we have used detention less for people who are suspects. Last year more than 64,000 persons who committed petty crimes were released from detention during the investigation stage. That represents a certain change for the better. Not simply organizational factors but moral factors have been influential—the very spirit of the times. We cannot go on operating in the old way.

[Question] No doubt the press has gotten on your nerves to some extent. At any rate, I receive quite a number of responses to critical articles even from the investigators. They think the press only gets in the way. But, of course, publicity means one thing: Don't break the law.

[Answer] The press may also be criticized in some respects. Conducting a preliminary investigation without violating the law is for us the top priority. The fact of the matter is that it is the pivotal aspect of investigative practice as a whole. And when the mass media brings to light instances of one kind or another revealing deviations from the law, violating the rights and legitimate interests of citizens, we feel nothing but gratitude for such criticism.

Unfortunately, for the time being, we have not managed to eliminate instances of arrest, detention, and incarceration for insufficient cause. As for the number of causal factors, I would cite first of all a very acute lack of

professionalism. True, the objection may be raised: How can this be when the investigative service is the most highly educated in the system of internal affairs organs? Eighty-six percent of its members have the highest law degrees. Alas, a person with a law degree is not yet an inspector.

Quite a number of those in the investigative service are still young and do not possess the necessary practical experience. A professional core of skilled workers is only beginning to take shape. Many cannot withstand the stress, which is enormous. Moreover, in recent years the former prestige of the profession has gone down in the opinion of the public. It should not be forgotten that the struggle means not only victories but mistakes and defeats. A person insufficiently trained in terms of moral as well as professional relations sometimes chooses means to wage this struggle that are impermissible. As a result mistakes and legal violations occur in investigations, often associated with undisguised legal nihilism. Here is just one example of how it is possible for a person to lose his freedom on the basis of "make-believe" evidence. In April 1987 Investigator Bazarov of the Donskoy city department of internal affairs in Tula Oblast instituted criminal proceedings against a citizen named Skripkin, who was detained in the attic of a house that belonged to a citizen named Savostin. There were pigeons in the attic. Savostin made the allegation that "Skripkin no doubt wanted to steal the pigeons." The investigator pressed charges (on the basis of this statement alone), arresting him with the official approval of the procurator, and took the case to court. The People's Court, of course, acquitted Skripkin, and the investigator was punished. I cite this extremely simple example to underscore my conception of legal nihilism, and also your point about the enormous power of the investigator, which can be used to serve evil purposes.

But in the interest of justice I will say this. Analysis shows that the preponderance of legal violations associated with arrest, detention, and criminal offense charges are unintentional in nature. Nevertheless, the USSR MVD and its Main Administration for Investigations maintain a hard line with respect to violations of legality, especially the so-called "seamy" sort involving falsification and forgery in office.

[Question] Can you be more specific? Is it possible to comment on the extent of legal violations in quantitative terms?

[Answer] Why not? Although I will not hide the fact that the statistical information of the past year has indicated a marked rise in instances of arrest without due cause and preventive detention. But it must be borne in mind that about 70 percent of these instances occurred during the period 1983-1986, many cases carrying sentences that subsequently entered into force.

What does this signify? First of all, that judicial practice has substantially changed. This change immediately altered our indicators for the worse. In short, the "old sins" of the law enforcement organs, if I may express myself in such a way, were woven into the statistics of the past year.

At the same time, the situation with regard to observance of legal procedure should not be overdramatized. Here are a few statistics for the year 1967. Instances of criminal charges without sufficient cause against citizens brought by MVD investigators amounted to 43 percent of the total number of cases sent to court; and unjustified arrests occurred in 15 percent of the cases. But we are not building an illusion. These percentages stand for dozens and hundreds of people.

[Question] You mentioned indicators. I know that it is not possible to do without them. But if I had my way I would evaluate your work exclusively in terms of negative indicators: detention without grounds, unjustified legal action. At the abstract level, such instances do not exist.

[Answer] Yes, indicators—the mania of thinking in terms of percentages and the "gross" approach—are a chronic illness. This malady has taken over the field of economics and it has not left the organs of internal affairs unscathed, especially in making assessments of the degree of detecting crimes. It is no secret that official statistics of five and six years ago in certain regions showed a hundred percent success rate in crime detection. These statistics were believed and won plaudits. And what lay behind these percentages, and what the implications of them were, concerned no one. At the same time, this mania with percentages corrupted people, encouraging unhealthy ambitions and prompting the crudest sort of violations of the law.

The head of the Mukachevo city department of internal affairs in Transcarpathian Oblast, I Fabritskiy, and his deputy, M. Bordey, throughout the period 1985-1987, in order to create an illusion of being active in the battle against crime, instructed subordinates to conceal reported crimes, and they themselves falsified the accounting records. They forced investigators to bring charges against citizens without proper grounds. They themselves organized the harassment of the chief of the investigations department, who was hampering their unlawful activities. And all this for the sake of good accountability! The USSR MVD put an end to this lawlessness.

The drive for quantitative results in terms of percentages, for window-dressing, inevitably led to successful convictions. First, they disclosed the crime, and only later began to think about establishing the guilt of the suspects. And if proof was not forthcoming, then a time would come when it was necessary to save the honor of the uniform. Of course, the guilt of the defendant was

already declared. As a result, there was an increasing number of "half-finished" cases where the judges often mechanically rubber-stamped sentences.

Prejudice, biased arguments, the tendency to prosecute, and a bureaucratic way of looking at things in terms of investigative procedure sprang up abundantly as a result of this mania for percentages. For too long a time we placed our hopes in "band-aid" therapy, in slogans and other rationalizations. But the illness, which had rooted itself too deeply, called for "surgical interference." On 19 November 1987 the USSR procurator-general and the USSR minister of internal affairs signed an official document "on the introduction of new standards for crime detection and on amending the Uniform Crime Code Regulations." As of 1 January a crime is considered established not from the moment that a suspect is charged with the crime, but only after the guilt of the defendant in a criminal case is finally proved by the procurator. Similarly, a number of supplementary guarantees are in effect which make it possible to exclude from judicial proceedings cases involving unjustified decisions regarding detention, arrest, and criminal charges. The new criteria are safeguarded by the supervisory functions of the procurator inasmuch as registration of crime detection is now contingent upon a guilty verdict.

[Question] Thus the reorganization, the changing of indicators, and strengthening of the moral foundations offer assurance that we will return to the investigator his former aura of integrity?

[Answer] Well, that day is not yet at hand. And yet the aura in itself is not so important. The main thing is not the brilliant exposure of crime but achieving fewer violations of the law. Of course, unemployment does not pose a threat to us for the present. But if the cases of investigators become fewer, that means the life of the soviet peoples is becoming increasingly purged of crime and more peaceful.

12889

**'Pamyat' Organization Documents Presented, Criticized**

*18000005 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Sep 88 pp 2-3*

[Article by Special Correspondent I. Sidorov, under the "Face to Face" rubric: "Pamyat As it Really Is"]

[Text] "You come again for materials for the newspaper," they said to me on parting.

"The times are changing!"

"You are mistaken," I replied. "They are changing, but not in the way that you want..."



And that is how the talks with the leaders of Pamyat ended, after they had been offered the opportunity to openly express their position in the pages of **LENIN-GRADSKAYA PRAVDA**. But the "front" categorically refused to do this under conditions acceptable to the newspaper.

#### An Ultimatum

In a preceding survey of letters dedicated to the activity of the "front," I cited the letter from artist B. Kirsanov, which proposed giving the leaders of Pamyat an opportunity to speak out in the newspaper and expound their point of view. Naturally, they would under those circumstances bear legal responsibility for the truthfulness of the facts they cite.

It was with just such a suggestion that I appealed to the leaders of Pamyat and received their consent to a meeting. In an apartment on Vasilevskiy Ostrov I heard:

"The conditions are as follows: You guarantee that you will print any of our documents, and then we will consent to an interview..."

From the folio of proffered documents I selected a pamphlet entitled, "An Appeal to Our Fellow Countrymen," which seemed most appropriate in terms of volume, and I told the leaders of the "front" of my willingness to publish it. In response I heard:

"No, it would not be desirable to publish that pamphlet; there are several unclear areas in it and people might not understand..."

You can distribute multiple copies of a document but must not have it published "because of unclear areas?" That's a strange logic. But they pointed out that they had prepared something especially for the newspapers, in the form of a manifesto entitled, "What is Pamyat?" True, its volume is rather large, and after all we want to publish at the same time an interview such as this also. "No problem," they tell me, "we can cut it down."

For four days they "cut it down." But when I came for the interview I received a text even longer than before, and with the presentation an ultimatum: first publish the propagandistic document from Pamyat and only then the interview, not otherwise!

Everyone has his limits. We truly wanted to provide the people of Leningrad an opportunity to become familiar with the views of "Pamyat," and at the same time clearly express our own attitude to them. We expressed our willingness to compromise in the course of the discussions, but we had no intention whatever to knuckle under to demands and to become a propaganda pamphlet for the "front."

The newspaper has not "slammed the door." Our offer to Pamyat stands. But the responsibility for withdrawing from open discussion lies with its leaders. Those very same leaders who consider themselves the "only patriots" in Russia recently gave an interview to journalists from the Western press—and certain of them have already been published in issues which have drawn no sympathy, neither for Russia, nor for our country in general.

#### "No Discussion!"

Why has Pamyat not taken advantage of the opportunity to speak out publicly; after all, it is continually demanding to do so?

Everyone who has been to the meetings of the "front" knows how they begin:

"Comrades," the leader inevitably begins, "we have come here not to hold discussions but to work. In order to avoid provocation, let there be no arguments!"

The mechanism works unfailingly—they truly have no arguments here. And every attempt to object or to express a different point of view is immediately cut off.

The "front" refuses to argue with its opponents; the "front" refuses to answer questions from Soviet journalists... Is such a combination coincidental?

In order to answer this question, we must become better acquainted with the ideological baggage of Pamyat and its methods of operation. Since the "front" has refused to speak out publicly, we shall use for this purpose the documents presented to me by its leadership.

"The national-patriotic front, Pamyat is a nationwide movement which has established as its goal the restoration of the Russian people, as well as the related Ukrainian and Belorussian peoples, while completely respecting the other nations. It sprang up spontaneously in response to the relentless degradation and the spiritual and physical destruction to which these peoples have been subjected during our century, during which our country has lost 60 million people, the greater portion of which fell to the slavic peoples.

"Our centuries-old culture has been ruthlessly trampled and defiled. In the RSFSR, for example, 40 percent of the architectural monuments have perished; many talented writers and artists vanished in the labor camps; and for decades our story has gone unheard... We have become a nation without roots, for we have completely forgotten many of our age-old customs, our national dress, dances and games. Interest is fading everywhere in how our ancestors lived, because our empty hearts and minds have been intensively and maliciously supplanted by a vulgar mass culture imported from the West, or developed on the spot by a denationalized intelligentsia... We have partially lost our inherent Russian spiritual attributes:

compassion, kindness, generosity and responsiveness, since two-thirds of our people live without Christ... We have become an impoverished nation, which is unable to live without foreign grain, meat and oil... Before our very eyes we are turning into a technically backward power, on the level of India or Brazil... A terrible thing has begun—the physical extinction and denigration of the Russian people... If we do not die off because of the reduced birth rate, then we shall be undone by our polluted water, air and soil... Having carried out a revolution and having won the victory in the cruelest of wars, the Russian people today feels that it has been deceived and abused, and asks in bewilderment, when and why have we deviated from the shining path?"

I have quoted the first paragraph completely, and key phrases of the first two pages of the document, "What is Pamyat?" And I am prepared to agree with nine-tenths of these assertions: the economy, equipment and technology, and the ecology of the country are truly in serious condition. At times it is in even more serious condition than Pamyat believes it to be: Alas, in terms of the level of computerization, we can compete with neither India nor Brazil.

But—what does the expression "denationalized intelligentsia" signify? I have always believed that the Russian intelligentsia, cruelly mown down by Stalin's repression, has nevertheless survived and continues to create. But I am not convinced of the fact that we have "partially lost our inherent Russian spiritual attributes" exclusively because of mass atheism. And furthermore, the assertion that our mass culture has been implanted with "ill-intention," puts me on my guard. Just who is it that is supplying "ill intentions" with respect to the Russian people?

#### Who is to Blame?

The above-mentioned Pamyat document contains only incomprehensible hints of some sort of "dark powers." Probably this was intentional: the manifest was, of course, prepared for the press, and it was impossible to refer directly in it to what they shout about at their meetings.

Let us turn to another document. Here is the pamphlet, "Appeal to our Fellow Countrymen," which was prepared in August of this year: "The time has come to make a choice—to bury our heads in the sand like an ostrich and to continue moving in the herd of slaves "building Solomon's temple," or, to gather our forces and get off the path of Zionism, rid ourselves of the Zionist reptiles, and save and heal our much-wounded, profaned and assaulted Mother Russia..." And here is what two adherents of the "front," N. Spiridonova and Ye. Glukhova write (This letter was also given to me by the leaders of Pamyat): "Pamyat believes that the fundamental reason for the well-known, widespread breakdown in various spheres of

our lives is—Zionism, which has for a long time been chipping away at the socialist foundation of our society, with its perfidious psychological methods."

What does Pamyat mean by "Zionist reptiles?" It is quite difficult to find an explanation on this account in the documents of the "front." Therefore, we shall turn to the text of an interview given not so long ago to a correspondent from SOIR, a Belgian newspaper, by one of the leaders of the "front" (and incidentally a member of its central council in Moscow), Lenfilm director Yu. Riverov. Here is an excerpt from the interview:

#### "How will you implement your program?"

"We must strive to ensure that Russia is ruled by Russians. And we must return the land to the peasants. This is the basis of all the changes. The party also expresses such intentions, but it cannot carry them out, because the real power in this country belongs not to the party, but to the Jewish mafia which made the revolution and since that time has been crucifying and ravaging the country..."

Pamyat makes use of various terms—Masonic Plot, or Jewish Mafia; but its leaders look upon everything, absolutely everything that is going on in the country, through the prism of these fantastic ideas. The Masons are strangling Russia! The October Revolution was the work of their hands. The shooting of the Royal Family was Jewish ritual execution (I am not joking! That is in their documents...). And Stalin—a weak-willed puppet in the hands of the Masons and Zionists, among whom Kaganovich and Mekhlis are singled out especially. The supply of gas to the West by the Soviet Union, and the breakdown of agriculture—are also their machinations. That damnable, all-penetrating plot is to blame for everything! There are no other causes.

But who will save Russia? I quote: "In our day, Pamyat and no one else stands for the salvation and restoration of the Russian people." The CPSU, which has brought forth the policy of perestroika, consequently does not count either.

#### What do they Propose?

A careful examination of the two parts of the manifesto, "What is Pamyat?"—the critical and the constructive—makes it quite clear how asymmetrical they are. The critical part is written (and you have seen that) in strong and clear terms. But then, when one reaches the specific proposals, just how to save Russia—all convictions are removed.

Apart from the most ordinary words ("genuine and not sham reform of education... development of legislation to protect the citizens from loss of rights and arbitrary rule...

the possibility for women to return to the family; funding, especially in localities affected by depopulation, sufficient facilities for educating the children..."), Pamyat has no concrete proposals.

However, in one sphere of our lives, the "front" proposes what are very radical measures. The manifesto "What is Pamyat?" speaks of this sparingly, but expressively of: "the spread of glasnost to all areas of our history and contemporary life, to include the Jewish question... Restoring the health of our cultural life and the mass information media by means of struggle with the Zionists and pro-zionist mafia which have taken over." And at a 7 July meeting of Pamyat, the speaker, responding to a question of how the "front" relates to socialism and Soviet rule, expressed himself even more clearly: "We are for socialism, as soon as it can be built; for socialism without Jews..."

The leaders of Pamyat know full well that propagating national enmity in our country is in violation of the Constitution and falls under the corresponding statute of the Criminal Code. That is precisely why at meetings of the "front" one hears so often the affirmation: "We are not anti-semites; we are not struggling with the Jews, but only with the Zionists!"

But you already know who Yu. Riverov named as the enemy in the interview with SOIR. Here then is another document offered by the leadership of Pamyat. It is called "The National Make-Up of the Leningrad Department of the USSR Union of Composers." The names listed in it are underlined in a special way: "ethnic Jews," with a solid line; "persons who have married Jews," with a dashed line; and "cringing Russians," with a dotted line. Are they really concerned with Zionists here?

#### A Choice of Time

No matter what today's leaders of Pamyat say about their fraternal love toward representatives of all other nationalities (D. Vasilyev informs that the membership of the "front" includes Jews as well), their statements form an impression of nationalism of the very worst kind.

This nationalism is not simply limited to anti-semitism, or simply by ideas of a fantastic Masonic Plot. It appears to be a rather well-developed system, which contains such pearls as the following: "Propagating international marriages brings only harm to all the peoples of the USSR. A criminally stupid attitude toward the principal wealth of the Triune Russian People (Great Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians)—which is the purity of the Slavic Gene Fund—Slavic Blood. Long live Russia. God rot her enemies!" I suggest comparing this statement with the facts cited in V. Bessonov's book, "Fashizm: ideologiya i politika" [Fascism: Its Ideology and Politics]: "On

15 September 1935, the Law on Protection of German Blood and German Honor was adopted, forbidding marriage and cohabitation with Jews by citizens of the Reich..."

But why is it precisely today, in the fourth year of perestroyka, that such an attack of nationalism is possible? Is it any coincidence that at that very moment, when the country is straining every effort to cast off the methods of the command-administrative system, that a threat is observed from where it was not expected? At the USSR Academy of Sciences' Ethnography Institute I had a talk with Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Valentin Georgiyevich Uznovoy, and found out approximately the following:

Any period of social upheaval—revolution, or social crisis—is accompanied by an increase in "internal pressures" in society. People try to act energetically and show their worth. Perestroyka, which in many respects is similar to a revolution, says to a person: Stand up; straighten your spine: you are no longer one of Stalin's pawns; you are free. Fight! Take action! And what is Pamyat saying? I quote from its manifesto under the caption, "From the Association to the Front": "Overcome your cowardice! Courage—that is the necessary quality for a man, but not for a slave!... Everyone is born free. It is namely the individual who is the creator of his own destiny!... Everyone must understand his great role!... Down with feelings of fear! Oppression and genocide flourish in those places where there is cowardice... Fight for your rights, for the shining national ideals!"

Thus, Pamyat is trying to take the principal and the most attractive idea of perestroyka—the liberation of the thinking and the spirit of man—and force it to work for itself. But the party, in proclaiming this slogan, tells the people honestly that the path to worthiness and freedom requires a great deal of work, or else the country cannot be brought out of the crisis. The "front," however, proposes immediate action: Go to the meeting, win over adherents, and expose the "Zionists" where you work. "Where there is no Pamyat NPF [National Patriotic Front], be more bold and more active in creating one; and, having overcome your aloofness, unite under the banner of the Central Council... Departments of the Pamyat NPF must become actively involved in government in the localities... and deal a crushing blow to all the usurpers of power, setting a personal example of service to the Fatherland... Close up your ranks more decisively, O heroes, true sons of the Fatherland, under the flag of the Pamyat National Patriotic Front!" (From the same document).

Nationalism inevitably leads to extremism, most often verbal extremism, but nevertheless ready for concrete action as well. I will quote once again from the SOIR interview with Yu. Riverov: "...We are holding street demonstrations at the Theater imeni S.M. Kirov, where the cosmopolites who have seized power are sacrificing the classical Russian ballet for modern decadent dances; and

**in front of the university dormitory where foreigners insult their Russian instructors; and in front of the Lenfilm movie studios, which is completely in the hands of the Jews."**

There is no need to struggle tenaciously for the sake of renewing the country; instead, extremism offers "the man in the crowd" the opportunity of personal participation in immediate actions, and it is precisely this that part of the populace finds attractive. It has been that way in all ages, and Pamyat has not invented anything new here: as, incidentally, in the choice of an idea capable of uniting its followers. Psychologists know that people band together stronger than ever when they perceive an external threat. For its own propaganda, Pamyat simply needs to depict a terrible, all-penetrating plot; just as those who frightened the German people in the 1920's and 30's needed the "domination of the Jewish plutocrats."

Reflecting the slogans of perestroika in a distorting mirror, Pamyat leads people away from reality, and replaces it with a myth. This myth is carefully guarded from testing its resistance to criticism—the "front" assiduously avoids discussion. It needs no doubts; it needs no disputes. It does need the blind faith of thousands of people in the sound of a bell, portrayed on the black sweaters of the defenders of the "front."

In the struggle for people, the "front," as is typical of extremism, does not hesitate to use the worst kind of "black propaganda," loudly and perfidiously. The following incident gives one an idea of its methods: At one of its meetings, the leaders of the "front" stooped to filthy slander of I.M. Zaltsman, who had been director of a plant in Kirov during the war years, and had passed away just a few days prior to the meeting. The anguished relatives of the deceased, who had not yet recovered since the funeral, tried to bring the slanderers to justice. And what happened? It turned out that the false allegations, which sullied the name of a man who had given his health and all his strength to the Victory, belong not to the leaders of Pamyat themselves—at the meeting, it turns out, they "were simply reading" from a letter from a certain pensioner... And since it was just a case of reading a letter, they can get nothing at all out of the "patriots"...

What are the current Pamyat leaders' chances for the success of such propaganda? Figures cited in the SOIR interview were, 500 activists of the "front" in Leningrad, 4,500 supporters, and 10,000 sympathizers... We treat those figures with a certain amount of skepticism, but we will not declare them a total fabrication either. It is dangerous, it seems to me, to underestimate the threat: certain facts speak indirectly of the power of those forces which stand behind Pamyat. This is also a precise choice of the moment when, with the help of aroused nationalism, they try to deal a blow to perestroika—yesterday in Nagornyy Karabakh and Kazakhstan, and today in Leningrad. This is also the internal evolution of Pamyat,

which has steadily developed in the course of many years—also, undoubtedly, not without the influence of those to whom this is advantageous.

"Who stands to gain from this?" asked the Romans. We have the right to ask the very same question. Pamyat is aiming its arrows at "criminal and mindless bureaucrats"... But Lenin also warned that people will always be dumb victims of political deception, until they begin to seek out the interests of one class or another which lie behind all political phrases. Thus, which class stands to gain from the activity of the "front," and which tries to play one nationality off against another? The "class" or stratum is the far from mindless bureaucrats skillfully manipulating the "front," corrupted officials, and criminal clans.

### Forgotten Ideals

But you see, at one time Pamyat was completely different.

This movement began in the 1970's under the noblest of slogans for restoring the cultural heritage of Russian poetry, Russian music, and Russian art and architecture. It was a magnificent, necessary cause, especially if one will recall the great losses our national culture suffered during the years of the civil war, Stalin's terror, the Patriotic War, and the domination of stagnation. One could cite a great many examples: the terrible blow to the study of local lore in 1929, when it was declared a "bourgeois science;" the massive destruction of churches; the sale of our artistic treasures to the west... The precursors of Pamyat attempted to speak out loudly about all of this.

But then a "palace revolution" took place in Pamyat. Different people rose to the leadership and other words began to be heard. Certain readers, who sincerely believed that "the press is trampling on a patriotic society," pointed out that the "front" was fighting for the restoration of Russian culture, and what is so bad about that? Last Spring Yu. Riverov and one of the leaders of the organization, N. Shiryayev, an artist, described to me the plans for propagating Russian romance music, and told of their strivings to win the young people away from the "satanic" rock music...

Where is all this now? Where are those marvelous plans? Pamyat is not organizing concerts, but political meetings. The "front" has long ago cast aside all activities on propagating Russian culture and has concentrated its efforts exclusively on politics. I myself have seen how even after the ban on meetings in Rumyantsevskiy Garden, a crowd of the curious gathered the next Thursday and one of the activists of the "front" was taking down the phone numbers of those who wished to join Pamyat. And you see its leaders had given their word to the authorities that they would cease all activities here!

In the speeches of the leaders one hears appeals to prepare for the spring elections to the Soviets: Pamyat plans to present its own candidates...

The Pamyat of today is neither that which was originally conceived, nor is it that which it passes itself off as. I continue to speak of this because I truly hope that people with common sense, who undoubtedly exist in the ranks of this organization and whom they are trying to make fools of, will nevertheless find strength in themselves to get rid of the extremists who have usurped the leadership, and return Pamyat to the path of service to Russian culture and Russian history. There are certain signs which indicate that such a struggle is going on within the "front." Not long ago one of the most odious figures, N. Lysenko, was apparently expelled from the Leningrad Pamyat Council... But even if the forces of wisdom, capable of taking the path of reflection on national problems without losing themselves in a nationalistic fog, takes the leadership here—it will not be easy for them to clear the name of Pamyat from the filth with which it has covered itself in the eyes of the people.

#### What is to be Done?

In their letters dozens of readers demand taking immediate measures against the "front," pointing out that in their opinion, its leaders have clearly violated the law.

I place special emphasis on the word "immediate." The tone of many statements are like the following: Why fiddle around? Ban them, and the case is closed!

We would like to live in a state of socialist legality. But this matter has proceeded to the practical adoption of its principles, and the reflexes learned over the decades are in operation: cut them off right now!

First of all, establishing the fact of breaking the law, to include the Basic Law of the State, the Constitution, can be done only by the organs, to whose prerogatives this case falls; that is, the procuracy and the court. Toward these ends, the Leningrad procurator is currently conducting a painstaking, careful analysis of Pamyat documents, and video and magnetic tape recordings of its meetings. The press will report the conclusions of the specialists in due time.

Secondly, I will utter a seditious thought: I am not at all convinced that bringing figures from Pamyat to trial will resolve all the problems. Once I managed to speak on the telephone with D. Vasilyev, and he frankly stated: Try us; we want a trial! The reasons for such aspirations are, I think, clear: the judicial process will create an aura of martyrdom, suffering for the Fatherland, around the heads of the leaders of the "front," and that will be a sensation for the foreign press, to which they readily grant interviews, for it is a rostrum for Pamyat, and will

create a new stir around it. And then it will, you can be sure, be able to take advantage of this atmosphere for propagating its "ideas," and attracting more and more new supporters.

It seems to me that society has clearly lost its head in the face of the open attacks on the foundations of internationalism, which we had always proclaimed to be unshakable. And we can beat off this attack and change over to the offensive only by making use of the truth, by using honest and convincing words. I inquired at the aforementioned Ethnography Institute, where there are brilliant specialists on the history of national relations, as to whether Leningrad propagandists are making use of this gold mine of knowledge and facts. No, they were not... During the latter part of September several academic institutions had planned to conduct a scientific-practical conference in Leningrad on the problems of international relations, no doubt a much-needed one. Will its results become the property of the broad public or will they lie on the shelves? We don't know... Where, finally, were the party and Soviet leaders, the scholars and the specialists, when that provocative nonsense was being handed out on the stage in Rumyantsevskiy Garden? Not one of our ideologists came out and attempted to refute them!

We must wage a purposeful and serious struggle with the poison of chauvinism and nationalism, with which they are trying to contaminate perestroyka. The forces to do this exist; they must be utilized. And here the thousands of people who call themselves propagandists and ideologists will have to pass a genuine test, whether or not they are capable of convincing the people. And if they fail to pass this test, then we do not need such propagandists and such ideologists.

And there's more. Soil for such phenomena as Pamyat will continue to exist until such a time as society hastens to make use of the energy and concerns of socially-active people. As long as it continues to vacillate, as long as it takes an unbearably long time trying to cope with the very idea of "unplanned" manifestations of human activeness, the "front" will win over many people through the use of demagoguery.

Of course we must save the monuments of the past, and this idea is dear to the hearts of many citizens of Leningrad; and they are prepared to work for the sake of the cause. But do you remember how we initially reacted to the Spasenie Group?... Of course we have to protect the environment. But do you remember how some administrators reacted to the demonstrations of the "greens" in Kirishi—"undermining the foundations!" The people have been awakened, and they want to take action, to take matters in the country into their own hands; and they angrily say to them, "What's all the fuss about? We'll manage without you..."

I am of the opinion that there can and must be a variety of true alternatives to Pamyat; truly informal organizations, in which people could actually study the history of the Fatherland; could restore the monuments of antiquity; and could fight with the bureaucrats. In striving to close the valves of social activeness out of long-established habit, we ourselves are creating the possibility of its being manifested in a distorted, caricatured manner, as in the case of the "front." The single true path for the struggle with the recidivists of nationalism is further democratization of society, and increasing the level of freedom in it. I am convinced of this.

For whom did I write this material? Not for those who already understand the danger to perestroika of nationalism and chauvinism, for they need no convincing. Not for those who blindly believe everything that the present leaders of Pamyat say—there is no way one can convince them. I wrote it for those who have not yet determined their own position, who believe with all honesty that "in some things Pamyat is correct."

**FROM THE EDITORS:** This material represents our response to the multitudes of letters and verbal appeals from the citizens to the party and Soviet organs of Leningrad, and to the editors of our newspaper, with respect to the activity of Pamyat. In the process of its preparation by our correspondent, the editorial staff of **LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA** was apprised by the Leningrad Gorispolkom of the fact that right up to the receipt of final conclusions from the city procuracy on the nature of the activity of the "national patriotic front," all of its public activity in Leningrad (meetings, gatherings and the like) are categorically forbidden. Those guilty of violating this ban will bear legal responsibility in accordance with the law.

09006

### **Charges of Soviet 'Negative Attitude' to Jewish Culture Rejected**

*18000003 Moscow VECHEARNAYA MOSKVA in Russian 9 Sep 88 pp 2-3*

[Article by Viktor Magidson, under the rubric "Polemical Notes": "National Culture and Nationalistic Games"]

[Text] It seems extremely important for everyone to clarify for himself as precisely as possible where the border lies between such concepts as "national" and "nationalistic."

National self-respect and consciousness not only do not rule out but invariably presuppose respect for the representatives of other peoples, while nationalism, out of all the priorities on the universal human scale of values, recognizes only one—national self-love and confidence in the complete and absolute supremacy of "one's own" nation over all the others. Its extreme expression, as we recall from recent history, was German Nazism.

It is necessary to know and remember history. I hope that the first part of these notes, which was published in the previous issue of **VECHERNAYA MOSKVA** and which traced certain stages in the development of Jewish culture attracted readers' attention. A little more history.

After the Great Patriotic War the process of restoring Soviet Jewish culture, which of course had suffered gravely, was about to get under way. But it was soon halted, for by that time the faulty thesis holding that the encouragement of national cultures is at odds with the principles of developing a socialist culture of the whole people had already fully taken shape. The situation was worsened even further by the fact that Stalin's persecutions of the intelligentsia, naturally, affected the Jewish part of it.

However, as I recall, most Jews almost never took this as a national cultural tragedy; for them it was a tragedy precisely of the whole people.

It became a tragedy (and by no means only for Jews) that both a sense of national dignity and practically any appeal to the history of one's people, if it went beyond limits that had been established once and for all, were sometimes declared to be nationalism. And not just appeals to history, but appeals to the customs of one's fathers and grandfathers. We all were terribly afraid of being known as nationalists or, God forbid, cosmopolitans!

Such a distortion of national consciousness frequently led not just to national narrow-mindedness but also to recurrences of nationalism in its extremely diverse forms and manifestations: an abnormal upbringing could not produce perfect fruits.

Here is an example. Recently several students appealed to the Komsomol committee of the Institute of the Petrochemical and Gas Industry with a request that they be permitted to organize an evening of Jewish song, but only for Jews. Is any comment required?

I recall another recent case. Soon after the book "Svet na gore" [Light on the Mountain] by the Moscow prose writer Vladimir Tikhvinskiy had come out (it tells about the fate of the inhabitants of a Ukrainian city during the Hitlerites' occupation), the idea arose of translating its action to the stage of a central studio theater (it was brilliantly realized somewhat later by V. Spesivtsev). At that same time I had become acquainted with a group of young Jews who had set up something like a theater circle in one of their apartments. They were looking for a present-day repertoire, which, they told me, absolutely had to reflect the "national subject." I also met Sergey Lugovskoy in that apartment.

I proposed that those youngsters involve themselves in working on the production based on V. Tikhvinskiy's novel. After learning that it deals with a Jewish boy who hides from the fascists, they were about to agree, and

they even showed up all together to see the director to look things over. But when it turned out that that boy's comrades, mentors and friends from the anti-Nazi Resistance were people of various nationalities, they refused point-blank. They were interested only in the "narrowly national" subject. The internationalist idea on which the author had based his work neither inspired them or drew any response from them. Yet they could spend hours discussing the "exclusiveness" of Jewish history and culture, some sort of "national component" that belonged only to Jews, and the utterly mystical notion of "national instinct." All that, honestly speaking, was hard to take seriously, for behind all of it one could see no sign of either serious mental work or accurate knowledge.

However, one of them, S. Lugovskoy, evoked involuntary respect, not by virtue of his position itself, but by virtue of his unquestionable definiteness and his pragmatism. He spoke approximately as follows: "To me it is a matter of profound indifference how Jewish culture develops in the Soviet Union. In general, I do not believe that one can remain a Jew and not, at the same time, strive to emigrate to Israel, for Jewish culture can develop in Israel, and nowhere else. And I will be there."

Whatever you say, it is a rather clear-cut and candid position. Every time I met him, S. Lugovskoy would return to it over and over. As he would to the idea of his imminent departure for Israel.

Now imagine my surprise when, upon reading (granted, a bit late) an article published last 6 December in the newspaper the WASHINGTON POST titled "Aliens in One's Own Country," I discovered under it, among four other signatures, that of S. Lugovskoy. He, who had so categorically and quite recently been denying any possibility of the development of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union, and who considered any attack on Zionism to be an anti-Semitic manifestation, was now declaring that he had begun, together with several other people, to establish a **public Jewish culture association** in Moscow!

Doubtlessly, in and of itself the idea may not be worse than any other. Especially since there really are people to unite. After all, despite all the distortion of the development of Soviet Jewish culture in recent decades, acknowledged masters have successfully worked in it and continue to do so. Thus, for example, in the area of literature, the older generation is represented by such widely known names as Aron Vergelis, Shira Gorshman, Khaim Beyder, Samuil Gordon, Khaim Melamud, Tevye Gen, Ikhil Shraybman and Grigoriy Polyanker. Among the younger writers, Lev Berinskiy and Boris Sandler have managed to recommend themselves. The Jewish Chamber Musical Theater, directed by Mikhail Gluz, a RSFSR honored artist, enjoys success. There is a studio theater under the direction of Vladimir Levenbuk. There are interesting Jewish folk theaters in Birobidzhan and Vilnius. A dictionary and a textbook have come out for students of Yiddish.

And although personally I am extremely far from thinking that even under the most favorable conditions the development and spread of Yiddish as a literary language or language of everyday communication can prove promising, for Soviet Jews live mainly in big cities where it is the language of the national majority that inevitably becomes the language of communication, it must be admitted that such a development of national cultural forms unquestionably is in keeping with the sense of national consciousness of Soviet Jews. Including those (and they are a majority) for whom the Jewish language never was and never will be their native language, and who psychologically and emotionally have merged with the culture of the national majority and, moreover, themselves work very successfully in it. Here what is important is not so much personal involvement in the national cultural legacy as the very possibility of becoming acquainted with it. An acquaintance whereby a sense of injury does not arise, for there is no forbidden fruit.

**So the very idea of establishing a public Jewish cultural association (and it had also been expressed earlier) may be perfectly fine and perfectly timely.** But what sort of attitude could S. Lugovskoy have to it, except a sharply negative one? It even occurred to me that over the months in which I had not seen him he had drastically changed his position and his principled, as he had told me, rejection of any forms of development of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union.

I decided to turn to Lugovskoy himself for explanations and immediately learned that Sergey was in Israel! So I never understood whether he had written that article during the last days before his emigration from our country, or once he was already there, abroad.

And what about the other authors? I do not know their plans for the future. But their ideological precepts leave no doubts. Suffice it to return to the article published in the WASHINGTON POST. Its authors, like Lugovskoy during our meetings, unanimously identify the struggle against Zionism with anti-Semitism and accuse the Soviet mass information media of "representing the Arab-Israeli conflict without taking into account the interests and views of the two million Soviet Jews, most of whom sympathize with the Jewish state and maintain, accordingly, personal and family contacts."

I want to ask the authors of this assertion whether they really believe that they are expressing the opinion of the majority of Soviet Jews and in what regard, specifically, in these authors' opinion, Soviet Jews sympathize with Israel—in its policy with regard to the Palestinian population on the occupied territories? Or do they sympathize in general—without regard to that policy? In that case, what is the attitude of the article's authors toward those Israelis who come out for the Palestinians' rights?

This is by no means a rhetorical question. And the answers to it are extremely essential for me. For I want to understand whether it really was concern for Soviet Jews



and, thus, for me that moved the initiators who established the association. In order to do that it is necessary, first and foremost, to be persuaded of their sincerity and inner integrity. In the case of Lugovskoy everything is clear. I think that it is more or less clear with the others, too. As just one example, take Mikhail Chlenov, whose name is first among those who signed the newspaper article. What sort of objections can there be against his participation in the development of Jewish culture, especially since he is a highly experienced ethnologist? But as for the association that he may be striving to head up, I regard it with extreme mistrust, which in my view is perfectly justifiable, for his signature under the article in the WASHINGTON POST was by no means an accident. His name, as the VOICE OF ISRAEL has reported, was also signed under an appeal of an action group regarding the holding of a protest rally against anti-Semitism, along with the name of Lugovskoy, whose positions are sufficiently clear to me. But the appeal was also signed by another well-known name—Lev Ovsishcher, who also lives in Israel now. He once wrote his former comrade (the letter was published in nationalistic "samizdat"): "...can it be that you and your fellow fighters against Zionism have accommodated yourselves to such an extent that you are absolutely indifferent toward such writings (i.e., those directed against Zionism—V. M.)? Read my letter together with your fellow writers and fellow anti-Semites....My letter is addressed not only to you but also to Dragunskiy and other war veterans...."

M. Chlenov did not know of those lines? Yet that is how his position was expressed. I recall a round table held in March at the Home of Scholars. At it the most acute issues of internationality relations in our country were considered in a free discussion. M. Chlenov was one of those who spoke there. He claimed, in particular, that among those who criticize Zionism there is only a formal distinction: some criticize Zionism rudely, while others maintain a "human face" in doing so. But both of them, in M. Chlenov's words, are participants in an anti-Semitic campaign, for the Soviet people, once again in M. Chlenov's words, automatically perceive criticism of Zionism as criticism of Jews in general.

In actuality, there is nothing new in that position. It is the Zionist ideologues who insist on the fact that for the whole world the concept of Jew and that of Zionist are identical. One can understand them—they would be glad to really make a Zionist of every Jew. But here, so to speak, dreams diverge widely from reality, and ethnic origin, of course, by no means always determines a person's ideology.

From this position of M. Chlenov's stemmed another, which he also expressed in the course of the discussion: he believes that the negative attitude toward Jewish culture and the difficulties that sometimes arise between Jews and the representatives of other nationalities—most often, on the level of everyday life—are by their

nature exclusive, and that the reasons for that "exclusivity" must be sought, in the final analysis, not in deviations from Lenin's nationalities policy but in the anti-Semitism with which Soviet society, he claims, is infected.

I have already written that for every person who is familiar with our country's history and feels himself to be a citizen of it and an internationalist, such a position is offensive, for in it one can detect an open indifference toward anyone who does not belong to "your" nation or nationality. And just how, one wonders, can one, while holding to a position of the "exclusivity" of a given nation (it doesn't matter in what regard), fight for its equal rights? Can nationalism be nationalism while hoping at the same time to achieve fraternal love among the representatives of different peoples?

When I think about the cultural association proposed by Chlenov, another thought comes to mind. After all, no matter how important an idea is in and of itself, no matter how timely it seems, you will agree that who it comes from and who plans to implement are even more important. M. Chlenov, with his position that in no way reflects the position of the majority, if only because that majority hardly shares his views on the criticism of Zionism in general and of its policies in the Middle East? Or one of the followers of S. Lugovskoy, who long ago packed his bag to depart from our country?

For me these are by no means idle questions. They are filled with extremely concrete, practical meaning. I now recall not only meetings with S. Lugovskoy (who, in his own words, was a "principled Zionist," and who, as we know, also stood at the sources of that same association that people are now trying to establish), but a rally organized with the direct participation of M. Chlenov at the Vostryakovskoye Cemetery last April. It was devoted to the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto during World War II. At the time, in April, VECHERNAYA MOSKVA wrote about the rally.

That rally, to put it mildly, could in no way be called internationalist. In any case, its organizers did a very great deal in order to instill in the minds and hearts of the Jews who were gathered there a feeling of isolation and alienation from the rest of the world, and to sow hostility toward it and mistrust in it.

I doubt that such a position evoked approval and understanding on the part of Soviet people, including Jews. And I am by no means certain that it will not be carried over to the activities of the cultural association, for many of that rally's organizers are now also acting as the cultural association's founders. Therefore, I shall return to the rally in the cemetery. And to M. Chlenov's participation in it.



On that day, taking over the microphone for a long time, one of Chlenov's comrades expatiated on the notion that in the Soviet Union "official anti-Semitism, anti-Semitism from above, comes together with anti-Semitism from below," and then heaped crude and indecent abuse on twice Hero of the Soviet Union Col.-Gen. David Dragunskiy, who, in contrast to practically everyone attending the rally, himself took direct part in liberating Poland from the fascist occupation. Was M. Chlenov indignant? Nothing of the sort!

After several minutes he dispassionately translated from English the words of the visiting Canadian [I. Abell] to the effect that during World War II, when the fascists had undertaken to destroy Europe's Jewish population, "there was not a single country that would plan a program for rescuing the Jews, and there was not a single country that would openly express a sense of compassion and sympathy toward the Jews." That was stated in the Soviet Union, in Moscow. And it was stated as though the Soviet state and its army never existed—the Soviet state and its army, which in the final analysis did, at the price of incredible sacrifices, bring freedom to the peoples of Europe and put an end to the misanthropic policy of Nazism.

And when a veteran of the Great Patriotic War rose to the improvised podium with difficulty and attempted to rebut those who were slandering the Soviet people, M. Chlenov quite serenely observed people trying to drag the veteran down to the ground and insulting him. In order to express one's sympathies or antipathies, you will agree, sometimes it is sufficient merely to keep quiet in time. In a very meaningful fashion.

And another consideration that cannot be overlooked. I am by no means calling on the reader to seek out the "intrigues of hostile forces" always and in everything. However, one must nonetheless recall that the last session of the pro-Zionist World Jewish Congress was held, to a significant extent, under the slogan of the utmost development in countries in which Jews reside of precisely the sort of forms of national culture that would

contribute in the final analysis to emigration to Israel. The same thing was mentioned in one of the protocols adopted at the latest congress of the World Zionist Association. I dare say it is worth quoting: "the Zionist congress calls on Jewish communities throughout the world to launch broad Jewish education among the young generation of Jews in order to prevent their assimilation and divorce from Israel, and in order to identify a sense of mutual destiny between Jews of the diaspora and those of Israel."

Of course, I am very far from thinking that the initiators of the establishment of a Jewish cultural association in Moscow are carrying out some sort of assignment from foreign Zionist centers. Subjectively, they are not. Therefore, it seems to me, they should not be prevented from engaging in cultural activities. **But to entrust them with the practical leadership of them, even within the framework of a grassroots organization, would be objectively playing into the hands of precisely the foreign Zionist centers.** I have cited only some of the corroborating evidence, that which, in my view, is the most important.

As for Soviet Jewish culture, it really is in need of development. Its state should fully correspond to the level of national consciousness and the level of democracy of our society. And, I think, its development should and can proceed from existing Jewish national institutions—such as the magazine SOVETISH GEYMLAND, the newspaper BIROBIDZHANER SHTERN, and Jewish theaters and music groups—both state and amateur. And here, evidently, it is impossible to get by without the Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public, although that, I realize, will not be to some people's liking.

The success of the undertaking really does require a collective effort and, I believe, one that goes far beyond the national framework. As to what form it should take—serious thought should be given to that. As for its ideological platform, in my view it is as clear as can be—**the platform, for all the pluralism of views, should be socialist.**

## Estonian 'International Movement' Challenges 'Popular Front'

### Estonian Nationalism Criticized

18000626 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 21 Jul 88 p 4

[Article by V. Ivanov: "He Who is Not With Us Is—What?"]

[Text] *When, the day after the first meeting on the Estonian Red Marksmen Square organized at the initiative of the International Front group (today renamed the Intermovement) on July 12, we were visited in our editorial offices by one of the activists of the new movement, Konstantin Kiknadze, we asked him, I recall, this question: why didn't they want to join the already announced Popular Front [PF]? The answer, if we omit the details, sounded roughly like this: "We do not in principle reject the idea of unification in the future—on this or that basis—with the Popular Front. However, as Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote at one time, there must be delimitation before unification. In other words, if we simply joined the PF as one of its groups, we would dissolve in that stream, we would not be noticed, no attention would be paid to our platform. And herein, although we accept the program proposed by the Popular Front on many positions, we also have material complaints toward it and things we do not agree with."*

I do not vouch for the stenographic accuracy of the quote, but that was the sense of it.

It is perhaps convenient to begin a discussion of the second meeting of the friendship of peoples (that is how the status of the function was officially defined) that was held at the same place on July 19 from a focus on the differences in the positions of the PF and the International Movement [IM]. More precisely, not with the differences themselves, but with the causes of them.

The point is, of course, that we can welcome the new initiative or reject it, criticize the platform of the IM or approve of it, consider the very appearance of the movement a positive phenomenon or a negative one, but we must acknowledge one thing as undisputed and unambiguous. Namely that the International Movement did not arise in and of itself, in an empty space and at the whim of its creators. Do not mistake Ye. Kogan, K. Kiknadze and others of today's activists as the whole matter—someplace other people would have undertaken something similar, except that they would have called their offspring something else.

The profound cause (not grounds, I emphasize, but cause) for the appearance of the Popular Front was the concern of the Estonian population for the fate of their culture, language and existence as a nation per se. We can discuss the justice of such apprehensions, but they exist, and we cannot fail to take that into account.

The same with the Intermovement. The Russian-speaking part of the population of the republic, worried about some statements in the press, and the more so the rumors and gossip around these statements, is experiencing alarm over its own fate in this land, where they are a national minority. What is more, it is possible to condemn and disguise how much this alarm has a real basis, but it exists, and it cannot fail to be taken into account.

The more so as during the course of the meeting it became clear that while far from all of those in attendance shared the necessity of creating the Intermovement, they nonetheless came to discuss the problems that troubled them.

If we speak directly of the meeting of July 19, it started out quite traditionally. A throng of people, over their heads placards and slogans: "The unity of peoples—our present and future," "No to nationalism," "We are all citizens of the USSR," "We are for restructuring; the Revolution continues," "We are for the flourishing of socialist Estonia" and similar inscriptions expressing the substance of the impending action.

The procedure for adopting program documents read at the microphone by an orator as prepared in advance also differed little from the conventions of past years.

We print here for familiarization the text of an appeal to all residents of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic: "The principal mission of the day is consolidating the forces of the entire population of the republic to bring to life and create guarantees of the irreversibility of the processes of restructuring. We are alarmed by the appearance of late of movements and groupings based on national traits and incorporating elements of nationalism, chauvinism and extremism undermining the socialist order.

"We therefore appeal to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia with a call to interpret profoundly those resolutions that you are accepting, think about the consequences and their effectiveness for the processes of restructuring. Remember that any law or decree is only effective when it is understood and accepted by the whole population of the republic.

"The success of restructuring is impossible without the active inclusion of the intellectual and spiritual potential of the republic in it. We appeal to the leadership of creative unions and communists V. Beekmanu, E. Pyl-droos, Ya. Ryaetsu, M. Soosaaru, Yu. Paalma, M. Miki-veru and Yu. Yaama with a call to remember the lofty responsibility of the intelligentsia to the people and the fact that it has always been the incarnation of humanitarianism, philanthropy and justice.

*"It is difficult to overestimate the role of the mass media in the cause of restructuring. We therefore appeal to its leaders, editors, journalists and commentators to remember that your words have enormous power, both creative and destructive. Therefore, never forget your personal responsibility for the state of affairs in the republic."*

*"We appeal to the leaders of the initiatives center of the Popular Front. Taking note of your positive role in the cause of raising the socio-political activeness of the population, we call for you to come out decisively against the manifestations of nationalism that are taking place in the republic. This would facilitate a reinforcement of the unity of the workers of Soviet Estonia in the fight for the democratization of society and restructuring."*

*"We appeal to all mothers. Each of you, regardless of nationality, does not give life for hostility and hatred. Do everything so that your children never know this on Estonian soil. This is your duty, this is within your power."*

*"We appeal to the vital courage of the older generation. You have lived through a great deal, you have seen much. You cannot change the past, but the future is in our hands. Help your children to avoid the mistakes of the past and become worthy participants in the ascent and development of socialist Estonia."*

*"We appeal to the working class with a call to stand firmly for principles of internationalism and the friendship of peoples, socialism and restructuring. There is no force that can withstand the will of the proletariat."*

*"Restructuring—to life! Restructuring is irreversible!"*

*"Participants in a meeting in the city of Tallinn on 19 Jul 88 on the Estonian Red Marksmen Square."*

Everything is seemingly stated correctly, it is difficult to quarrel with the points made in this document. But then the speeches started. (I will mention at once that I was not able to note down all of the names of the speakers correctly—both due to the fact that they sometimes pronounced them indistinctly and there was no opportunity of asking them again and due to the numbers of them, since after an hour-and-a-half demonstration at the new House of Political Enlightenment of the Central Committee of the Estonian CP, its participants went to its auditorium, where the discussion went on for another two and a half hours).

One of the first to speak was Valeriy Yelkin, introduced as a member of the city aktiv of the Intermovement. I will not make use of direct quotation marks, since I do not have a recorded record of the speeches. In the retelling, its substance is reduced, first of all, to an unambiguous evaluation of the movement of the Popular Front as a **national** front. We (i.e. the IM—Ed. note), the speaker stated, do not have any (would-be) specialists, like the Popular Front, that would guide us with an experienced hand... We are nonetheless ready, without

leaving our positions, to recognize the Popular Front, but with one condition... There next followed, I would say, a **listing** of conditions expressed in ultimatum form. The main one was the rejection by the PF of its initial platform. No more, but also no less.

Other speeches also frequently contained phrases of the type "the so-called Popular Front...", "the figures of the Popular Front should...", and so forth.

But excuse me: what **constructive** dialogue can be discussed if we begin with such ultimatums and clearly expressed disrespect for one's opponents?!

This was expressed in particular in the fact that Maryu Lauristin, who came specially to this meeting and was entered to speak, was heard out with clear disapproval, and as soon as the allotted five minutes expired, she was cut off by the moderator...

One of the participants, introducing himself as Vladimir Sergeyevich Kuznetsov (true, without indicating either where he worked or at least the movement or public organization that he represented), went so far as to make insulting attacks on the national colors and symbols of the Estonian people, recently permitted for use by the documents of the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, and concluded his tirade in a threatening tone: "Do not disturb the Russian bear! Or else he will become enraged..." and so forth. If I were to characterize this speech in a single word, I would use the term **provocationist**.

Justice demands an elaboration: such speeches in no way dominated at the meeting. But the misfortune is that such orators "besmirched" what was constructive in the speeches of other participants, who were nonetheless in the majority, with their intolerance of other opinions.

*S.F. Pasko (Dvigatel Plant): "We are troubled by questions of citizenship in the Estonian SSR and the state language. What is this? What is the substance of these formulations? There is very little information in this regard. Have the interests of all nationalities living in the republic been taken into account in preparing the resolution of these issues? We propose holding negotiations with the participation of all interested parties. We must seek points of convergence, and not that which divides us."*

*Batyuk (Prompribor Production Association): "The Popular Front, in my opinion, has omitted the most important element of its program at the very beginning—the international essence of relations among the representatives of various peoples. Recent features in the press, however, make it possible to assert that the activists of the PF are drawing conclusions and correcting their errors in the course of development of the situation. It seems to me in general that the roots of the national questions are economic and social blunders and omissions, and our attention toward them must be sharpened."*

*Bespashnina (Dvigatel Plant): "Even if we all started speaking Estonian tomorrow, there will be no more meat in the stores because of it, no more kielbasa, sugar, clothes and shoes. Let's start together and resolve economic problems with our labor. This is the paramount task for the leaders of the republic as well."*

A few words on the culture of the discussion must evidently be spoken. Emotions are needed, of course; living people cannot manage without them. But sometimes these very emotions simply impede not only hearing someone else out, but even stating one's own opinion. The audience encouraged those orators that expressed the opinion and sentiments of the majority of those in the hall with stormy applause. Those that "went against the grain" were booed and driven from the podium. But there was another factor that forced people to mutter in dissatisfaction and even grumble quietly, and at the reprimands of the moderator that it was "time," voices sounded from the hall, "Let him speak, continue the speech!" That happened when the speaker was expressing a point of view that was possibly not shared by the majority, but he was speaking calmly, in reasoned fashion, with conviction, answering for his own words.

That is how, for example, they listened to Avo-Reyn Tereping from the republic Radio and Television Center when he elaborated on the provisions on state language and citizenship, citing specific instances that supported narrowing the sphere of application of the Estonian language. The attitude was the same toward the speech of Robert Villu from the Pirita Sovkhoz when he began speaking on the arbitrariness of the administrative and bureaucratic system. ("After all, it is not Russians poisoning Estonians, or Estonians Russians, in Kokhtla-Yarva, Narva, Maardu or Sillamya. The system creates harmful types of production without regard for the health of people regardless of their nationality.") ESKhA instructor Igor Rozenfeld, who returned anew to the problem of mutual relations between the PF and the IM, was also met without particular enthusiasm, but he was heard out attentively anyway, because he spoke of things that were **worthy** of attention. I will not retell his speech, because an article on the same topic that he prepared earlier will soon be published in our newspaper.

Everyone also agreed with Viktor Vakht, secretary of the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, who not only gave information on the work of the commission on the status of language and citizenship, but also emphasized that it was important in debate to be able to hear out the other side.

That which was said affirms once again that it is essential to go before any audience with a strictly reasoned and well thought-out speech that is also restrained and in a respectful tone. Not a particularly wise thought, but for some reason many at the podium forget it.

It is common to expect a final verdict from a newspaper feature: "This one is right, and that one is not. The phenomenon in general merits approval (or does not merit it)..."

There will be no verdict this time. Let's learn to extract **our own** judgments about what is happening before our eyes. Hear out and **listen to** the interlocutor. And forget the infamous phrase, "He who is not with us is against us." This relates in equal measure to the Intermovement, the Popular Front and other informal movements. Why necessarily against? What if close by? Or a little on your side? Is it really necessary to paste a label on them on which is "the face of the enemy" for this alone? We do not possess the truth in its ultimate form—none of us. Let us seek it out in common, all together. Only without a crush and coarse haste, patiently, making mutual concessions, and not cuffing each other.

### Popular Front Leader Responds

Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian  
21 Jul 88 p 4

[Article by E. Kekelidze: "Creating Different Conditions"]

[Text] *In connection with the fact that differences of opinion with the Popular Front on two positions—citizenship in the ESSR and the state language of the republic—were defined at the meeting, we requested that Tartu State University docent and member of the Initiatives Center of the Popular Front Maryu Lauristin elaborate on them.*

It really seems to me that the positions must be elaborated. The meeting also showed that attitudes toward these issues are most often emotional ones. Some people see in namely these positions somewhat of a diminishment of their rights, and these words were even employed at the meeting—the foisting of administrative measures. These positions are counter to the problems of economic development of the republic and problems of economic accountability. They are closely linked in the program of the Popular Front.

I would like to have explained this, but I was not permitted to finish in connection with the strictness of the time limit.

Let's look into the future. The socio-economic problems of the republic cannot be resolved without a strict limitation on migration. Why? If we really reach our socio-economic goals associated with economic accountability and achieve a rise in the standard of living, the migration pressure on the republic will grow even more. But it already exceeds those limits where we can provide a person with an infrastructure (housing, medical care, transport and so forth). Matters are especially poor in this regard in Tallinn, and everyone obviously feels this. Further growth in the population will lead to an even greater worsening of the situation. It must moreover be taken into account that the composition of the migratory

influx, as research shows, is changing at the expense of representatives of regions ever more remote from the republic, for example, Central Asia. If we do not anticipate it, if we do not take timely steps, the consequences can easily be imagined. This is on the one hand. On the other, that part of the Russian population that wants with all of its heart to interact with the Estonian culture and language has very narrow opportunities for it today. Today a person can learn the language only by counting on his own enthusiasm, the state helps him little in this—there are not enough teachers, schools, courses or textbooks... Until recently the question of the necessity of studying the Estonian language was not posed in practice, and the language policy of the period of stagnation was not aimed at the study of local languages in the republics. If there are no objective conditions that would, on the one hand, stimulate the study of Estonian and, on the other, impel the government to allocate funds for it, the current situation will not change.

What is the way out? Tie in a minimum of assimilation of the national culture and language with other factors of socio-economic life. Essential for this is citizenship in the republic. Citizenship means that the republic takes on itself an obligation to people that come here, offering conditions for studying the language and culture and the right to demand these conditions. A person will have a free choice—make use of the conditions for acquiring citizenship or not. Citizenship is not a national institution, it is a state institution guaranteeing the social protection of people (for example, if a citizen of Estonia returns to Estonia—after serving in the army, studying in another city or for other reasons—there will be no questions arising with his residence permit).

Why is it that the question of citizenship should be resolved namely now, without delay? In order to begin to provide these conditions. Say we are deciding that citizenship in Estonia will be introduced from such-and-such a certain year. This resolution should be followed by a government decree allocating funds for the training of teachers, translators, equipment for language offices and other conditions for the study of the Estonian language. All of these steps take time. Today the government has no foundation for training teachers of Estonian in the necessary proportions. A law is needed so that the republic budget incorporates the necessary line items.

We should understand, including the Estonian side, that any right is linked with obligations. And any requirement is linked with conditions guaranteeing its fulfillment. This means that if we do not resolve the question of citizenship today, the conditions for it will not exist a year from now, or two years or ten. The creation of the conditions requires time and funds.

I repeat once more: no one is saying that simultaneously with the fundamental resolution of the question of citizenship, a knowledge of the language will be demanded of everyone who doesn't know it—this would contradict all democratic principles. And the Popular

Front declares this in all of its documents and its program with complete definiteness. We do not support any laws or any steps that could discriminate against people in any way by national traits. But this signifies at the same time that we support the creation of different conditions.

As for the equality of two languages on a statewide scale, this was well answered at the meeting by the secretary of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the republic, Viktor Vakht.

Complaints were made at the meeting against the Popular Front—it would be better, they said, if it assisted us in teaching the language. The program of the Tartu PF, which has now been published for discussion, creates a teaching center whose aim is to propagate and teach Estonian language, culture, traditions and so forth. We want to create a network of such teaching centers, and the PF has taken upon itself the initiative of giving time to create a statewide network of language training. Such is our practical attitude toward the problem.

*From the editor: The complex issues of citizenship in the republic and a state language, in our opinion, require more profound and detailed discussion. We propose a return to them in the near future.*

12821

**Readers Lament Loss of Slavic Values, Support  
New Balto-Slavic Society**  
18000008a Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in  
Russian 23 Jul 88 pp 1,3

[Article by A. Bure, member of the Balto-Slavic Society's founding group: "Balto-Slavic Society: A Beginning"]

[Text] For the past three days office telephones of members of the founding group of the Balto-Slavic Society have been ringing nonstop. This fact alone leads to the conclusion that the idea of forming such a society was more than timely. Slavic culture, which includes Polish, Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian cultures, has roots going back many centuries and demands to be brought back. The years of Stalinism and stagnation silenced and deformed national conscience. All too often we forgot that internationalist education did not preclude pride for the cultural achievements of one's people. Those who refuse to recognize their own roots behave accordingly.

Strictly speaking, the root of nationalism, chauvinism and disdain for other people's culture is all too often found in the lack of respect for one's own culture. Consequently, most callers to the editorial offices expressed pain over the loss of Slavs' cultural traditions and values.

N. Sokolova, teacher at the Yeglava Latvian school: "Such cultural society should have been formed long ago. In every cultural center of the world works by Dostoevskiy, Tolstoy and Pushkin and the traditions of Russian folklore are taught. Here, however, school children are ignorant of the most basic things. Moreover, I am convinced that the republic has many talented Ukrainian, Polish and Russian poets, writers and artists; their work should be supported and advertised, just like the work of Latvian artists, among Russian-speaking young people."

A. Alekseev, retail sector employee: "It is strange, but few young people know that Riga has a park where Peter I planted a tree or that a monument once stood here commemorating heroes of 1812. The pearls of historic memory must be restored. Young people should not feel as though they live in a vacuum."

L. Afanasyev, worker: "Recently, I was involved in a conflict. Several tipsy young fellows insulted the national dignity of Latvians. As you can guess, those fellows were Russian. I came up to them and asked: 'Don't you think your behavior is indecent?' They mumbled something in reply, half-heartedly. We started to talk. It turned out that they were not only ignorant, in essence, of the history and culture of the Latvian people, but know little about their own roots as well. This is why I am wholeheartedly behind the idea of a Balto-Slavic Society."

These are only a few samples. Among the callers were historians, engineers, economists, intellectuals, teachers and workers. To summarize all the calls briefly, the readers raised two essential problems. A large part of Russian-speaking population in the republic feels alienated from their cultural heritage. This situation, which has been artificially created in recent years, has not done anything to improve inter-nationalities relations. At the same time, the study and development of Slavic culture in the Baltic republics would enable both Latvian and Slavic cultures to grow and enrich one another.

On Thursday, a scheduled meeting of the founding group of the Balto-Slavic Society took place. The main principles and directions of our activity have already been set. First of all, any USSR citizen, of any nationality or religious creed, can join the society. The drafts of the statute and goals of the society will be offered for discussion to society members in the near future. But to start with, we are offering a questionnaire to those who are troubled by the leveling of culture, those whose hearts ache for the lost, buried traditions and values of Slavic peoples.

Questionnaire for Those Who Wish to Join the Balto-Slavic Society.

1. Last Name, First Name and Patronymic (We would like you to list your address and telephone number as well)

2. What new area of the society's activity would you like to suggest? In which area would you like to work?

And one other thing. The preliminary meeting of all those who want to join the Balto-Slavic Society will take place on July 30. Do not forget the date, at 7:00 p.m. at the House of Knowledge.

(Please mail questionnaires to the SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH editorial offices, at 226081 Riga, Balasta Dambis 3, SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH.)

12892

### **LiSSR Council of Ministers Reviews Proposals for Economic, Educational Autonomy**

*18000008b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian  
1 Sep 88 pp 1,3*

[Unattributed report entitled: "At the LiSSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] As reported in the press, the LiSSR Council of Ministers has considered proposals to broaden the republic's autonomy in the economic management, planning, finance and labor policies. The proposals have been finalized to be presented to the USSR Council of Ministers.

In particular, the proposals address the following questions:

In order to strengthen the responsibility and motivation of the republic to increase production and raise the technological level and quality of output, it is proposed to place under the authority of the LiSSR Council of Ministers practically all economic enterprises, simultaneously transferring to the republic the appropriate research institutes, technology design and development organizations and other entities situated on the territory of the republic.

To strengthen and broaden the food supply base and to enhance substantively the role of the republic's managerial entities in satisfying the population's demand for alimentary products, it is proposed to transfer the agricultural industry complex to the LiSSR Council of Ministers, giving the latter the right to pursue an independent agricultural policy, manage short-term and long-term planning, improve the structure of the farming sector and set prices. It is also planned to introduce substantive changes in the way plans for supplying meat and milk to the All-Union fund are set.

It is also proposed to dissolve such inter-republic entities situated on the territory of neighboring republics as "Zapryba," the Baltic Railroad and others, with appropriate entities created within the republic.

In the area of industrial construction, it is proposed to allow the republic's Council of Ministers to make independent decisions in investment policy. In particular, preliminary 5-year and annual plans for development of the material base of economic sectors and social services, no matter what source of financing they use, must be drafted and approved by the republic's Council of Ministers. Construction contracts for individual construction projects, in accordance with the USSR Law on State Enterprises (Complexes), should be drafted by construction organizations together with their customers, and not passed down from above. Construction projects of organizations that report directly to Union-level entities should be coordinated with the republic's Council of Ministers.

In the area of education, under the current system educational the methodological literature and manuscripts of textbooks for national schools are translated into Russian and submitted to the USSR State Committee for Education for expert evaluation. The committee also approves curricula, programs and examination questions for Russian-language schools. It is proposed to allow the republic's Council of Ministers to decide those questions independently, with the USSR State Committee for Education retaining the function of methodological supervision in this area. It is also proposed to transfer the Lithuanian Veterinary Academy and Lithuanian Agricultural Academy to the republic's authority.

The proposals also spell out the relationship between the state budget of the republic and the Union budget. In view of the proposed transfer of enterprises reporting to Union-level entities to the republic's authority, all contributions from their profits and their payments for labor resources, as well as all taxes collected from the population, must go to the republic as its revenue. The republic's financial needs must be mostly covered by its own income, while its obligations to the Union budget should be covered by set contributions from the republic's revenues.

Moreover, it is proposed to give the republic's Council of Ministers the right to decide all questions related to labor remuneration and conditions at enterprises and organizations under its authority, and to broaden considerably its right to set wholesale and retail prices for industrial and technological products, as well as consumer goods, produced by enterprises under its authority.

The LiSSR Council of Ministers also proposed to give priority to a number of questions in the area of external economic ties.

All these proposal are viewed as the first step toward increasing Lithuania's autonomy.

The results of the USSR Council of Minister's assessment of the republic's proposals will be reported in the press.

### **Party Aktiv Assesses Political Urgency of Lithuania's Education Reform**

*18000505 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 5 Jun 88 pp 1,3*

[ELTA Report: "Meeting of Republic Party Aktiv": "Popular Education Must Be on a Par with the Tasks of Perestroyka"]

[Excerpts] A meeting of the republic party aktiv was held today at the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. The question of the tasks of the republic party organization on implementing the requirements promulgated by the February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum was discussed.

Invited to the meeting were: first secretaries, and secretaries concerned with ideological work, of city and rayon party committees; chairmen of executive committees; administrators of ministries and departments; and, responsible officials of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the republic Council of Ministers, Gosplan, the republic Trade Union Council, the Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee; prominent scientists, and the aktiv in popular education.

Arriving at the meeting were Comrades R. Songayla, V. Astrauskas, V. Berezov, Yu. Bernatavichus, A. Brazauskas, S. Gedraytis, I. Lukauskas, L. Maksimovas, V. Mikuchyauskas, N. Mitkin, V. Sakalauskas, L. Shepetis, P. Shileykis; V.A. Grigoryev, Chief of the Department of Science and Academic Institutions of the CPSU Central Committee, and A.D. Chernev, a responsible official at the CPSU Central Committee.

The meeting was opened with introductory remarks by Lithuanian CP Central Committee First Secretary R. Songayla:

"Esteemed Comrades! This meeting of the republic party aktiv is being held at a time when an atmosphere of great political and labor enthusiasm is gripping the republic and the entire country—an enthusiasm born of the preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference, and by the overall revolutionary process of renewal.

"Today we are faced with the heavy party responsibility of thoroughly analyzing the state of popular education in the republic and outlining such measures, the realization of which will bring about fundamental improvements in the work of all the academic institutions, as required by the process of perestroyka and by the February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

"The republic party organization, while striving to solve the urgent problems of training and educating the younger generation which have sprung up in the course of implementing elementary-school reforms, has already

accumulated a certain amount of experience. But this should hardly serve as a pretext for complacency. On the contrary: while putting into practice the resolutions of the February CPSU Central Committee Plenum, we must strive to significantly improve the effectiveness of this work. We must unite more decisively the efforts of all schools, families and working collectives; party, Soviet and Komsomol organizations; and those of the popular education authorities, for the purpose of swiftly overcoming the existing shortcomings in preparing the student youth for independent practical activity in the new conditions. The important thing that must be achieved in this work is to actively nurture confirmed creators of perestroika everywhere—the people who will be faced with continuing the implementation of revolutionary changes in all spheres of public life.

“Of course, the restructuring of secondary and higher education depends principally on purposeful party leadership. Not long ago the Lithuanian CP Central Committee evaluated the work of the dean and the party committee of the Kaunas Political Institute imeni Antanas Sneckus on restructuring the training of engineer cadres, as well as the activity of the Panevezhskiy Raykom on supervision of the primary party organizations at elementary schools in the light of the requirements of the February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

“The evaluations showed that not all party organizations and communists are actively supporting, in their day-to-day work, the perestroika of training and education of the student youth. The old approaches to the matter—formalism and inertness in resolving acute problems—still make themselves known all too often.

“At present, when independence, initiative and social activeness has shown a marked increase among the student youth, party influence must be increased even more in every school. At the same time the most serious attention must be paid to improving the work of the primary party organizations and on increasing their effectiveness. We must not underestimate the importance of the growth of the party ranks. This is especially urgent for the Kaunasskiy, Klaypedskiy, Vilnyusskiy and Vilkavishskiy Rayons, where in a number of schools there are few communist among the teachers.

“The most important questions on the activity of the pedagogical collectives, the pupils and the students must always be among the key issues in the work of the party gorkoms and raykoms, and their secretaries. We must decisively reject the administrative-command approach to the matter, and open up broader opportunities for displaying initiative and social activeness among the student youth, their teachers and mentors. Meanwhile, we must be increasingly demanding toward them as well, and must significantly increase our supervision of putting into practice the decisions on restructuring popular

education. The Department of Science and Academic Institutions of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee must display even more concern.

“In improving the administration of the operation of the schools and in increasing their activities, the newly-established Ministry of Popular Education (G. Zabulis, minister) must take active steps to make itself known. Its principal task is to solve the most important and most promising problems of the entire educational system, and actively propagate the experience of innovative teachers. We must refrain from nit-picking; moreover, specialists from various areas of learning, and representatives of the public, should be cordially invited to attend discussions of key questions of their activity. The work of the popular education councils now being formed must also support this.

“We have a host of skilled teacher cadres in the republic. Almost 97 percent of the teachers working in the subject system have higher education. Many of them actively strive to work creatively, with zest. There is a considerable number of innovative teachers taking part in the gathering of our aktiv as well.

“Unfortunately, one also encounters teachers who do not have the requisite professional training. The largest number of insufficiently skilled teacher cadres are found in Akmyanskiy, Anikshchyayskiy, Kapsukskiy, Kednaynskiy, Lazdiyskiy and Shilalskiy Rayons. The administrators of these and certain other rayons must take the most effective measures to improve the situation which has come to pass.

“One cannot help notice teachers such as those who, when encountering the first difficulties, at once throw up their hands, and refuse to search for the most effective means of pedagogical activity. We must increase our demands with respect to such people. At the same time it is important to actively devote even greater concern toward increasing the skills of the pedagogical cadres. Here it is especially important to step up the role of the Institute of Advanced Teacher Training and the Department of Popular Education. In solving all the principal problems of training, assignments, and increasing the skills of teacher cadres, the Ministry of Popular Education must always display the required energy.

“Comrades! Not long ago, as we all know, the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Plenum was held, and discussed the work of the Vilnius city party organization on improving ideological-class, internationalist and patriotic education in the light of the resolutions of the February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. A considerable number of urgent tasks were brought forth at the plenum, on matters of improving the upbringing of the young people. We must propagate more broadly the resolutions of the plenum and become more active in carrying them out.



"This year is an anniversary year for our republic. It will soon be 70 years since those historic days when the Lithuanian Communist Party was formed, and Soviet rule was proclaimed in the republic. In our preparations for this anniversary celebration we must be more decisive in mobilizing the working collectives to actively carry out the tasks of the 12th Five Year Plan under conditions of the radical economic reforms, and steadfastly resolve the problems of social and intellectual development. It is especially important to strive for fundamental improvements in the formation of patriotic and international conviction among the student youth.

"In solving this problem, improving the teaching of the social sciences is of paramount importance. Numerous suggestions have been presented on improving the teaching of the history of Lithuania. They must be carefully examined, and the contents of these disciplines must be renewed in their very essence. Stinting neither efforts nor time, we must actively strive to overcome the degree to which the teaching of socio-political disciplines is divorced from the real problems of life.

"In illuminating the urgent problems of the historic journey of the Soviet people, the party must subject to analysis the period of the personality cult of Stalin, as well as the period of stagnation and the mistakes and blunders which took place then. All this must, of course, be done objectively. At the same time the most serious attention must be devoted to ensuring that the student youth thoroughly study the theoretical heritage of V.I. Lenin, and above all his works on the national question, in order that they gain a profound understanding of the historical experience of the Lithuanian CP on this and other questions.

"I would also like to stress how important it is to study in the most careful manner those positive achievements which are taking place in the young people's world, and on the basis of the scientific data derived, outline and implement concrete measures for nurturing a well-rounded personality. Here there is indeed a broad and responsible field of activity for the teaching profession and psychology, and for the pedagogical collectives and the party and Komsomol organizations at the schools.

"Comrades! A certain amount of work is being carried out in the republic on strengthening the material-technical base of all types of academic institutions. However, we must in no way limit ourselves to that which has already been achieved. It is important even now to actively engage in work on creating new designs for schools which best meet contemporary needs, and take the necessary measures to implement them. We must also improve the solution of a number of questions of material support to the republic's schools, and steadfastly introduce computerization. In strengthening the material-technical base of the schools, Soviets of People's Deputies are summoned to take the most active role. They must strive to ensure that resources allocated for the development of popular education are always

utilized in full volume; ensure that working, living and recreational conditions for the teacher collectives and the student youth are improved in a more energetic manner."

Lithuanian CP Central Committee Secretary L. Shepetis was also offered the floor for his report:

"Since the day the Theses were published, the republic, city and rayon press, radio and TV stations, have received over a thousand letters, in which we are presently searching for the answer to questions just raised. It is a question of attitudes toward socialism, of one's conception of socialism, and of how it could happen that alongside the heroic achievements of the people, it was possible that crimes were committed against society and against man.

"One must acknowledge the activeness of the creative and scientific intelligentsiya of Lithuania in all spheres of perestroika, and their concern for their native language, for historic and cultural monuments, and for ecology.

"The creative societies of the Lithuanian SSR and the party organizations, in their letter to the 19th Party Conference, expressed approval of the policy being carried out by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and by General Secretary Gorbachev for restructuring the country; they support the democratic substance of this process, and the Theses to the 19th Conference.

"While discussing the Theses it is important not to forget that an integral national-economic complex has been formed and is operating successfully—which is the material basis for the unity of the people of the Soviet Union.

"Have we ever before experienced, can we remember such activeness, and such directness and interest that we are seeing now? I think not. Therefore we have grounds to affirm that perestroika has already become a nationwide, national cause. The people are ardently discussing the activity of party, state and economic organs, and all the processes. This is evidence of the fact that we are overcoming the state of stagnation and apathy. On the other hand, at times we have been unable to withstand the temptation for self-aggrandizement, and an irresponsible attitude to the realities of life.

"Perestroika and the ideology of renewal are continually bringing forth new and interesting people in all spheres: both in the political process, in the sphere of economics, and in the intellectual sphere. The expansion of democracy is bringing into the political arena increasingly sound individuals.

"At the same time the wave of democratization inevitably washes up and exposes those people who for many years have been storing up social and class hatred for

socialism and for socialist Lithuania; people are washing up who have become drunk on national egoism, and others—on chauvinism. We have in mind not what they think, but how they act.

"City and rayon party organizations, who have programs for patriotic and international education, must devote even greater attention to carrying them out.

"One must note the fact that our newspapers, magazines, television and radio have done quite a bit to spread the processes of democratization and glasnost, and to arouse the people's interest in all aspects of perestroika. It is very important for journalists to support the enthusiasts, to disseminate their experience, and to encourage those people who have wholeheartedly set about working in the new way.

"With the coming year the potential of our press will be reinforced by new, respectable publications: a new monthly magazine, LITOVSKIY YAZYK I LITERATURA V SHKOLE ["The Lithuanian Language and Literature in School"] will be published; also, MYANAS (Art), a monthly illustrated magazine; and SHEYMA, which is now being published as a bulletin, will be turned into a respectable monthly magazine with a circulation of 160,000; the size of the newspapers SPORTAS and YAUNIMO GRYATOS will be doubled, and the Ignalina newspaper NAUYA VAGA will be published in two languages.

"And the principal achievement of the mass information media lies in the fact that they are showing our people speaking out for renewal of society and for changes, and firmly declaring: 'only within the framework of socialism, and only on the basis of its values.'

"It goes without saying, this does not mean that everything is fine here. We shall limit ourselves to discussions in the press on questions of renewing popular education. Although there are a considerable number of genuine ways and means here for restructuring the schools, there is no lack of confusion and nihilism as well. Certain publications, meetings, and radio and television broadcasts have been extremist in nature, and thus do no one any good and are harmful to perestroika. And there are others who insistently recommend copying the experience of other regions of the country, ignoring the unique features of our national culture and popular traditions.

"I believe that all aspects of ideological renewal intersect in the school," said the speaker. "The goal of the humanistic principles of our policy is, to support the intellectual progress of society, and the development of popular education and culture. Over the past three years a great deal of attention has been devoted to developing education at various stages and levels. But matters have moved very sluggishly.

"In recent years the Lithuanian CP Central Committee and the Council of Ministers have been analyzing the problems of training teachers and increasing their skills; on feeding the students; on the work of primary party organizations at the schools in implementing the requirements of school reform; and questions of improving the activity of higher educational institutions. A considerable number of important problems have been examined at the plenums, and at sessions of the bureaus of city and rayon party committees. This has helped solve many economic questions in the life of the schools, and problems of material support to the pupils and students.

"However, in implementing the school reform our republic is still encountering serious problems. The content of the training and education is slow to change. We have become excessively fond of high indicators in solving the question of training children from the age of six. Where this is evident, in certain cities and rayons, classes for six-year-olds are being set up at the expense of eliminating Pioneer rooms and libraries, and by putting the children on the second shift. Nor are labor training, professional orientation, and socially-useful labor always organized flexibly, in accordance with local conditions.

"The former republic Ministry of Education, Ministry of Higher and Secondary Special Education, and the State Committee for Vocational-Technical Training turned out to be incapable of solving the problems which have accumulated.

"The length of studies in general educational schools in the republic, where teaching is conducted in the Lithuanian and Polish languages, has been increased by one year in comparison with other academic institutions in the country. Apparently it would be expedient to preserve this difference of one year in the future, and to include in this context schools where teaching is conducted in the Russian language as well. On the basis of proposals from scholars and from the public, we must take yet another step in order for the structure of the school to conform to the formula of 4+6+2. The four-year primary and the six-year link would comprise the basic elementary school. This structure should retain a mandatory minimum of general-educational subjects. Only those whose chosen profession requires higher education should study at schools on a higher grade-level (Grades 11-12). Training here can be highly differentiated—divided into the humanities, natural sciences, polytechnical and other groups. Intensification of the academic-educational process and increasing the humanitarian content will inspire thoughts of creative integration of certain subjects while reducing the number of disciplines, and of differentiated training, with the establishment of the most favorable conditions for developing the individual capabilities of the students.

"In every fourth school in the republic instruction in mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology and languages has already been intensified. However, academic institutions of this type have until now been the prerogative

of large cities. Apparently it would be expedient to have a lot more schools which offer the opportunity to those who wish, to freely choose any profile of intensive instruction.

"We must devote serious thought to the future of rural schools, creating all the conditions for the children who live there to receive a full-valued education. It is time to solve the question of establishing specialized schools at VUZes and other scholarly centers in the republic, for especially-gifted pupils; and on differentiation of certain boarding schools.

"There is an acute problem in the quality of the students' knowledge. Decades of percentage mania have undermined the prestige of scientific knowledge and have atrophied the feeling of responsibility of not only the students, but that of the teacher as well. The gap between the formal indicators and the actual level of student knowledge is especially evident when the graduates apply to the VUZes. Cardinal changes in the situation can take place only by offering the schools the right to creativity, permitting them greater independence in choosing the methods of training and education, and promoting the talented teachers.

"The level of knowledge and the students' capability to think independently depend on the school textbooks, which are too difficult and are not organized logically. The Ministry of Education has heard a great many bitter words with regard to textbooks in native literature and history which have not been changed for 15-20 years; on poor training aids for the Lithuanian language (for non-native speakers); and Russian-language textbooks and literature for the national school which do not meet contemporary requirements.

"At the present time a certain amount of invigoration can be felt. Teachers are giving good marks to training aids for the primary classes, and six new textbooks are being prepared on a competitive basis.

"Printing plant facilities for textbook publishing must be fundamentally strengthened. The Department of Science and Academic Institutions at the Lithuanian CP Central Committee and the Department of Culture of the Administration of Affairs at the Council of Ministers must display greater initiative in resolving these problems.

"Finally, union-level organs of popular education must reject the command-method of administration, and excessive regulation. To this day, the approval of academic programs and textbooks for the national schools is centralized for the entire country; thereby, the local education authorities are deprived of responsibility and their independence is limited. A great deal more solid results could be achieved by giving maximum authority to the territorial organs of administration.

"We must take a new look at labor training and professional orientation of the students. The choice of professions is one of the most responsible moments in the life of a young person; therefore, bureaucratic rules which do not take into consideration the inclination and the interests of the students cause irreparable harm to the student and to society. This must be completely rejected.

"The mass professional training of students at general educational schools has not justified itself. We must at last speak of this frankly. In those places where there is a solid material base, skilled specialists, and where a tradition has taken shape, this cause may be continued. The school itself must resolve this.

The speaker stressed that "The work of a student is to study and study some more; to develop; to read works of fiction; to take part in disputes on any topic." This is also very useful social labor; for it arouses curiosity to learning, to professions; and it encourages one to have and to defend one's own opinion. In a word, only knowledge can form a personality, which is now in great demand. Is it not the result of this deficit that there is no competition for entry into graduate school, and scholars in the fundamental sciences are becoming increasingly rare?

"It was after the February CPSU Central Committee Plenum that the administrative structure for the vocational-technical educational system was changed in the republic. Forty schools were transferred to the republic State Agro-Industrial Commission; several went to the basic enterprises, and the remainder went to the Ministry of Popular Education. Regardless of their departmental subordination, vocational-technical schools should remain the single state system for training skilled workers.

"Under the conditions of radical economic reform, the PTU contingent should be brought up to strength, accepting only as many as the national economy requires. We have gone much farther than other regions of the Union in sending 10th-grade students to rural PTUs. This has brought about certain negative phenomena. In the secondary schools, and especially in the countryside the number of upper-classmen has declined. Fewer young people are entering the VUZes. The situation must be corrected.

"Gosplan together with the Ministry of Popular Education and the Ministry on Labor and Social Services must work out a scientifically-based program for determining the demand for specialists, and must draw up a state order for groups of specialties and regions of the republic.

"The effectiveness of the activity of secondary and higher special schools in the republic depends to a significant extent on the degree to which their contingent is up to strength. On the whole, it corresponds to the social and national structure of the republic. However,

the rectors and the party organizations of State Committee on Conservatories and the State Artistic Institute, where the number of children of the employees greatly exceeds the overall, average indicator for the republic, must apply greater efforts to form the optimal student contingent.

"At the very same time we must acknowledge that there are still quite a few links and people in the VUZes who are opposed to and are hindering perestroika. This was spoken of in a principled and businesslike manner at the session of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Buro held last February, at which the work of the rectorate and the party committee of the Kaunass Ploytechnical Institute imeni Antanas Sniechkus was discussed, with respect to restructuring the training of engineer cadres, and increasing the contribution of scholars to the acceleration of scientific-technical progress. The resolution adopted is a concrete program for activity for all higher schools at that level, without exception.

"Major restructuring is impossible without a fundamental turning point in the work of the faculty, departments, laboratories and academic groups. Unfortunately, today that is precisely where a great deal of passiveness and inertia, formalism and dogmatism are found—which is called stagnation. Quite often student self-government in higher education appears only by means of including students in the membership of scientific councils. The students' desire to distribute stipends and evaluate the work of the instructors is interpreted as an impudent encroachment on the prestige of the professors and docents. For this reason the students in the departments of the Klaypeda Conservatory are to this day not permitted to investigate the quality of teaching by means of questionnaires. Such suspiciousness and conservatism destroys initiative, and sows a mood of skepticism. On the other hand, this shows once again that the Komsomol leaders are unable to defend the interests of the student body.

"We need more specialists in electronics, machine-building, robot technology, power engineering, automated designing, biotechnology and others. On the other hand, to the extent that the principles of cost accounting and self financing are more and more widely introduced to the economy, the more democracy is deepened and self-government of enterprises increases, the more the need arises for skilled economists, production organizers, legal experts, specialists in applied sociology and social psychology.

"The ministry of popular education is obliged to devote greater attention to the selection of capable young people and to direct them to the country's higher academic institutions. Every year we fulfill the plans for special-purpose direction to VUZes by only 70 percent. And after all, it is there that they train the specialists who are badly needed in the republic's national economy, which we do not have the ability to train ourselves.

"Further expansion of fundamental research and increasing its effectiveness is an important lever for scientific-technical progress. In the republic's VUZes it comprises only an insignificant part of scientific-research work, which is not always carried out in priority directions.

"Speaking out in criticism of our schools," the speaker continued, "We can in no way brush aside its significance in the history of Lithuania and in the building of socialism. However, in order for great changes to take place which would render the proper influence on society, a new spurt must take place in the schools.

"We are now faced with a difficult task—to learn democracy. The schools can and must do a great deal in this study, for they are commissioned to develop the first habits of independent thinking among the young people.

"Incidentally, it is precisely here that we encounter difficulties. Not all teachers today are prepared to satisfy the increasing interest of the young people on problems of perestroika and the processes of democratization on which which our people have embarked. The schools are still prisoners of the old stereotypical thinking: they have not succeeded in rejecting ostentations measures, nor have they outlived formalism in their work. All of this requires deep reflection and a new attitude toward many problems, and principally among the communist-teachers.

"One of these is the quality of teaching the discipline of social sciences. Creative mastery of the theory of Marxism-Leninism is a reliable basis for molding the young people's consciousness in the spirit of perestroika, and for learning its political culture.

"Almost 450 social science instructors are working in the VUZes; among them are 30 doctors of sciences and 249 candidates of sciences and docents. From them we expect above all theoretical analysis of the profound processes taking place in society, and the far-seeing decisions which are important for life's practical experiences. However, thus far the participation of instructors in the social disciplines in the republic press and in the work of radio and TV programs has been unsatisfactory. Revolutionary changes are taking place in society; production is changing, as is society's thinking; but on the whole it is the commentators, writers and engineers who are speaking of these processes. Meanwhile, the theoreticians of Marxism-Leninism are somehow on the sidelines, and only a few of them are joining in the actual political discussion in the press.

"In education as a whole, there has been no fundamental turning point in the teaching of social sciences. In many secondary and higher schools the social sciences and history are still taught on a plane that is divorced from

real life, without an in-depth interpretation of its contradictions. This gives rise to indifference among the pupils and students. The instructors themselves must reinterpret a great deal for themselves, and search for nonstandard forms of instruction.

"We must single out history from among the social sciences, as the central element of education. In the past it was ravaged to the nth degree by dogmatism, and was depersonalized. The situation must be corrected. Every lesson must be dedicated to teaching the students from class positions, to an altogether genuine analysis and evaluation of the processes of history and social life. To these ends we must actively take advantage of the 70th Anniversary of the proclamation of Soviet rule in Lithuania, and the celebration of the establishment of the Lithuanian Communist Party.

"Commencing with the new academic year, a systematic course of study of the history of the Lithuanian SSR is being introduced to the general educational schools; but this is merely the beginning. Topical questions on the history of the Lithuanian SSR were examined at a recently-held scientific conference, the materials of which must be published and used for improving the instruction of history in schools at all levels. The new academic programs and textbooks must bring out the principal moments in the history of the Lithuanian people—the national-liberation movement; the restoration of the state; the question of choosing the socialist path, socialist construction and others—honestly illuminating all the events of the past, and telling the truth about the negative phenomena which have distorted socialism.

"We must acknowledge that there is still a considerable portion of the students who have no definite opinion on the processes in the sphere of national relations, who are unable to make a proper analysis of individual phenomena in the life of society. Therefore, the task of the party and Komsomol organs, and all teachers, is to make specific and well-reasoned facts available to the students on the essence of the national policy of the CPSU, to engage in polemics with nationalist-oriented people and to imbue the students with high standards of international relations, and a serious attitude toward the historical-cultural heritage of their own people and that of others.

"The development of bilingualism and the study of the Lithuanian and Russian languages requires constant attention and tact. Most of the citizens of the republic can converse in the Lithuanian and Russian languages, and in the Vilnius area many know Polish as well. But this does not signify that there are no problems in the sphere of languages, especially if one has in mind their study.

"Above all it is necessary to improve the study of the Lithuanian language in schools of all types. Both the teachers and the students must master the fact that the

language is not just another discipline on the academic plan; it has exceptional academic and educational significance, and is inextricably connected with the development of thinking and the assimilation of the fundamentals of science. This was aptly noted by the well-known Lithuanian linguist Yuožas Balchikonis, who wrote in his time, that: 'A good grasp of a language distinguishes an educated person from an uneducated one. Therefore, one may say that a person's language is a mirror of his erudition.' In spite of certain positive achievements, insufficient attention is devoted in native language lessons to its expressiveness, and to teaching good style and standards of language as a whole. Many young men and women, having completed secondary school, feel no need to perfect their language; they do not strive for clarity or precision, for expounding their thoughts convincingly; and they have not mastered the norms of the language in general use as they should. Even the language of teachers of linguistics is cause for concern. In many situations it does not serve as an example for the students. Radical changes are needed in the study of the Lithuanian language in Russian and Polish schools as well. In order to change the situation for the better, the existing conditions are quite good: over 73 percent of the Lithuanian scholars are employed at schools where teaching is in the Russian language. The situation is worse in Polish schools. The cadre of Lithuanian scholars is especially poorly staffed in the schools of the Shvenchenskiy, Ignalinskiy, Shalchininskiy and Vilnyuskiy Rayons.

"Good conditions have been established for improving the study of the Russian language in schools where Lithuanian and Polish are the languages of instruction. We have for this purpose a good material base, and skilled pedagogical cadres, which permits everyone to assimilate the Russian language well. One learns to properly and smoothly expound one's ideas, both orally and in writing. At present there is considerable discussion about when it is most expedient to begin the study of the Russian language in Lithuanian and Polish schools—in kindergarten or in the primary grades? A variety of experiences have been accumulated. It must be carefully studied and, after well-rounded discussion which takes into the capabilities of the children, the optimum beginning for the study of a second language must be determined. This is very important. It is also very important to equalize the working conditions of the teachers who teach all the languages.

"Practical experience in atheist work in the schools indicates that quite often the teachers strive to give their students as much knowledge as possible, but do not formulate a value-relationship to it. The other extreme is when teachers—the leaders of knowledge of atheism—accentuate exclusively its critical aspect, limiting themselves to obsolete dialogues about the origins of religion. And they say nothing that affirms atheism itself, wherein religion is inferior to atheism. In such a case the teaching of a scientific-atheist world view is not tied-in with the development of moral-ethical consciousness.

"It is especially important for all education officials to tie-in more closely the problems of communist upbringing with culture, art and literature.

"At present, as we are solving the problems of the renewal of society, our intellectual culture is also manifested anew—being oriented exclusively on man, on the concepts of truth and freedom, conscience and morality: precisely on those things which are most often found lacking among the young people.

"While we have good student amateur activity among the pupils and students; while we are able to organize impressive song festivals and competitions, we must nevertheless speak with concern about the state of aesthetic education in the republic. True, one can cite a multitude of positive facts; however, in considering the general trend, we are becoming convinced that the artistic tastes of the young people are still excessively one-sided, poorly-developed and passive. More than one teacher has stated that the reason for such a situation lies in the lack of hours devoted to the artistic disciplines. But the essence of the matter is not only in the hours.

"We must make fundamental changes in our attitude toward aesthetic and artistic education as a most important element of the humanization of a person, and his preparation for social life and active social activity. A full-fledged spiritual person, who possesses a socialist world-view and moral principles does not appear spontaneously, as a result of our postulates on the fact that he is obliged to have a harmonious personality," said the speaker. "As long as aesthetic and artistic education are merely an adjunct to the so-called basic disciplines, we will be unable to bring up a person who is sensitive, creative and exacting. Only such a person, incidentally, can achieve much in both the exact sciences and in technology.

"Aesthetic and artistic upbringing and education should be restructured, starting with the preschool institutions and the general-educational schools, and finishing the VUZ.

"We must create a unified, flexible system for preparation and for advanced training of specialist cadres in this area, and must require that the administrators at secondary specialized higher schools on a pedagogical profile, the rectorates of artistic institutes, the State Conservatory, the directorate of the Institute for Advanced Teacher Training and Increasing Skills of Cultural Workers, and the Pedagogical Scientific Research Institute, work together as a united front, and not as disconnected forces.

"Apparently the time has come to create artists' workshops in the general educational schools for fine arts instructors, in order to attract the best forces of the republic's creative societies for practical activity in this sector of aesthetic education. And should we not be

thinking about setting up cultural centers for children and young people in the republic's major cities. There is, by the way, such a center already in Mazheykyay.

"We must systematically increase the number of secondary specialized artistic schools and evening artistic and music schools, and especially general-educational schools with intensified instruction in the humanitarian and artistic disciplines. In certain rayons there are virtually no schools such as these. And this is a large area of neglect for all of us. The Ministry of Culture ought to pay closer attention to this as well.

"Great responsibility for this is invested in the party committees," the speaker stressed. "They should be providing the impetus for the entire life of the schools; however, quite often it still happens that instead of in-depth analysis of the processes taking place in the schools, they limit themselves to superficial verification of certain facts. This can in no way inspire the teachers to creative work.

"It is no secret that the period of stagnation had a marked effect on the teachers. The vast increase in the regulation of their activities and micromanagement stifled the initiative, the creative disposition, and the independence of some of the teachers. Some have resigned themselves to the mentality of a 'small cog' and as always, wait for instructions 'from above.'

"It was stressed at the February CPSU Central Committee Plenum that the teacher is the most important actor in perestroyka, and is its basic element. Accordingly, the renewal of the schools depends to a large extent on the teacher, and on his position. The measures outlined in the resolution of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Buro of 1986 on restructuring work with the teacher cadres is helping to resolve certain problems.

"In a number of rayons in the republic they have begun to take a businesslike attitude toward the teachers' living and working conditions.

"On the whole, Comrades, we are probably also soothing ourselves when we speak about the teacher staffs. After all, nearly 67 percent of the teachers in grades 1-4 have higher education, and in the preschool institutions almost 27 percent do. In certain rayons this percentage is still lower. It is not uncommon for teachers to display no interest in deepening their knowledge.

"Of late the make-up of the school principals in the republic popular education system is being changed.

"However the advice of the collective is still not being sought in the selection of school principals, nor are their opinions heard. Only 26 school principals in the republic have achieved their positions through elections.

"There is also an acute problem in the assignment of teacher cadres. Many teachers who are subject-matter specialists are working in pre-school institutions in Vilnius and Kaunas, whereas there is a great need for them in the rural areas. Therefore we must give serious thought to systematic professional orientation work in the rural schools and rayon centers.

"The position and working style of the republic Advanced Teacher Training Institute must be changed. Not so many years ago it was possible to pass on to the teachers what the instructor knew and was able to do; now it is what the teachers need that must be passed on in the courses.

"One cannot detect any activity by the Pedagogical Scientific Research Institute or the pedagogical and psychology departments at the VUZes, although 13 out of the republic's 14 available doctors in this area of science work there, as well as the majority of the candidates of pedagogical and psychological sciences.

"Party committees are called upon to formulate a new attitude toward the family, and through the primary party organizations, increase the family's responsibility for the upbringing, training and behavior of the children. Wider practice should be made of reports by communist relatives at party meetings on their concerns for the children. Local Soviets of People's Deputies are obliged to determine the kind of assistance a family needs—moral or material—and render such assistance. The republic pedagogical society, the Republic Division of the Lenin Children's Fund, and the republic and local press could do a great deal in this regard."

The speaker indicated that the Klaypedskiy, Yurbarskiy, Moletskiy, Tauragskiy and Shirvintskiy party raykoms are not delving deeply enough into questions of popular education. "It is very important for the process of democratization of school life and for further development of popular education, to involve not only the teachers but also the party organizations of the base enterprises, and the parents.

"Social organs—school soviets—must still be set up this year in the general-educational schools and vocational-technical academic institutions. The best representatives of the pedagogical collective; of the party, Komsomol, trade union and student organizations; of the base enterprises; and parents, must be chosen for the councils. Possessing broad authority, the school soviet will thoroughly study questions of an academic-educational nature, and financial-economic activities.

"Komsomol committees must be more bold to seek out new forms of ideological-political and organizational work for the pupils and students, which corresponds to the spirit of the times; and they must encourage in every way the principles of voluntarism in the life of the collectives.

"The Ministry of Popular Education which was established in the republic combines three departments which had functioned until now. The administrative staff has been reduced by 55 percent, and organizational barriers have been taken down. It is very important that the newly-created ministry does not become another bureaucratic apparatus; it must serve the needs of the school in every way, freeing the teachers from petty details and over-regulation, and giving scope to creative work," stressed the speaker.

Taking part in the discussion of the report were N. Vaytkyavichyus, first secretary of the Panevezhis Gorkom, Lithuanian CP; A. Sellene, director of the Kaunas Secondary School imeni Yu.Aleksonis; G. Zabulis, LiSSR minister of popular education; I. Lankutis, director of the Institute of Lithuanian Language and Literature, LiSSR Academy of Sciences; S. Sosunov, deputy director of the Vilnius Secondary Vocational Technical School No 25; D. Matsyulyavichyus, a department chief at the Vilnius Engineering and Construction Institute; A. Bernotas, Ukmergskiy Rayispolkom chairman; I. Strumilene, Lithuanian Komsomol Central Committee secretary; A. Poplevkin, secretary, Ionavskiy Raykom, Lithuanian CP; K. Dzidolikas, general director of the Kaunas Machine-building Production Association imeni F.E. Dzerzhinskiy; O. Statulyavichene, Chief of the popular education department at the Utenskiy Rayispolkom; V. Yakavichyus, secretary of the party bureau for the Klaypeda departments of the State Conservatory; and A. Chesnavichus, deputy chairman of the LiSSR Council of Ministers.

V.A. Grigoriev, chief of the Department of Science and Academic Institutions at the CPSU Central Committee, also spoke at the gathering.

The resolution was adopted at the meeting.

09006

### **Lithuanian Restructuring Movement Views Republic's Nationality Relations**

*18000667 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian  
3 Sep 88 p 2*

[Report, written by G. Afanasyeva, A. Gelbakh and V. Khrul, on a meeting between the newspaper's editorial staff and representatives of the action group called the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement: "Clarity of Positions is the Basis for Productive Debate and Mutual Understanding"; first two paragraphs are unattributed source introduction]

[Text] Participants in the meeting included B. Genzelis, professor at Vilnius State University; A. Zhebryunas, director at the Lithuanian Film Studio; Prof. B. Kuzmitskas, department head at the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law; V. Landsbergis, professor at the State Conservatory; R. Ozolas, deputy editor in chief of the Mintis



Izdatelstvo; E. Potashinskas, senior engineer at the television technical center; Doctor of Economics K. Prunskene, deputy director of the Agricultural Economics Research Institute; A. Skuchas, architect with Litstroy-projekt; V. Chepaytis, writer and editor in chief of the ARS Association of the Lithuanian Film Studio.

On the part of the editorial staff, practically all journalists who were not engaged in putting out the current issue of the newspaper and not away on business trips or regular vacations took part. On behalf of the editorial staff, the discussion was moderated by A. Gelbakh, deputy editor; G. Afanasyeva, head of the propaganda department; and correspondent V. Khrul. Other journalists also expressed their views. Therefore, in order not to confuse the reader about names, in place of the name of the person who expressed a given view, we shall use the indication "Ed."

[Ed.] The movement born of restructuring has already performed considerable services over its relatively short history. It is contributing to the development of democracy and glasnost in our society and, together with the party, struggling against that which interferes with restructuring. It is arousing public awareness and drawing people's attention to acute social and economic problems. Of course, these efforts can only be welcomed, and such activities meet with the approval of all the republic's residents, regardless of their nationality.

But at the same time, the movement, which has manifested itself first and foremost in the form of mass rallies, has also provided grounds for apprehension. The first rally on Gediminas Square, where a meeting with delegates to the 19th Party Conference was held, aroused alarm and perplexity among a group of the nonindigenous-language population. We have received a good many readers' letters on that subject. Offensive and provocative slogans were expressed at the rally, such as "Lithuania for the Lithuanians!" and "Lithuania Belongs in the Family of European Peoples!" Not to mention the insulting of individual persons and state institutions. We were perplexed chiefly by the fact that none of the movement's leaders passed any judgment on those slogans or disassociated himself from them.

[V. Landsbergis] That's not true. On our part it was stated right off that we were not responsible for the words and deeds of individual people in the square.

[Ed.] Yes, you said that. But that was stated in general, and not in relation to any specific fact. But the judgment should be specific, otherwise there is no clarity.

[B. Genzelis] I, all of us everywhere and always, have opposed nationality discord. But our effort will have no results if we do not find mutual understanding. It is also necessary to take a look at history.

The one-sided approach has dominated in history. What was dear to us may not be dear to Russians, and vice-versa. Take Pushkin. We know that Pushkin was an outstanding poet and we bow our heads to him as a poet. But when people start writing that Pushkin was a great friend of the Lithuanian people—! After all, his attitude toward our people was insulting. But we are not saying that Pushkin was a bad poet. And if some Lithuanian poet—Mayronis, for example—wrote against tsarism in the past, we immediately accused him of nationalism and tried to expunge him from literature.

Another problem is street names. There are representatives of other peoples against whom no one objects at all. Gorky, say. He had certain ties with Lithuanian cultural figures. And a street named for him is a symbol of mutual understanding and friendship. But if there is a Suvorov Street in Vilnius, that cannot be taken as anything but an insult. After all, Suvorov put down the Kosciusko uprising with a cruelty to which even the cruelty of Muravyev the Hangman could not be compared, and he ordered people's arms to be cut off. Kutuzov was governor general in Lithuania. And suddenly a group of authors in VECHERNIYE NOVOSTI calls for the creation of a Kutuzov Museum. How is that to be understood? Such articles also wound national pride and dignity.

We have visited nonindigenous-language groups. For example, Chepaytis and I were recently in Snechkus and met with workers, who initially took an extremely wary attitude toward us. But we arrived at mutual understanding and expressed the desire to meet more often.

[V. Chepaytis] It seems to me that what some people view as the exacerbation of nationality relations is the tip of the iceberg, which has grown from the slogans about the friendship of peoples that were used to cover up the problem during the time of stagnation. These relations will have even greater importance, and we must all prepare for that.

Our movement is not divided along nationality lines. I realize that the fact that there are mainly Lithuanians in the movement and that many issues are devoted to language causes a certain amount of concern, yet we have been living here for 4,000 years, and our hearts ache the most over the republic's problems; we feel them more emotionally. There is a Russian population that has been living here for several centuries, and there are also those who settled here after the war, and those who came recently. During the meeting in Snechkus, which is inhabited, to all intents and purposes, by newcomers, we were glad that people already felt themselves to be citizens of the republic and wanted to understand us, although they still had little knowledge of our problems. People there already want to attend courses in Lithuanian and complain that there are not enough such courses. There we could see quite distinctly the common nature of the goals of all people living in Lithuania. Our movement's goal is not to separate, but to unite people.



Because we are all equally tormented by corruption and the mafia. Wherever you go in our republic, there is always a mass of problems, yet the press, by and large, writes that everything is fine.

We have so many things that must be done, and we are trying to find out who said what and who put forth what slogan. That's not the main thing. We must find that common element that unites us. And as far as slogans, let me put it this way: we are living under the conditions of democracy, and under democracy anything can happen.

[Ed.] Forgive me, but democracy is not general permissiveness. Democracy and the rule of law are inseparable. But we are talking about something else. About the need for a clear-cut definition and clear attitude on one's part toward a given fact. We are calling on people not to rush to tear down some slogan or other, but rather to express their attitude toward it. You'll admit, that's necessary. Otherwise we will not be able to understand one another for a long time.

[V. Chepaytis] You mustn't think that we, an action group, sat down and wrote down on paper: put forward this or that slogan. In a state based on law, there should be laws. Is there a law prohibiting the public insult of a republic's leader? It ought to be enforced.

But in my opinion at the meeting in Vingis Park there were no such slogans. And on Gediminas Square, if I am not mistaken, the Terlyatskas group put forward the slogan concerning Lithuania in the family of European peoples. But in point of fact, don't we live in Europe? Although I should note that recently, when we took part in a television bridge with Riga on the problems of preserving the Old City, we were struck by the somewhat different level of glasnost in our neighboring republic. Represented in the broadcast were such movements as Helsinki-86, the League for an Independent Latvia, and the Movement for a Clean Environment, i.e., in the generally accepted understanding of the term, "disident" movements.

In conclusion, I want to say that numerous offenses have accumulated among us Lithuanians. That should be spoken about openly. Don't forget that Lithuanians' national pride is rather hypertrophied. Our history was under a ban for a long time, but it existed practically in oral retelling, as in remote antiquity. National feeling that was nurtured, if one may put it that way, by underground "samizdat" history was able to grow even more hypertrophied. Only the calm discussion of all these issues can restore true dimensions to national feeling.

[Ed.] Right now in this discussion we understand one another excellently and support all those positions. What is not understandable is something else. You were speaking of emotional outbursts. In a crowd they are unavoidable. Yet it is necessary to free oneself from them. Insults against Russians are felt just as keenly as insults against

Lithuanians. And Terlyatskas's words and slogans are one thing (we know with whom we are dealing), but carelessness in the statements of a writer or journalist is something else.

[K. Prunskene] I have had to fight for restructuring, and in the process it is Russians, especially Muscovites, with whom I have cooperated most. People said to me: What is it with you Lithuanians? You're waiting for someone to bring you restructuring on a platter. From an economic viewpoint we do not have any problems that might separate us, whereby people would say: that's a Lithuanian problem, and that's a Russian one. Yet emotional sensitivity with regard to certain issues manifests itself in different ways (that's evident even from today's discussion) where nationality problems are affected. We representatives of the action group never put forward any divisive slogans. I have made many speeches and have always said that we live under the same sky, eat the same bread, and breathe the same air. Who, if not the republic itself, will see to it that there is more of everything that a person needs? It is only thanks to the CPSU Central Committee, i.e., if one is to speak of nationalities, thanks primarily to the Russians, that the present process has begun. As for the fact that certain failures to make connections are arising among us now in real life, it is necessary to consider where that comes from. It comes from the unbalanced way in which the problems of nationalities have been posed, from their inequality, and from the small nations' desire to overcome that inequality. Of course, even in that desire it would not be a bad idea to maintain a sense of measure. Compromises are necessary; without them, we evidently cannot get by. But I shall stress one more time that compromises proceed from the premise that it is necessary, all the same, to overcome inequality. And therefore, if we understand this together in an intelligent way, as members of the intelligentsia, then the approach to the masses, the people, should be such, in my opinion, that every person understands it. I agree that that does not mean that Russians who have come to Lithuania should already be speaking Lithuanian tomorrow. I am talking about something else, about preserving one's own nationality. Who, if not Lithuanians, will be concerned about that?

[Ed.] Regarding the issue of the Lithuanian language: SOVETSKAYA LITVA never has objected to but, to the contrary, has agitated for having the nonindigenous-language population study Lithuanian. Eighteen months ago we insistently pointed out the need to publish dictionaries for the nonindigenous-language population so that people really would finally study.

[V. Landsbergis] In the first place, several critical observations on issues that have been raised here. It is true that stagnation left behind a bundle of problems and various questions in various areas. They include, among others, problems pertaining to nationalities. And it is natural that the restructuring movement does not skirt these problems, which are connected with certain losses

and acts of oppression with regard to the Lithuanian language, restrictions on the development of Lithuanian culture, etc. If anyone thinks that there is no reason for us to take up these problems and says we should concern ourselves only with common problems and leave these alone, that position is illogical. Yet it does creep in.

As soon as we touch on stagnation-related nationality problems, a red light goes on. That should not happen. Everything should be examined as part of our natural concern for neglected matters. The same thing is true of dictionaries. Indeed, things are very bad in that regard. But that is also a consequence of a policy, an incorrect policy when the great goal was being proclaimed of the merger of the peoples, but a merger from one side only. And the policy of the nonmerger of the Russians with the Lithuanians. Why, then, did the Russians need phrase books in order to study Lithuanian? But as for Lithuanians shifting to Russian as fast as possible, that was fine. There was such an approach. And it really was a great-power, chauvinistic approach, one can say, as Lenin called it. Lenin pointed out that nationalism was always a consequence. And when people fought against nationalism as something that had seemingly come from somewhere, but hushed up its causes, that was another distortion of Leninist policy. If we proceed from such a premise, we will probably use the word nationalism very cautiously. Very cautiously. Because to call concern for the national element and protection of the national element nationalism is a dirty trick. It must not be done.

[B. Kuzmitskas] Many people in the Soviet Union judge Lithuania by what SOVETSKAYA LITVA writes. The newspaper also shapes public opinion among the Russian-speaking population. And in that lie great responsibility and a great task. However, this newspaper interests the Lithuanian reader, including me, for example, because through it one can find out how Lithuania's Russian-speaking population lives and feels. And for other Lithuanians the newspaper is interesting in that respect.

In accordance with that, a few critical observations. The first question. How does the newspaper promote the Russian-speaking population's integration in the republic's cultural and economic life? In today's world, the problems of integration are receiving a great deal of attention. Because this is not just an economic problem. We sometimes regard integration only in the respect that here we have collective consisting of different nationalities and everyone works well, so everything is fine. That is an interpretation of the matter in its purely economic aspect, and that is not enough. The newspaper, it seems to me, does not recognize that. The problem is most often recognized in its ideological aspect and in connection with those well-known slogans that have no social content whatsoever.

Every Lithuanian fully recognizes that we live as neighbors, and will always live as neighbors, of the great Russian people. And everyone also knows that it is a

great people. And there are not and cannot be any deep causes for quarrels and misunderstanding. But what are Lithuania's Russians in a cultural sense? Most of them are relatively unfamiliar with Lithuania's culture and satisfy their spiritual requirements in traditional Russian culture. The situation is hardly normal—to live and work in Lithuania but to be outside it in a cultural sense. I would like for the newspaper to give more attention to that question. But I do not think SOVETSKAYA LITVA has such a strategy.

The newspaper picks out peripheral, negative phenomena in our movement, phenomena which, incidentally, have practically nothing to do with the movement. Sometimes one gets the impression that someone on the editorial staff, having the movement in view, uses a microscope to scrutinize every little word and seeks out nationalism there. And he who seeks, as we know, will always find. It is necessary to be a little less offended by the movement, and a greater degree of emotional sophistication would contribute to that.

But in connection with integration, one must not forget that there is a certain category of the population, the so-called nomads. They come to one republic today and another republic tomorrow; they march under the slogan of internationalism, but in actuality they are cultural and national nihilists. Such nihilists also exist among Lithuanians.

[V. Landsbergis] Two things must be explained to everyone. In the first place, the fact that our internationalism at the present time is based to a great extent on the Ignalina Nuclear Power Station. Because if it blows up, it will not just be Lithuanians who will blow up; we will all blow up, which means that these problems pertain to everyone, and what the movement is for is the solution of problems that pertain to everyone. But besides that, the movement is also concerned with nationality problems. And if there are, in the future, people in the movement who concern themselves with Polish nationality problems, Russian nationality problems, etc., that's very good. But let those people come, and let them be interested. And they already are coming and already are interested. We are already making some contact, and not just with regard to ecological and social problems. And to the people who complain about insults, you could—I don't know how—say that Lithuanians also receive insults daily, and not from genuinely Russian people, but from those rolling stones who have practically no nation and who only speak in a poor, slang Russian.

[Ed.] In our articles we have repeatedly raised the question in precisely that way, that such people drive others to a reaction that really is extremely acute. We have written about just that, and are writing about it now. But we would like for people to express themselves more carefully on the other side, as well. The movement's leaders must state clearly which problems the movement is working to solve, how it is working to solve them, and how it sets itself apart from the extremists.

[Voice] Of course, we shall also print today's discussion and a clear explanation of your position.

[A. Zhebryunas] At first we felt great mistrust in one another. Now there is hope that we will, nonetheless, be able to do something together. And since we are presently in the editorial offices, I simply must note the work that was done even before official restructuring, since I personally had contact with SOVETSKAYA LITVA, and with the newspaper's help steps were undertaken that were risky for those times. Neither TIYESA nor LITERATURNAYA GAZETA would print my article, but SOVETSKAYA LITVA even published three articles. And there was a struggle there, a struggle against the bureaucracy and a struggle, in general, against arrogant people. So I should express respect for the newspaper, which began restructuring very early.

I think that we created our action group very rapidly and unexpectedly. We, of course, also make mistakes. But even you were so flabbergasted by such an unexpected phenomenon that you didn't control the breaks, and you also experienced a misfire. Neither side was without fault.

[Ed.] The movement is not formally organized at all. The public, in general, has the following idea: Whoever speaks filth and makes hooligan statements using the movement's name is a spokesman for the movement. That is why we want the movement's leaders to stress once again that that is not the case.

[E. Potashinkas] Perhaps declare that only members of the action group have the right to speak on the movement's behalf?

[Ed.] Of course, that would clarify the situation.

[A. Zhebryunas] I call for us to clarify our positions together and fight together against a very powerful enemy, which still exists. We are powerless without you, and you are also powerless without us. The enemy is a common one for both Lithuanians and Russians, and for everyone living in the republic. We should help the Russians, the Poles and the Karaites, so that they, too, develop their culture.

At the given stage we already must identify the specific people who are opposed to restructuring, i.e., not the bureaucracy in general—that word means nothing—but the opponents of restructuring. We are doing everything to that end. In your newspaper the bias has been to find people in our movement who said something wrong. You know that here is an entirely different position. So let's not fiddle around over who said what, but find a way to fight that which is hampering us all and will continue to hamper us for a very long time.

[Ed.] What you're saying is right. But who said what is also a matter of concern. You have a tremendous forum, and in that connection every word has significance, just

as our word does. And to state that you are being perceived differently from the way you may perceive yourselves and that people are using your name as a cover is essential. There is also a certain honesty of position in that. You are saying today that you set yourselves apart from the extremists. But looking for the extremists who speak out in your name is also your task, so it will be clear who is hampering the movement.

[E. Potashinkas] I do not belong to the action group and am speaking only for myself. The ignorance of various movements is the same sort of ignorance as the ignorance of Lithuanian culture. Can you even enumerate which movements—nationalistic and not nationalistic—exist in Lithuania? In order to create labels and fight against someone, one must study and know who should be fought.

One should distinguish between cases when reference is being made to the Russian people or any other people, and when it is being made to bureaucrats and functionaries with imperial or colonial ways.

[V. Landsbergis] I shall permit myself to quote from my own speech in Vingis Park. There I was also speaking about everyone who lives in Lithuania—Lithuanians, Russians, Belorussians, Poles, etc., and about our common cause. And I said approximately the following: Our responsibility is for **this place**, and if Lithuania is purer, that will be our contribution to the business of the entire country. Right here we can make the Soviet Union better. It makes no sense to demand that we go somewhere to the Kamchatka Peninsula and fight pollution there.

[E. Potashinkas] Why are we speaking so persistently right now about the ecology of Lithuania? Because today, per square kilometer of Lithuania, such capacity has been created, such an underlying level of pollution and chemical buildup, that it is impossible to go any further. If the numbers are raised to the point that they threaten the genetic code and the continuation of the human species, we ought to reflect on that.

[Ed.] We have also been thinking about that, fighting environmental pollution, and publishing trenchant articles. In the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, whose publication we are, and the Central Committee Bureau this issue is also being raised in a very acute fashion, and attempts are being made to solve it.

[R. Ozolas] I would like to speak about general matters. As far as I understand from everything that we have said today, a certain lack of information exists, and not just with regard to the nationality issue. All of us here are seeking information about our true situation. A certain lack of information exists on the editorial staff, too—about the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement, in particular.

Even worse is the vagueness of thinking. That is the most complex thing. The most complex because it is bound up with the party's fundamental precept concerning the need for new thinking, on the one hand, and stereotyped perceptions of the world that were asserted for decades, on the other. All day today we have been talking about things that we find difficult to define, while the ability to do so should have come to us when we were in school. That is, once again, a warning signal concerning the state of our spirit and intellect, which are in a deplorable state not just in Lithuania, and not just among people of various nationalities who are living here, but among inhabitants of the whole Soviet Union. I am talking about the state of the spirit that was systematically destroyed over a period of decades, the spirit to which we must rise today, in the time of restructuring, the disclosure of which spirit, incidentally, is complicated by the stagnation-era precept, shared by "Soviet Lithuania" among others, that everything is fine in our Soviet Lithuania. That is a profoundly incorrect—and not just incorrect but erroneous—orientation.

Unless that view is changed, nothing will change—there will be neither new thinking nor any means of solving the problems that confront us. People have gradually been speaking about what is bad throughout the whole country. But we only started talking seriously about what is bad in Lithuania with the appearance of the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement. That movement, of course, ripened for years, revealing a new knowledge and understanding of what is going on, and new orientations. But only with the help of the movement was all that freed and made available to the public. The movement opened a new stage in the search for truth—not a personal, but a collective search. The movement's difficulties are that everything must be found quickly, while things are in progress. But the fact that the truth is being found and being sought can be denied by no one.

The Lithuanian Restructuring Movement's point of departure remains the same: to help the party manage the crisis of confidence and help the people find the sort of mechanism for the Soviet regime that will operate without fail, expressing precisely the will of the people, and not the interests of the ruling strata. And when this goal is achieved, when such a form of people's control is no longer necessary, the movement will exhaust itself. What happens after that, and what forms the social movement will take, I don't know. No one can say that. Only one thing can be said: The Communist Party and the Soviets will then be fully capable of exercising their state functions.

[Ed.] Our readers ask in their letters: Doesn't the movement have the goal of eventually fighting for withdrawal from the Soviet Union?

[V. Chepaytis] Right now the whole world is moving toward integration, and not toward division.

[R. Ozolas] The movement arose and operates within the framework of restructuring; it has supported and will support the real advances toward what is new that should be made in defiance of everything, even that which is shielded by the loftiest bureaucratic words. The movement should resolve to do a great deal, even that which is risky. Otherwise you won't find enough of what is new. So mistakes are possible, even inevitable, and the fact that they will occur is not a problem, if they are the costs of the process. And in order for the process to be healthy—that's why we exist. How is that possible, in specific terms?

A long-term program is being drawn up with regard to the most important issues. Problem groups have been set up that are gathering information, formulating problems, and taking steps to solve them. Our proposals are being examined and will be examined in commissions set up under the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers and Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet. The demonstration is used as a means of arguing for the exceptional importance of a problem. There is enough work to last us for many years with regard to the improvement of our natural environment, our cultural situation and our spirit, and with regard to the revival of the complex of components that are called human life and that exist, within the framework of society, as the life of the nation. Carrying out that work is very difficult, especially since the creation of conditions for the reproduction of the nation is not just the creation of economic, cultural and political preconditions; it is the creation precisely of the optimal combination of preconditions. That is why the combination of restructuring measures cannot arise and exist other than as a movement, and not just a movement on the national scale but a national revival movement. The involvement of people in the movement in rayons and cities is a very important thing. But the main thing is the spiritual state of those who are being involved in the process, especially their ability to take personal spiritual responsibility for everything. In this context, the question of involving nonindigenous-language groups of the republic's population in restructuring is extremely important. The questions of integration, as Prof. B. Kuzmitskas noted, should find a permanent place in the newspaper, since all of us must make sense of these processes. Who can answer sensibly the question of how a Russian in Lithuania turns from simply an inhabitant, a member of the "population," into a Russian of Lithuania. Yet without that, there cannot be a step along the path of restructuring.

Up until now we have frequently defined ourselves using negatives: we are not anti-Soviet, not antiparty, etc. I think the time has come to define ourselves positively, as well. We can define ourselves briefly as follows: we are people who believe in restructuring. We realize very well that we should help express the aspiration of the people—if not the whole people, at least that part of the people that has already waked up and that also believes in restructuring and the possibility of living in a human

way. How that will manifest itself concretely in a human way is our civic cause. But that, we also recognize, is something we must work to accomplish concretely, through sweat and sleepless nights. But work to accomplish it we must, because not working to accomplish it means committing crimes; it means agreeing to destruction in general.

[Addition] At the meeting the question was repeatedly raised of publishing a report of the conversation between V. Martinkus, chairman of the Board of the Lithuanian SSR Writers' Union, and representatives of the employees of the Vilnius Radio-Measuring Instruments Plant, and of the open letter the writer sent to the newspaper (SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 17 and 23 June 1988). The editors gave explanations and reproduced excerpts from a tape recording made at the plant. It seems to us that the conflict has been settled.

#### Afterword

We are submitting for readers' judgments an abridged version of the discussion that took place at the meeting between the editorial staff of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA LITVA and representatives of the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement action group. We believe that the abridgements we have made are not of fundamental significance to the essence of the discussion. One should, perhaps, start everything from the beginning, otherwise we would have conducted the discussion with other points of orientation in mind. But this was our first such "face-to-face" discussion and therefore, of course, was not always logically and emotionally consistent, although in principle our basic, vitally important interests are common interests—after all, we are all for restructuring, glasnost and democratization. The path of restructuring necessarily lies through concrete deeds, deeds which it is easier for us to accomplish together, by pooling our efforts.

In our view both members of the editorial staff and representatives of the action group understood that there is much more that brings us together than separates us, although the discussion dealt primarily, unfortunately, with the latter.

It is probably no accident that the issue of nationality relations ran through the whole discussion like a pain wave, for without finding mutual understanding on that issue, we will hardly be able to find a common language with regard to all the rest. It turns out that, while breaking up established stereotypes in our minds in our judgment of the peoples of other states, we have still barely touched the stereotypes with regard to one another that have developed among people of different nationalities living side by side. Let us confront the bitter truth: don't we know of the existence of the widespread opinions that Lithuanians are militant nationalists and Russians are self-satisfied, arrogant ignoramuses (and those are even mild ways of putting it)? Indirectly that was felt and probably expressed in the nervous excesses

of our discussion. But if one is to speak the truth, then it should be the whole truth: every stereotype has some basis. And without clearing away that basis, we will not be able to achieve unity and surmount the barrier of misunderstanding that exists in the national consciousness. And in the effort to accomplish that extremely complex and delicate task, we are embarking on a genuinely new and unexplored course where there are no ready-made solutions awaiting us and much of what we arrive at, we will have to arrive at by relying on our own minds.

We have offered and will offer the newspaper's pages for constructive articles by figures from the movement. But we also reserve the right to debate, for we see in it not "bias," but the duty of party journalists.

Both the mass media and the public are still taking the first steps on the path of the democratization of our society and learning the art of debate and the ability to listen to one's interlocutor.

Let us, before each of our acts, ask ourselves the question: What may this act lead to? To good, or to evil? Will it contribute to the harmonization of internationality relations? After all, any setting off, one against the other, of peoples or the territories on which those peoples live is fraught with exacerbation, mutual offense and the settling of scores. The path of making contrasts is an unproductive path that can have grave consequences. That is especially true since we are dealing with a tangled knot of nationality problems. But it is not a Gordian knot, and it must not be cut but painstakingly untangled, whatever that costs us. We should, evidently, summon all our patience and goodwill for assistance.

The time has come for painstaking work and actual deeds. It is the actual deed, in our view, that should back up every word spoken at rallies.

We are sincerely glad that such a meeting took place, and we hope that it will not be the last. So, let us continue to debate, express our own views, and work out specific programs for implementing the decisions of the party and the people. But only realistic programs. And only useful ones. We have already taken the first and probably most difficult step in that direction.

8756

**Lithuanian Decree on Teaching, Study of Native Language, History**  
18000657 *Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian*  
20 Aug 1988 pp 1,3

[Article: "In the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and the LiSSR Council of Ministers]

[Text] The Central Committee of the the Communist Party of Lithuania and the LiSSR Council of Ministers have adopted a decree concerning additional measures

to improve the teaching and study of the Lithuanian language and of the literature, history, and geography of the Lithuanian SSR in the educational institutions of the republic.

The decree notes that, in accordance with the guidelines of the XIXth All-Union Party Conference and of the February and July (1988) Plenums of the CC CPSU and the tasks of social perestroika, and with the objective of further improving teaching and study of the Lithuanian language and the literature, history, and geography of the Lithuanian SSR in the educational institutions of the republic, the Ministry of Public Education, conjointly with the Academy of Sciences, creative unions, and the educational community, must develop a concept for teaching and study of the Lithuanian language and the literature, history, and geography of LiSSR within the humanities program and undertake the necessary measures to implement this concept.

In order to improve teaching and study of the Lithuanian language and literature, it has been established that education will be conducted in the native language in the preschool institutions of the republic. Teaching of another language in addition to the native one will occur only at the parents' request.

Systematic teaching of a second language, in addition to a child's native one, to children will begin in the third grade in nonspecialized schools. It is considered desirable that the class time which will be made available as a result of this measure be used to improve the childrens' knowledge of their own language.

The Ministry of Public Education has been tasked with implementing additional measures to raise the level and efficiency of teaching and study of the Lithuanian language and literature in all types of educational institutions where instruction is in Lithuanian, regardless of the department to which these schools report. These measures will involve finding opportunities to make class time available for these objectives and also more extensive use of extracurricular and after school hours. In all types of secondary educational institutions, plans call for dividing up classes in the native language with 25 or more students into smaller groups. This procedure will be introduced gradually beginning with the 1988/89 school year.

The Ministry of Public Education must substantially improve teaching of the Lithuanian language and literature in all higher educational institutions regardless of the department to which they report. Starting in September of 1989, a course in the culture of speech will be introduced for future teachers in all subjects. For students studying in groups where instruction is in Russian and Polish, the conditions for ensuring a deeper knowledge of the Lithuanian language will be created.

Before 1 January 1989, the Ministry of Public Education and the State Agricultural Industry Agency must study the state of teaching and study of the Lithuanian language and literature in secondary educational institutions with instruction in Russian and Polish, regardless of the department to which they report, and implement the necessary measures to radically improve these areas.

Beginning in the 1989/1990 school year, all non-specialized secondary schools where language of instruction is Russian and Polish must introduce elective courses in the Lithuanian language and literature, and make more extensive use of all extracurricular and out-of-school opportunities to improve students' knowledge of the Lithuanian language.

Starting in 1989, Republic, city and rayon level olympiads in the Lithuanian language and literature will be conducted for students in all types of secondary schools where language of instruction is Russian and Polish.

The salaries of teachers of the Lithuanian language and literature in secondary educational institutions of all types with instruction in Russian and Polish in rural areas or towns will be increased by 15 percent.

Before 1 March 1989, the Ministry of Public Education, conjointly with the city and rayon ispolkoms, must learn the desires of the parents and students of other nationalities living in the territory of the republic whose native languages are not taught in educational institutions of the republic as to how to improve the students' knowledge of their native languages. The possibility of arranging elective courses for them in these institutions will be considered.

Within 6 months, the Ministry of Public Education, conjointly with the city and rayon ispolkoms, must conduct a study of the desirability of further expanding the network of schools with enhanced study of the Lithuanian, Russian, and Polish languages, and also foreign languages, including Latin, taking into account the desires of the parents, and the capability of the existing teachers and educational materials and facilities to support the requisite measures. They must examine the possibility of creating [magnet] language schools, on the model of children's music and art schools, that would be supported by state funds and parent contributions.

Starting in 1988, the Ministry of Public Education, conjointly with the board of the "Znaniye" society, must expand the availability of fee charged courses for those wishing to study the Lithuanian language.

The Ministry of Public Education must radically improve teaching of the history and geography of the LiSSR. To this end, comprehensive use must be made of the systematic course in Lithuanian history to be introduced into non-specialized schools starting in the 1988/89 school year, the new course in the study of ecological problems "Conservation of Nature," and also

an increased number of hours devoted to study of the geography of the LiSSR. It is considered desirable to combine the course on the history of the LiSSR and the elective course on "Soviet Lithuania in the Family of Fraternal Peoples."

Before the 1989/90 school year, the Ministry of Public Education conjointly with the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences, must implement measures necessary to improve the knowledge of pupils and students in this area.

The Ministry of Public Education, conjointly with other interested ministries and departments and the appropriate institutes of the Academy of Sciences, must institute changes following from the present decree and introduce them into the curriculum of all types of educational institutions and begin working to improve syllabi without delay.

The Ministry of Public Education and the State Agricultural Industry Agency must: materially improve work with teachers and instructors in the Lithuanian language, and literature, history, and geography; improve work to raise the qualification of teachers and instructors in these disciplines, doing everything possible to encourage their self-education; study the additional need for educational institutions of all types, regardless of the department to which they report, and for cadres of teachers of Lithuanian language and literature, Russian language and literature, and Polish language and literature, history and geography and present to the Gosplan well-substantiated proposals for training these cadres; consider the issue of the desirability of the Vilnius State Pedagogic Institute training teachers of Lithuanian language and literature for teaching in secondary schools where the language of instruction is Russian and Polish, starting in the 1989/90 school year.

Before 1 January 1989, the Ministry of Public Education, conjointly with the State Committee on Publishing, Printing, and the Book Trade and other interested ministries and departments, must develop a specific program to provide all educational institutions, regardless of the departments to which they report, with the textbooks and visual aids needed for improving the teaching and study of the Lithuanian language and the literature, history, and geography of the LiSSR. Plans call for holding competitions for creation of new textbooks. The creative Unions, and appropriate departments of higher educational institutions and institutes of the Academy of Sciences will be encouraged to participate more actively in developing these texts.

Starting on 1 January 1989, ministries and departments are permitted to offer authors of school textbooks creative leave lasting up to 3 months at the mean salary writers earn in their primary job in order to complete work on their texts (those on the graded list of published textbooks approved by the Ministry of Public Education).

The State Committee on Publishing, Printing, and the Book Trade is to expand the publication of textbooks and instructional literature, and radically improve their quality, contents, and format, and reduce the duration of the publication cycle to a minimum.

Before 1991, a Lithuanian-Russian dictionary, short Lithuanian-Russian and Russian-Lithuanian dictionaries, a pocket Lithuanian-Russian dictionary, a Russian-Lithuanian dictionary of common phrases, a book for teaching yourself Lithuanian, and Lithuanian-Russian and Russian-Lithuanian phrase books will be published for pupils, students and teachers in educational institutions with Russian and Polish as the language of instruction, as well as literary works in Lithuanian for reading outside of school.

The Ministry of Public Education and the State Agricultural Industry Agency must take measures to strengthen the facilities and resources for teaching the Lithuanian language and literature, and the history and geography of the LiSSR, and also to equip language labs for study of Lithuanian in secondary schools where the language of instruction is Russian and Polish.

The draft State Plan of Economic and Social Development for the Republic for 1989-1990 and the 13th 5-year plan to be written by the Gosplan and Ministry of Public Education must stipulate the measures necessary for implementing the present decree.

The Division of Science and Educational Institutions of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the Division of Culture of the Administration of Affairs of the LiSSSR Council of Ministers are assigned to monitor the implementation of the present decree.

9285

**Academician Examines Proposals for Lithuanian State Language**

18000641 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian  
22 Jul 88 p 2

[Article by Professor V. Lazutka, doctor of philosophical sciences, director of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and the Law of the under the rubric of "Opinion of a Scholar": "Free Development, Equal Rights: Some Comments on the Proposals To Make the Nationality Language the State Language of the Republic"; first paragraph is source introduction]

[Text] The editorial office is receiving letters from readers expressing interest in the proposals to introduce Lithuanian as the state language of the republic. Below we publish an article by Professor V. Lazutka, doctor of philosophical sciences, and director of the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and the Law.



As is well known, when the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th All-Union Party Conference were being discussed, a number of proposals were made (by the Lithuanian SSR Union of Writers, the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences, the secretaries of the republic's creative organizations, etc.) to introduce into the Lithuanian SSR Constitution an article making Lithuanian the state language of the republic. Support for this proposal was expressed in an article which appeared in *LITERATURA IR MYANAS* and other newspapers. This proposal was debated orally at meetings between workers in the creative unions and officials from the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. Obviously these arguments were the basis for the positive opinion which was formed on this question within broad circles of ideological and party workers. In expressing this widely-held opinion at the party conference, Comrade R.-B. I. Songayla, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, put forward the view that a positive decision on the question of the nationality language as the state language of a union republic is possible in principle. This statement by Comrade R.-B. I. Songayla was greeted with approval within circles of the Lithuanian intelligentsia.

However, it should be said that this proposal on language was not followed up with sufficient propaganda. There was no widespread debate over it, nor was there any serious discussion of it in the press. There is no doubt that this problem interests not only the Lithuanian population but also the people of other nationalities, and it is possible that it interests the latter to an even greater degree. This is because of a growing fear for the fate of the native (non-Lithuanian) languages, and for their own fate with regard to job placement, the enjoyment of cultural benefits, etc.

In order to avoid this it is essential to explain clearly that the constitutional establishment of a state language in no way presumes a rejection of democracy in linguistic politics, or a rejection of the idea of equality and equal rights of languages. This idea must also be constitutionally established. For example, the constitutions of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia establish the nationality languages as the state languages, but the same article establishes the rights of other languages which are spoken in these republics. The significance of Russian as the medium of inter-nationality communication is particularly emphasized.

In the discussion on the functioning of languages, references are frequently made to well-known statements by V.I. Lenin, but they are not always sufficiently valid by virtue of the abstract approach to those languages. The problem is that under tsarism the nationality languages were persecuted in one way or another; in the outlying areas the introduction of Russian as the state language meant linguistic genocide and the practice of linguistic Russification, which corresponded to the essence of

colonialist policy. The discussion is now about something completely different. With the practical dissemination of nationality-Russian bilingualism, the nationality languages began to lose a number of their functions, and the sphere of their application began to be limited naturally (not artificially). For example, the Lithuanian language began to be squeezed out of the industrial-occupational sphere more and more and more noticeably; it is not widely used in the industrial production sphere now and barbarisms, etc., have begun to penetrate it. In our press one can find evidence that the spheres of Ukrainian, Belorussian, Latvian, Uzbek, Armenian and other languages are narrowing. It is enough to recall a statement by the Ukrainian writer B.I. Oleynik at the 19th party conference; in the Ukraine "the nationality language has found itself virtually on the outskirts of the spiritual and material-production activities of the people. It is gradually receding from production and from state and party use. Moreover, many cities do not even have schools which operate in the native language. In almost none of the higher educational institutions, not to mention the kindergartens, do students have the opportunity to study in the language of their mothers." Can we afford to wait passively until the Lithuanian language finds itself in a similar situation in our republic? I think that the answer is obvious. The nationality languages have begun to lose their qualities as literary languages. For example, our country now has 87 literary languages but schools operate in only 39 nationality languages. Naturally the languages which do not have their own schools will in time cease to be literary languages and will function only as languages for everyday communication. Out of this grows the need to protect these languages, to create the most favorable conditions for their development. In some measure this also applies to the Lithuanian language, although not to the degree as it does, for example, to the Belorussian or Latvian languages. The elevation of the nationality languages to the rank of state languages will contribute to their more successful development and dissemination.

It is necessary to see another side of the question. The Lithuanian language is not only a means of nationality but also of interethnic communication. There are often instances in which Lithuanians, Poles, Belorussians, Russians, Jews and others communicate among themselves in Lithuanian. And this is no accident because, in the 20-30 year age bracket, for example, 35 percent of Russians know Lithuanian and 57 percent of Poles know it, etc. For this reason it is not only the Lithuanians but also people of other nationalities who are interested in the improvement and development of the Lithuanian language. And everyone knows that it is necessary to proceed from the premise that if the language of the indigenous nationality is mastered by speakers of other languages, this removes a number of problems in the sphere of inter-nationality communication and raises the level of such communication. In addition, people of the non-indigenous nationality or republic do not find it so difficult psychologically to accept the need to speak in



the language of the indigenous nationality as do representatives of the latter, when—residing in their own republic—they cannot communicate in their own language with other residents of that republic. In that case the feeling of national patriotism is wounded, and there is a danger that a national inferiority complex will spread. When the native language is undervalued, the psychological alienation can lead to the loss of orientation within the system of spiritual values, to the disintegration of that system, and consequently to the erosion of the personality.

The firm positions of the nationality languages in the Soviet republics, their successful development and comprehensive functioning in no way diminishes the role of Russian as the means of inter-nationality communication, and, of course, in no way concerns or limits their national functions. It is from precisely these positions that it is necessary to examine the attitude formulated at the 19th party conference toward the linguistic policy in the USSR which The resolution "Concerning Interethnic Relations" said: "The most important principle of our multi-nationality state is the free development and the utilization—based on equal rights—by all USSR citizens of their native languages and the mastery of Russian, which is voluntarily accepted by the Soviet people as a means of interethnic communication." Here it emphasizes: "Show greater concern for the active functioning of the nationality languages in various spheres of state, social and cultural life. Encourage the study of the language of the people for whom the republic is named by citizens of other nationalities living in the republic, and especially by children and young people." These words express, as we see, the idea of elevating the nationality language to the level of a state language. It is precisely this, and nothing more, that constitutes the essence of a state language.

Of course, nationalistically-inclined elements can exploit for chauvinistic purposes the elevation of a nationality language to the level of a state language (although in essence it always was that even when this was not written in the Constitution). Interethnic confrontations are possible on this basis where there is a low general level of culture, especially political culture. But this signifies only one thing: it is necessary to talk about this more, to explain and spread propaganda for democratism in the sphere of inter-nationality relations. And, of course, it is necessary to cut off any chauvinistic attacks directed at residents of the non-indigenous nationality, or any attempts to use the lack of knowledge of the republic's language to refuse a Soviet citizen any given rights: the right to work, to medical care, etc." The party conference resolution "Concerning Interethnic Relations" says: "It is necessary to encourage the establishment of that kind of public atmosphere in which a person of any nationality would feel at home in any part of our socialist Homeland." No matter which republic a person resides in, his native home is the entire Soviet Union. This interethnic essence of the Soviet people must never be forgotten and no one must be permitted to ignore it.

Frequently this question is asked: is the introduction of a state language in the republic not a compromise with nationalistic demands? In this way it is suggested that the introduction of a state language is a nationalistic act. In these specific conditions this introjection is invalid. The fact is that to show concern for the fate of any given language does not mean to take a position of nationalism. The natural desire to see the nationality develop and to see the nationality culture flourish presumes first of all concern for the improvement of the given nationality language. This concern on the part of the Lithuanian intelligentsia is natural; it corresponds to the spirit of the inter-nationality ideology which presumes steady progress in nationality self-awareness, which is unthinkable without the nationality language. Through this dialectic of inter-nationality and nationality factors, their mutual relations become clear, as do the following: the validity of the demand for recognition of the state functions of the nationality language; the need for concern on the part of the state regarding the establishment of conditions for the normal functioning of the nationality language, and the establishment of certain advantages for it.

Is the question of a state language a political question? One can answer it in the following way. The question of language has no relation to the question of power, in this sense it is not political. But if it is used for nationalistic, chauvinistic purposes, then it can become political. This must not be permitted, for which a Marxist explanation of the situation is required. It is necessary not to fear discussion and the comprehensive analysis of this question. At the same time it is always necessary to remember that a specifically historical approach is mandatory, as is a frank analysis of the situation which has developed in the republic within the sphere of nationality processes.

8543

**Lithuanian Historians Tasked with More Objective Study of Recent History**  
*18000637a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian*  
5 Jul 88 p 2

[Article by K. Navitskas, corresponding member, LiSSR Academy of Sciences, under the rubric: "Towards the 70th Anniversary of the Establishment of Soviet Power in Lithuania and the Creation of the Lithuanian Communist Party:" "Armed with the Knowledge of History"]

[Text] Today, discussions on historical themes have splashed out of the offices of scientists and historians and into the pages of newspapers and magazines. People of various professions and ages have expressed themselves in them. I recall one of the discussions in the weekly LITERATURA IR MYANAS. Here, writers spoke out on a most interesting question: the authenticity of the historical novel. From this alone, one can

already draw a conclusion on the topicality of the realization of history as of science and on the attempt to illuminate our past scientifically rather than subjectively, despite the unexact nature of the fictional genre.

One cannot help but agree with the writers on the main point—without a true and profound knowledge of the origins and past of one's land and people, it is impossible to write a work distinguished by historical authenticity. However, it stands to reason that this does not exhaust the significance of historical science, which is somewhat more extensive. The Roman political leader and thinker, Cicero, justifiably called history the school of life. And so it is: it teaches. It teaches us to look at the past, to evaluate the present and, if you wish, to see into the future.

Historical science, paradoxical though this may seem to some, is a precise science. It requires interpretation, verified in detail, of the processes and facts and their accurate presentation. Understandably, only researchers can do this. Their skills and conscientiousness play an important role here. True, the enumerated qualities ought to thrive in favorable social "soil," which is far from everywhere and is not always observed in reality.

Much light has been shed on various events of our country's and republic's past in studies by the historians of Soviet Lithuania, academicians Yu. Zhyugzhdy, K. Yablonskisa and I. Yurginisa, LiSSR Academy of Sciences corresponding members P. Pakarklisa, R. Shar-maytisa, R. Kulikauskene, B. Vaytyavichyus, V. Merkis, and many other researchers. The LiSSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History, the Lithuanian CP Central Committee Party History Institute and numerous VUZ researchers are doing significant work. Their works have been published as monographs, magazine articles and various publications. A list of the most important publications and the authors' last names alone would take quite a bit of space. Therefore, I will mention only that many serious scientific historical works have collected in libraries and reading halls, which, taken as a whole, provide a comprehensive and objective illumination of Lithuanian history from ancient times to today.

Nevertheless, I would like to say that despite the authors' competence and the multi-faceted nature of their works, historical science in our republic is not distinguished by irreproachable evaluations of one or another historical phenomenon. Not everyone has managed to avoid superficiality and subjectivism, in particular when illuminating events of recent history and the most recent times. Certain "pages" are sometimes interpreted contradictorily, while others are not sufficiently elucidated at all. Let us address some of these problems in Lithuania's new and most recent history.

Currently, in particular, the interpretation of the role of the Lithuanian Bourgeois Council in 1917-1919 remains contradictory. In some publications, one finds the claim

that the Lithuanian Council was allegedly formed to create a Lithuanian state. However, archive documents and even the recollections of some bourgeois activists from that period attest to the fact that it arose not on the initiative of Lithuanian bourgeois leaders, but on that of the Kaiser's occupation forces, who decided to ease the implementation of their own annexation plans regarding Lithuania by using the council.

Thus, it is obvious that the Lithuanian Council, formed September 1917 in Vilnius, was unable to serve to create an independent national Lithuanian state. It did not struggle against the Kaiser's occupation forces. It was only important for it to separate Lithuania from revolutionary Russia and, being virtually dependent on the occupation authorities, it did and could have done only that which the authorities permitted or required.

True, a Lithuanian bourgeois state was created. However, this hardly occurred as a result of the "activities" of the council, but of quite different historical conditions: the Lithuanian bourgeois state was formed as such only from July-August 1919, i.e., significantly later, after Germany had been defeated in World War I, when the foreign imperialist armed intervention was able to actually assist the Lithuanian bourgeoisie, which needed to suppress the first proletarian revolution and Soviet power in Lithuania.

Consequently, we historians must still do more work in order to firmly establish the historical truth of the matter under consideration. This must be done this year, during the course of preparations for the 70th anniversary of the Lithuanian Communist Party and of the restoration of the Lithuanian national state—the formation of the Lithuanian SSR in 16 December 1918.

The so-called secret protocols are yet another "blank spot." Bourgeois propaganda asserts that these were appended to the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact of 23 August 1939 and to the Soviet-German agreement of 28 September 1939. For the time being, Soviet historians are not in a position to scientifically discuss these protocols, since they have not been published in our country. On the other hand, it is impossible to rely only upon materials which were published in the West, since there is no opportunity to compare one or the other and, moreover, only copies, not the originals, served as the materials for the Western publications.

The light of historical objectivity should also be shed upon the collectivization of the Lithuanian countryside, the implementation of the cultural revolution and the class struggle in the process of socialist transformation. It is time to tell the truth about the numerous victims of the period of the cult of Stalin's personality, about the consequences of the repressions, not always justifiable, which have affected Lithuania's life and the authority of the communist party and socialism.

At the same time, we must also tell our society about the numerous sacrifices by the working people of Lithuania in the period of establishment of a bourgeois dictatorship and fascist regime during the Hitlerite occupation, and about the excesses of Lithuanian bourgeois nationalists and their armed gangs during the postwar years.

The illumination by researchers of the party's national policy, which is being implemented in the republic, merits special discussion. Lately, more and more articles on these questions are appearing in the press. Historians are being criticized because they are readying their works for publication too slowly, writers are outdistancing them, etc. However, it can be no other way. The work of writers has an inherent, fairly dynamic, creative nature. The historian's work has a different nature. In order to scientifically illuminate historical questions, profound and careful studies based on archive and other sources are necessary. Haste is impermissible in this.

School textbooks on LiSSR history, which are also not free of the above-mentioned shortcomings, should be accurate from precisely these positions. New textbooks are now being prepared which the schools will receive in 1990. Inasmuch as possible, a present-day textbook, covering the history of the LiSSR from 1917 to the present, has also been corrected. By this autumn, a one-volume history of the Lithuanian Communist Party, prepared by the Party History Institute, should be published. In this book many questions have already been illuminated with a view to contemporary requirements. A number of "blank spots" in history have been eliminated. In the same spirit, the LiSSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History is completing work on the second volume on LiSSR academic history, covering the period from 1917 to the present. Concerning the latest ideas, as far as I know, some people think that they are being "legitimized" among us, the historians of Lithuania, with difficulty. That is how it looks. Practice shows that an idea's newness does not guarantee its scientific validity and objectivity. Therefore, to those who see inordinate difficulties along this path, I would answer as follows: if the author of a historical innovation is in no position to scientifically refute the existing ideas and to prove the correctness of his new idea, then this new idea cannot in fact be "legitimized." One must seek additional documents and facts and study them scientifically, in order finally not to prove your own truth, but to establish the historical truth.

Thus, gradually, we have approached the question of the need to increase exigency toward the researchers themselves. Of course, much depends on them, or more precisely, on us ourselves. However, we must not rely only upon each researcher's work on its own. A high level of critical review, both of works being readied for publication, as well as newly published works, should be seen to. To this day, new publications, in particular, still receive an onslaught of compliments. The times themselves dictate new conditions for historians: a critique should not only be positive, but also objectively critical.

It would be expedient to expand the range of such discussions in republic publications. Let people participate as much as possible in reviewing scientific publications. This can only be of common benefit. Such a practice would introduce the broad reading masses to the study of history and would arm them with profound knowledge about the past of their own land and people.

13362

**LaSSR: Sup Sov Official on Popular Front, State Language, Flag Issues**

18000637b Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
15 Jul 88 p 3

[Interview by V. Semenov, LATINFORM correspondent, with A.M. Kruminsh, head of the juridical department, LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium: "Turning to the Law, Guided by Conscience." Passages in boldface as published]

[Text] The 19th All-Union Party Conference noted that, since the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, great steps have been taken in the legal support of restructuring. However, these should be considered only the beginning of a great work related to forming a legal socialist state. What is being done in this area in our republic? This was the central question in the conversation between LATINFORM correspondent V. Semenov and A.M. Kruminsh, head of the juridical department, LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

**Correspondent:** What, in your opinion, are the main tasks of the republic's Supreme Soviet in implementing legislative power?

**A.K.:** The 19th Party Conference resolutions are important political documents which include numerous regulations that define the truly revolutionary processes of renovating Soviet society.

The real and unrestricted power of the soviets of people's deputies, as the foundation of the socialist state and self-management, must be ensured. I emphasize—real power. In order to achieve this, the soviets must be granted rights, such that they will be able to fully ensure the successful solution of all problems within their competence. In other words, a complete reciprocal correspondence among responsibilities, duties and rights must be achieved. The problem of legal guarantees takes first priority. However, of course, the new Law on the Soviets or changes in legislation will be unable to ensure this by themselves, if material prerequisites of an economic nature for the implementation of power and properly weighed and regulated relations between soviets and enterprises, farms and kolkhozes located in their territory are not included within them.

In reforming the soviets, the task of improving legislative work takes first priority. Particularly important tasks face the USSR Supreme Soviet and union republic

supreme soviets. I see this work as being the preparation of drafts of essential changes in the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of union republics, in labor, housing, pension, criminal, administrative, procedural and corrective-labor legislation, as well as in the norms that affect planning, financing, taxation and economic relations.

The need to create legal guarantees figures repeatedly in the conference resolutions in general. This implies the task of drafting the appropriate acts to regulate various social relations.

In my opinion, the thesis "On the Legal Reform," advanced in the resolution, regarding the need to raise the authority of the law and to achieve its supremacy, so that the law functions as an act of the highest juridical force, is particularly important. To this purpose, we must significantly reduce the number of acts decreed by various administrative, ministerial and departmental authorities. Strict control over the complete accordance of decisions made by administrative authorities with the law must be ensured. Of course, raising the authority of the law is closely related to its quality. For this, it is important to rely upon competent, scientifically substantiated evaluations of the draft laws and the broad public discussion of them.

**Correspondent:** At the 8th Session of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, the LaSSR Law on the National Discussion of Important Problems of State Life was passed. What problems have been submitted for public discussion since this law was passed?

**A.K.:** I would like to note that the discussion of draft laws and other important matters of state life had been practiced before as well. Many of them are being discussed today with the assistance of the mass information media. However, in connection with the above-mentioned law, problems have not been submitted for national discussion, since the law was passed relatively recently—15 April 1988. Moreover, its effective operation depends not only on the republic's Supreme Soviet and Presidium. The rayon (city) soviets of people's deputies, the republic government and social organizations in the form of their republic agencies, should also display initiative in this issue. Citizens can turn to the rayon (city) soviets of people's deputies, to executive committees for their place of residence, or to social organizations with suggestions for the discussion of various issues of state life.

Presently in the republic a concept for the economic and social development of the LaSSR to the year 2005 is being worked out. Proposals for the universal discussion of the draft of this concept are also being prepared.

**Correspondent:** Early this June, an expanded plenum of the Union of Writers was held, at which various proposals were raised. Some of these were addressed to the republic legislative agencies, for example, the proposal to recognize

the Latvian language as the LaSSR state language and that on the definition of Latvian citizenship. Has work begun on the consideration of these proposals?

**A.K.:** Yes, this work has started. On July 11, the LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium formed a working group which will consider the proposals for improving the LaSSR Constitution and other legislative acts of the republic for purposes of ensuring the democratization of society and the improved work of the soviets of people's deputies. Republic Supreme Soviet deputies, party and soviet workers, and jurists have been included in the group. Its tasks are to profoundly and comprehensively study these proposals and prepare a scientifically valid recommendation, which will be examined by the permanent deputy commissions of the Supreme Soviet.

Materials will be presented to the republic Supreme Soviet, with regard to the fact that the solution to many problems is related to the need to make changes in the LaSSR Constitution.

**Correspondent:** Recently, in the process of revitalizing social life, new societies, clubs, independent social agencies and movements are appearing and being created. An exchange of opinions on the need to create a republic popular front in support of restructuring has also begun. What are the legal aspects of these various kinds of social initiative?

**A.K.** Under the conditions of democratization of society and glasnost, the people's initiative has opened up and a desire has appeared on the part of the working people to directly participate in managing the state and in the process of renovating the entire society. Naturally, as a result, new forms of social self-expression, clubs, societies and movements are being created. I think that this process should be viewed only as positive. I also see a grain of reason in the so-called popular front movement, the main purpose of which would be to consolidate all democratic forces of our republic, the most diverse strata, groups and citizens, and to direct all social initiatives into the necessary channel, answering today's circumstances and the problems being solved. It is not a struggle with state authority and the administrative system at all, but specific, real assistance in improving their activities: this is a true and necessary goal. Of course, the main thing is the question of the specific tasks of a movement or a society, of its platform, the means and methods for implementing it in strict accordance with the law, the principles of internationalism, and the work which must be done for the revolutionary renovation of society and acceleration of its socioeconomic development.

The problem of the legal aspect of all of the diverse forms of social initiative is, of course, also important. It should be noted that questions on social organizations and various societies, for example, the procedure for forming them, lack sufficiently clear regulation. Clarity will be introduced by a law, the draft of which is presently being

worked out. Meanwhile, the status of individual social organizations and independent social agencies is being regulated by separate documents, and the status of cooperatives—by the USSR Law on the Cooperative.

**Correspondent:** Has the republic Supreme Soviet received a declaration requesting the establishment of a Latvian people's national symbolism?

**A.K.:** Several citizens have turned to the LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium with questions about establishing the red-white-red colors as a Latvian national symbol. Recently, such a suggestion was received from representatives of the LaSSR delegation at the "Gaudeamus" student song and dance festival of the Baltic Republics.

In order to solve this problem, it must be carefully studied both in a historical and ethnographic, as well as in a political light. Today, under the conditions of democratization and glasnost, we have no right to disregard society's opinion. We must listen closely to it. Moreover, it should be noted that, during discussions on the red-white-red colors, started in the republic newspapers, television and radio, different and even diametrically opposed viewpoints have been expressed.

It must also be noted that months of stressed work preceded the passing of the Ukase "On the State and National Symbolism" by the ESSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Here, this work was begun by the working group formed on 11 July 1988. Its suggestions will be discussed by the permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet. Proposals on establishing a national symbolism should be directed to the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium.

**Correspondent:** What, in your opinion, is the proper attitude to take toward the red-white-red symbolism before this question is considered by the LaSSR Supreme Soviet?

**A.K.:** I think that two things are important here. In the first place, we should strictly separate and differentiate national symbolism from the state symbolism which was defined by the LaSSR Constitution.

With the approval of the republic's state flag in 1940 by the LaSSR Constitution, the red-white-red flag, adopted 15 February 1922, lost its strength as a state symbol.

National symbolism is quite another matter, and has not been regulated by existing legislative acts since the restoration of Soviet power in Latvia. The combination of the red-white-red colors is not forbidden by law. According to the principle stated in the conference materials, "anything not forbidden by law is permitted," the use of this symbolism is a question which each citizen has the right to solve for himself, guided by his own conscience and attitude towards the history of the Latvian people.

13362

### **LaSSR: Pugo Views Republic's Political, Economic Issues**

*18000016a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
27 Aug 88 pp 1, 3*

[Address by B.K. Pugo, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, at a meeting in the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee: "For Renovation and Perestroika"]

[Text] Social consciousness today is distinguished by a critical approach to reality and to one's own deeds. All generations of Soviet people are united by the ideas of perestroika. The elderly, those who bore on their shoulders the burdens of the first decades of socialist construction, who defended the country's independence in the Great Patriotic War, who raised the economy during the postwar years, and who have devoted their whole lives to serving the party and the people, also want to be involved in solving the pressing problems. The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee meeting, held on 25 August and lasting more than 3 hours, also showed this.

B.K. Pugo, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the participants. He shared his impressions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and spoke in detail about how the pressing problems in the republic are being resolved.

Stating the CPSU position on development of the agro-industrial complex, B.K. Pugo emphasized that the course taken today is priority development of agriculture in order to provide the population with food in the shortest possible time. This work must be conducted while taking into account the national traditions of agricultural labor characteristic of our republic, which have been lost to a great degree of late.

For some reason, American, Swedish and Finnish farmers are given respect, but we do not hold the words farmstead and farmer in esteem. Is that not why, not having yet created the necessary conditions in farming settlements, we have essentially ruined a large number of farmsteads? As a result, many plots of land were neglected. Where it is possible and where people consider it necessary, we must re-establish farmsteads. There is no need to counterpose collective and individual forms of economic management. We should not be afraid to transfer land—state property—to peasant families on long-term leases.

A note was received at the Party Conference Presidium in which it was suggested that leaseholders be permitted to hire seasonal workers when farm work is in full swing. Some consider this to be a deviation from socialist principles. But the question is this: Either we stand for so-called purity of socialism and further tighten our belts, or we build a society economically capable of

strongly standing on its own feet. It seems we must choose the latter. Right now, our party's concern is to find the most varied ways to resolve pressing problems which are affecting the mood of the people.

Food is a sore and complex problem for us. This especially applies to the supply of meat products. Each year the republic's stocks of meat increase, but supplying meat products to people gets worse. The rate of growth of consumption exceeds the rate of growth of production.

Many see the ration system as the solution. This has already been done with a number of commodities in Lithuania and Estonia. At a meeting with the leaders of rayon and city party and soviet bodies, we came to the conclusion that they would make decisions in the localities independently, depending on the situation.

This year the situation in agriculture is turning out to be worse than last year. The grain harvest will not exceed 21-22 centners per hectare on average throughout the republic. We also cannot count on assistance from the Union fund this year, from which we annually receive about 1 million tons of grain, half of which we grow ourselves. The Union grain harvest is also expected to be lower than last year's. Under these conditions, we need to pay special attention to providing winter feeding of livestock with feed that we have grown and make maximum use of green mass of corn and second-crop hay for silage.

It is now becoming increasingly obvious that the difficulties in providing food and non-food commodities to the population can be overcome only by granting various regions of the country greater economic independence. The leadership of the republic has made corresponding proposals to the Union bodies. Certain other republics and regions of the country have taken a similar position. At the present time, all the proposals which have been received regarding this are being examined at the same time.

The republic's acute housing problem is also not diminishing. It would seem that more houses are being built each year and that the line for obtaining an apartment would get shorter, but this is not happening. In some places, the line is even getting longer. Many are rightfully raising the question of changing the housing distribution system. The problem is that those who have live in the city for a long time cannot hope to improve their housing conditions, since each family member gets just more than the minimum area which gives the right of being placed on the waiting list. Perhaps it would be feasible to offer such families housing benefits according to the length of residence in that city. This issue is now being studied in the Council of Ministers.

We also cannot silently ignore the fact that voices have recently begun to be heard about giving the Republic "complete independence." Such talk can only be by people who misunderstand the laws of economics and

social development. There cannot be complete independence in today's world. An example of this is the capitalist countries of Western Europe, which are attempting not to isolate themselves from each other, but to join together to solve the most varied problems, including economic ones. They are going so far as to establish quotas on the production of various types of products and to regulate reciprocal deliveries.

At the same time, there is really an urgent need to review certain provisions of the USSR and republic constitutions. A special group consisting of representatives of various sections of society is working on these issues in the Presidium of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet. It has already worked out a number of recommendations on the language problem, national symbolism, and other burning issues of the day.

Afterwards, B.K. Pugo answered the veterans' numerous questions.

[Question] Please clarify why the decision has not been made throughout the Republic, as was done in Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev, banning the right of residence to those arriving from other regions of the country? You see, this would make it possible to calm the population, provide apartments to those who need them, and concentrate capital investment on the construction of treatment plants which the republic really needs.

[Answer] We, just as in the capitals of the other union republics, are working on these issues. But the government did not support the idea of limiting the right of residence in Riga. At the same time, you know, we can make it so that only those who have resided in the city for at least 10 years, and not 5 years as it is now, could be placed on the list for housing. They have already taken this route in a number of the nation's cities.

[Question] Why are apartments not being vacated for real workers by expelling parasites and drunkards?

[Answer] And how do we go about doing that, where do we move them? (Lively conversation in the hall.) We get altogether different questions from certain rayons: Why don't the enterprises in Riga employ those who are released from places of confinement, but send them to smaller cities. What are we, second-class citizens? So, it is not all that simple. Maybe it makes sense to think that some measures should be stipulated by law. We will send this question to the Republic Supreme Soviet for consideration.

[Question] In late 1987 and early 1988, I wrote four letters to you and did not receive a reply. In May, I received word only about the last letter, that it had been sent to the Latvian Council of Ministers and that the Administration of Affairs had given an answer. But I have still not yet received a reply. How is one to understand such an attitude toward a party member's letters?

[Answer] That is bad. The question often arises, do letters addressed to the first secretary reach him at all? They do. And I spend a lot of time working on them. I consider this necessary. How is the discharge of duties organized? It is certainly not always done well. Comrade Bozhko, I must apologize to you, and I will instruct the General Department to investigate it thoroughly.

[Question] Is party membership compatible with participation in nationalistic demonstrations?

[Answer] I think participation in nationalistic demonstrations is intolerable. But the question always arises, what is national and what is nationalistic? Our republic is very unusual because Latvians comprise just over half of the population, and non-Latvians comprise just less than half. This is reality. If we talk about how this situation came about, my opinion is that it is due to serious economic miscalculations and unfinished work which occurred in the past. It is because we too heavily developed our industry at the expense of extensive factors and did not expend enough on modernizing equipment; the degree of depreciation of the republic's production assets is one of the highest in the nation. This is very bad. And without the influx of workers, Latvia could not manage.

Who among us "shakes his head" at the work force from the outside? In Riga, it is the car factory, where until now working conditions were beneath criticism. This also applies to a number of light industrial enterprises. Therefore, we introduced such measures as collecting for above-limit composition of workers a fixed payment for the gorispolkom, and we were one of the first in the nation to do it. We are actively working to modernize equipment, improve working conditions, and, on this basis, raise labor productivity. Then the need for an "imported" work force will pass.

Many perceived the materials of the Latvian Writers' Union Plenum as "nationalistic." I think that such a definition is fundamentally incorrect. The questions raised at the plenum were sometimes unusually sharp and maybe sometimes dramatized and strident. But, in principle, they were just. They need to be resolved. It cannot be said that they were raised at this plenum before they were raised by party organizations. No, the party organizations and the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee saw and tried to resolve many questions. Perhaps too slowly, and therefore dissatisfaction built up.

[Question] In the late 1950's, Pauls Dzerve, the late director of the Economics Institute and corresponding member of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences, expressed his views on ways to intensify the republic's economy. For this he was unjustifiably removed from his post. Will his good name be restored? And, secondly, what is the position regarding Eduard Berklav?

[Answer] According to party policy, no accusations were brought against Dzerve. The Central Committee commission which is now studying questions associated with the 1959 Plenum will examine this fact as well. It must be admitted that this work has dragged on for too long. As concerns Berklav, he should not be placed on the same level with Dzerve. The Riga prosecutor has given him an official warning for his current activities.

[Exclamations from the hall:] Correct! To each his deserts! (Applause)

[Question] Now a Popular Front is being hurriedly created in the republic. What is the Central Committee's attitude towards it?

[Answer] The 19th All-Union Party Conference noted in its resolution that the CPSU supports the establishment of public associations which promote socialism and perestroika. Our Central Committee does not consider it necessary to take upon itself the organization of a Popular Front. My opinion is that we must increase the liveliness and activeness of the party, Komsomol and trade unions. (Applause) But at the same time, there are no grounds for banning the establishment of a Popular Front. It can function, if it will be on the socialist platform.

Communists and party committees should not shun informal associations, but should skillfully cooperate with them, support their good initiatives, warn of the appearance of unhealthy trends in their activities, and give them a socialist orientation.

It must be admitted that many party organizations, in conditions of increasing social self-consciousness, operate passively, without initiative, and constantly await orders from above.

Let us take the development of our cultural base. We rank at the top in our nation in the number of creative artists, but we are far from the best in the conditions of their work.

Many questions have arisen in regard to the study of the Latvian language in Russian schools. For many years, it was formal. During this time, a whole generation of people grew up who could have completely mastered the language and there would have been no problems. Now the situation must be corrected simultaneously without lowering by any means the level of study of Russian language in Latvian schools, and this is very necessary. It is necessary to create a good base for development of bilingualism and have sufficient teachers and the necessary textbooks.

Let us return to what is national and what is nationalistic. I recall a meeting with Moskovskiy Rayon propagandists. At it, I asked those who believed that the red and white flag could a national symbolism to raise their hands. There were more than 300 people in the hall, and



10 or 15 hands were raised. In connection with this, could one pose the question as to whether these comrades have the right to be party members? Of course not. It seems more correct for the Republic Supreme Soviet, taking various opinions into account, to make a decision on the symbolism issue. But we should not without grounds accuse of nationalism those who are searching for the roots of a national culture. If you believe that your fellow party members is wrong in participating in a some demonstration, convince him of it.

[Question] Where will these seasonal workers come from if we have full employment?

[Answer] Almost every peasant has relatives who live in the city. During planting and harvesting, maybe it would be feasible for them to take a vacation or a leave of absence for their own benefit. Yes, and any city dweller could have the right to take a leave of absence for a period of seasonal work, as it is done in many countries.

[Question] How much auto traffic is it possible to stuff into Riga's already narrow side streets? Pollution of the city is increasing, and the number of automobile accidents is on the rise.

[Answer] Well, compared to many developed countries, our streets are not too overloaded. And a solution is seen in the further development of public transportation. But I adhere to the opinion that we must refrain from building a subway in Riga in the near future. (Applause) We have a great need to develop rural roads. It hurts to see how, in bad weather, little ones must travel many kilometers on impassable roads to get to school.

Answers were also given to questions concerning the ecological situation in the republic, the expansion of glasnost in resolving important economic and political problems, the regulation of the sale of alcoholic beverages and the activities of the mass media and the creative unions.

On behalf of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, B.K. Pugo expressed gratitude to the veterans for their activeness and varied activities, and wished them health, happiness and continued success in their labor for the good of society.

"I would like to thank Boris Karlovich Pugo for this meeting and express confidence that such meetings will be conducted regularly," said V.M. Krumin, chairman of the Latvian Republic Society of Veterans of War and Labor. "Today we all reaffirmed that veterans unanimously support the resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and consider these documents the sole basis for practical work. They orient us towards specific deeds for the moral improvement of society based on internationalism and socialism."

**LaSSR: Nationalities Commission  
Recommendations on Bilingual Education**  
*18000016b Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian*  
7 Sep 88 p 3

[Unattributed LATINFORM article: "In the Standing Commissions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The issue of the practice of operating dual-track schools in the republic (instruction in Latvian and Russian languages) was discussed at a meeting of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Relations Between Nationalities, led by A.V. Gorbunov, chairman of the commission.

After hearing and discussing a report by LaSSR Minister of Public Education A.A. Buylis and the thoughts and points of view expressed by the commission members, and analyzing press publications and letters received from citizens, the commission stated that the activities of the dual-track schools were at the center of society's attention. In particular, the shortcomings existing in training and educational work are being criticized, and the prospects of developing this form of organizing instruction are being debated.

Dual-track schools were formed during the initial post-war years in order to provide all children with access to education. For economic considerations, large school buildings were built in the new housing areas, in which dual-track schools were organized, for they served all children of a microdistrict. The number of dual-track schools was largest in the 1970-71 school year, when one out of every three schoolchild in the republic attended them. In many instances, the formation and operation of dual-track schools were organically linked to local conditions, where bilingualism among residents, teachers and schoolchildren was established historically and had become traditional.

It was noted that, in connection with the development of school construction, the expansion of their network, and also as a result of taking into account the actual conditions and parents' wishes, the number of dual-track schools was gradually decreasing, and in the 1987-88 school year, only one in every five schoolchildren was attending them.

The commission admitted that substantial shortcomings were allowed during the formation of the dual-track schools. These schools, especially in Riga and in other cities of republic jurisdiction, were artificially created in many cases, without observing the prerequisites necessary for their operation and without providing parents the opportunity of freely selecting a school. A significant portion of the teachers were not psychologically or professionally prepared for working in dual-track schools, and in many instances they were not equally fluent in Latvian and Russian. Principles of equality of languages and bilingualism were not observed in educational work and in carrying out measures. Normally, the



language in which the majority of the students were fluent becomes the dominant language. National peculiarities, traditions, cultural heritage, and peculiarities of national psychology of all the students are not being taken into account. The material and technical base does not correspond to the needs of both tracks.

As a result, the work of many dual-track schools for the international education of the young generation has not achieved its goal, which is indicated by the letters to the commission, publications in the press, and the sociological research being conducted by Latvian State University imeni P. Stuchka.

At present, the Ministry of Public Education is working on a solution to the dual-track school problem.

The commission believes that in the future dual-track schools will be allowed to open only if they organically blend in with the social environment, taking into account the optimal prerequisites for successful operation which have taken shape in pedagogical science and practice.

In the resolution adopted, the commission recommended the following to the Ministry of Public Education and to the ispolkoms of the rayon and city soviets of people's deputies:

- implementing democratic principles and taking into account public opinion, analyze the school network before 1989 and in each specific case resolve the issue of maintaining or reorganizing dual-track schools, and provide parents the opportunity to select a school;
- in dual-track schools, consistently observe the principles of bilingualism in daily work and while carrying out educational measures and designing visual propaganda;
- evaluate the psychological and professional training of dual-track school teachers, their knowledge of the Latvian and Russian languages, and replace personnel when necessary;
- strengthen the material and technical base of dual-track schools in accordance with the specifics of their work and look into the possibility of supplementing the supply of visual-educational supplies, books, subscriptions to periodicals, and so forth;
- ensure observance of the principles of bilingualism in the operation of bilingual children's preschool institutions and children's homes and remove existing shortcomings;

—analyze future school construction plans and new construction projects and look into the possibility of building several smaller schools instead of one large school in a microdistrict, in which separate instruction could be organized for Latvian- and Russian-speaking school children.

The following was recommended to the LaSSR Ministry of Public Education:

- provide training for teachers working in bilingual conditions and take steps to increase the level of instruction in the Latvian and Russian languages in pedagogical educational institutions;
- organize measures to increase dual-track school teachers' qualifications (problem seminars, short courses), emphasizing the specifics of the work in these schools;
- conduct regular sociological research, analyze its results, and develop recommendations for improving the activities of dual-track schools;
- carefully study proposals to establish the same term of instruction in schools with instruction in Latvian and Russian, purposefully form public opinion on this issue, and work with parents.

It was recommended that the Republic Council of Ministers consider the question of providing additional financing of dual-track schools and increasing the standard of distribution of funds for them.

T.I. Savitskaya, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet, and V.S. Klibik, secretary of the Presidium of the Republic Supreme Soviet, took part in the commission's work.

12567

#### **Latvian Roundtable Examines Role of Popular Front Movement**

*18000661a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIA in Russian  
29 Jul 88 p 2*

[Roundtable discussion conducted by SOVETSKAYA LATVIA correspondents A. Grigoryan, V. Stefanovich and T. Shishkina: "On the Wave of the People's Initiative." First three paragraphs are source introduction; last paragraph is source conclusion]

[Text] One of the real manifestations of the democratization processes going on in our society is the activity of volunteer groups aimed at the creation of an all-people's patriotic movement in support of perestroika. The press recently published the appeals of several such groups which outline (in our opinion, in general form and in abbreviated manner) the principles of organization and activity of this movement, which is often called also the Popular Front, its tasks and goals, and finally its place in the structure of Soviet society.

As yet these are merely projects, proposals, information for thought and argument. There are no final variants, much less the customary (according to recent times), singularly possible decisions. And, after all, where could they come from?! Everything is still at its source, everything requires maximally broad and open discussion.

This is in fact the way it is. As the 19th All-Union Party Conference stressed, we are speaking of formulating a patriotic movement for supporting the line of perestroika, which reflects the deep-seated processes of socio-political life and strengthens our faith in the success of the cause which we have undertaken.

In short, there are a multitude of questions, and quite difficult ones at that. They concern all of us, and this means they require a collective search for the answers. Without making any pretenses toward the truth in the latter instance, the participants of the SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA roundtable discussion have tried to accomplish just this. These participants were: V. BOGDANOV, chairman of the club for socially active people; M. BAYDEKALNS, chairman of the Latvian SSR Committee on Youth Organizations; A. GRINBERG, head of the propaganda and mass cultural work department of the Latvian Komsomol Central Committee; V. DANILIN, chairman of the labor collective council of the "Rigaselmash" plant; L. DRIBIN, senior scientific associate of the Institute of Party History under the Latvian CP Central Committee, doctor of historical sciences and professor; V. KONONOV, engineer of the "Orbita" design bureau at the "Radiotekhnika" Production Association; G. KOTOV, engineer at the Gosagroprom Scientific-Research Institute of Economics; A. KUDRYASHOV, archpriest at the Preobrazhenskiy Orthodox Church in Riga; A. MALTSEV, instructor of sociology, Riga Medical School No 5; E. MELKISIS, chairman of the department of theory of state and law and political science, LGU imeni P. Stuchka, doctor of juridical sciences; V. OZOLINSH, first secretary of the Moscow Party Raykom in Riga; YA. PORIYETIS, chairman of the political economics department, LGU imeni P. Stuchka, professor, doctor of economic sciences; A. RUBIKS, chairman of the Riga ispolkom; L. YUSHCHENKO, physician-neurosurgeon at the 1st Riga City Hospital.

#### What Is The Basis?

[Ya. Poriyetis] I will begin with the principles of the movement about which we have decided to speak here today. The main ones may be formulated as follows: the movement must fight for strengthening socialism of the Leninist type, for consolidating forces in order to achieve this goal (against confrontation), and for the overall development of democracy and glasnost.

We must also define the name of this movement. I am in favor of having the word "movement" in the name, although it is not that important what it will ultimately be called. If the concept of the "Popular Front" will be more persistent in its use, possibly this name will remain. The main thing is that the organization (all of it!) must stem from the people: formal and informal groups, those which are organizationally united and those which are not, different social strata...

[E. Melkisis] I would like to continue the idea of the principles of the movement's organization. First of all: the volunteer principle must predominate, the absence of a strictly established membership, as we have become accustomed to, with dues, membership cards, etc. And the second thing is—how to act? Obviously, it must be within the framework of the Soviet legal system, by legal methods. Although to this we may add that today a number of legislative statutes and legal standards have lagged behind real life and have entered into contradiction with practical application. Thus, a substantiated initiative must stem from the movement, directed at changing and augmenting the legislative statutes.

It is impossible to provide for everything either in the programs or in other documents. In the future we will surely have to introduce some changes, since a reform of the political system is envisioned. So, for now it is hardly worth developing a strictly formulated program, much less defining each of its points. Life itself will help to define these.

[Correspondent] Is it a movement or an organization? Most people are inclined to call it a "movement" Why? Because there is no internal structural hierarchy, no membership cards, dues or other indicators distinguishing it as an organization. Yet there is another opinion as well. Its proponents reason as follows, presenting serious arguments. If the movement is planning to present proposals on introducing certain changes into the existing legislation and to nominate its candidates to the Soviets of Deputies, it must (necessarily) attain the status of a social organization. Only in this case can it achieve its set goals without entering into contradiction with the USSR Constitution.

[A. Maltsev] Our republic is multinational. Therefore, the principle of continued internationalism must be among the most important principles of organization of the Popular Front. In this plane, our movement may be understood only as a movement of all patriotically minded citizens of the republic.

[Correspondent] Let us clarify—it is not a national, but a popular front?

[A. Maltsev] Specifically. The definition of "National Front" has emerged in our press. No one denies the fact that the Popular Front must protect the interests of the native nationality as well. For a number of reasons, many problems are very acute in this sphere. This is so. Yet the front must be called popular. Otherwise, we would be providing a serious basis for inter-ethnic confrontation. And this, I believe, does not enter into the interests of patriotically minded citizens, regardless of their nationality.

#### Goals and Tasks

[L. Dribin] In my opinion, the role of such a movement is to unite the initiatives which today have appeared in multitude among us, in order to achieve a socially significant goal. Today many initiatives are not being realized.

[A. Rubiks] And what is hindering them?

[L. Dribin] The bureaucratic approach is hindering them.

[A. Rubiks] Yet why is it that we first begin discussion of new organizational forms, as if we had none at all?

[L. Dribin] We often encounter public initiative which does not always find the proper support within the framework of the existing social structures. This is where new, and I stress, social, structures and formations come from. It is perestroika itself which has called them to life.

[A. Rubiks] Perestroika is being headed up by the party. Why do we need some kind of organization?

[L. Dribin] In order to assist! The task, I believe, is understandable, specific, important and current. The leading and guiding role of the CPSU is in no way placed in doubt. It does not exclude, but on the contrary even presupposes, the development of social formations acting within the framework of the socialist system.

[A. Rubiks] Alright. But what is the purpose of such a movement? Not the initiative in general, but the purpose? Let me present my point of view. They have said here: "The people are ready to act..." Yet it is one thing to go out into the streets with a red-white-red flag (this too is an action), and quite another to assist in a practical manner in the solution of the problems facing us. We are seeking a form. The main thing is to define the goals of the movement.

I would like to share my observations on this matter, which I made in the GDR. There the National Front was created to unite all the forces for bringing to life the policies of the SUPG [Socialist Unity Party of Germany]. It does not pursue any other political goals. The purpose, I stress, is to unite the initiative and to take a hand in a specific endeavor. They do not set off anywhere in search of this endeavor. They begin with their own home, yard, block, rayon or city. Yet in our country there are attempts to drag another ideology into this movement from the very beginning. From this there emerge all kinds of flags, needed or not, there are discussions about the fact that "the government is no good," etc.

Let us take the "Club for Natural Environmental Protection." That is what this informal association was previously called. Now they have dropped the word "natural" and only "environmental protection" remains. We protect the social environment too, they explain... Against whom?

Now let us speak of the forms of work. How do they act in the GDR? There they have a monthly periodical—the publication of this movement. It explains the tasks, tells what has been done, and what is planned. I have an issue here. What do we see in the picture? People are repairing

a roof. That is how the front acts. Yet in our country we begin with the flag. So at first, I repeat, we must firmly agree on why the movement is being created.

We must ourselves speak out with initiatives, with proposals addressed at the government and the Latvian CP Central Committee. We should not hide the fact that command-administrative methods of management have not allowed this "channel of communication" to be used in full measure or to realize its necessary level of social activity. That means we must correct the matter. Therefore, the most suitable name would be the "Movement for People's Initiative." This is not a party or an organization. It is a people's movement. Of course, we can still argue and discuss on this topic, so that the initiative which is born will be a constructive rather than a destructive one.

[Ya. Poriyētis] As for activity, the first thing the current and future activists of the Popular Front must do is to clarify the goals and tasks of the movement, to convince its potential members of their significance and importance, to attract people to their ranks, and finally, to organize the latter for specific work.

The forms of organization, I believe, must be territorial-sectorial. Within the territory there is the block, the rayon, the group. And if there is a need to concentrate attention on the solution of some single problem, say for example the protection of the Daugava against pollution, then this will be a functional group, and maybe such groups are necessary also at individual enterprises. I believe there are such spheres of activity in which the People's Front is clearly necessary. Let us take, for example, urban management. Huge funds and a tremendous amount of labor have been put into the construction and improvement of Riga. The municipal services are doing much, particularly in recent times, including A. Rubiks who is present at our "roundtable" today. Yet this is not enough. All of us, the residents, must come to the aid of the ispolkom, because the problems are growing faster than the resources allocated for their solution. Here the Popular Front, as a consolidating factor, can play an important and significant role.

[A. Grinberg] The primary task of the front is to do everything possible to see that our Soviets begin to really work. It must help them in deed. What else will the front do? Many things have been named here: surveys of popular opinion, actions against bureaucracy, development of proposals addressed to the government... Yet the main thing is to undertake those problems which are most current for society, not to limit ourselves to postulates. And the initiative groups on site will deal with local problems.

[Ya. Poriyētis] The tasks? To help actively combine departmental and regional interests, to aid in the transition from extensive to intensive methods of economic development...

[A. Maltsev] In my opinion, one of the tasks of the Popular Front must be the active participation in the process of destalinization of our society. It must be resolved in such a way that every man will have faith in his own powers. They are there, and they are considerable. The emergence of informal associations also testifies to this. Of course, the tasks which they place before themselves are sometimes contradictory, the methods controversial, if not altogether unacceptable. Yet they (the groups) are directly associated with the initiative of the popular masses. It must be given space, and not hindered, guided by the principle of "what if something happens." The creation of such a situation is unthinkable without continually overcoming the Stalinist legacy and without the broad democratization of society.

[A. Kudryashov] The movement must also be concerned about instilling moral principles. This is very important, because the moral principle may be one of the consolidating principles, a powerful means of overcoming mistrust, alienation and confusion caused by various reasons, including also a low culture of inter-ethnic socialization. Religion understands morality in just this way. We appeal for kindness in relation to a person, regardless of his position and his nationality. The Bible says that for Christ there were no Jews, no Scythians, no one—all were equal.

#### Whom Will The Movement Unite and How?

[V. Ozolinsh] In my opinion, the movement will be productive only if it will be able to initially select a problem which is really important for everyone, and then to concentrate its efforts on the solution of this problem. Therefore, we must find a precise form of unifying initiatives—the most varied ones. For example, the Balto-Slavic Society and the Movement for Charity have emerged... Where do we classify them? They, in my opinion, must act under the aegis of the "Democratic Movement for Perestroika." By the way, that is another name for it. Then, evidently, we will be able to achieve the main thing—to consolidate those forces of society which cannot manifest themselves within the framework of already existing political and social institutions.

There is no alternative to the practice and ideology of perestroika. We see and understand this. Therefore, I do not quite understand the pretensions of the leaders of certain initiative groups to the right of presenting alternative candidates for Soviet deputies after the People's Front is organized. Alternative to whom?

[Correspondent] The question, as we understand it, is not one of an ideological-political alternative. We are evidently speaking here of nominating several candidates for deputies, each with his own pre-election platforms. The task of the voters will be to compare and to choose one of them.

[V. Ozolinsh] In that case, I agree. Furthermore, there is a Party Program. This is where we must seek the basic principles of relations with any social movement, including the movement of which we speak. And again we must remember the leading role of the party. Must such leadership be organizationally formulated? As we have already said here, communists may act through participation in the activity of this movement, relying on their authority.

[G. Kotov] I agree with Comrade Rubiks. We must define the goal of the movement. I would like to propose the following metaphorical definition: a school of communism. This is what the trade unions must become. Yet they are not handling this task, particularly now, when the processes of renovation are ongoing in all spheres of the life of society.

Whoever enters the new movement—be it an individual person or an organizationally united group of people (let us say, for example, some informal association or a labor collective council)—they should not have special status within it.

The role of the party must be manifested through the participation of the CPSU members in the activity of the movement, i.e., through their moral authority. The level of this authority will depend on how committed the person or group of people are to the ideas of perestroika, on how they facilitate the development of all the work and creative qualities of the members of our society, the implementation of their humanistic ideals in deed, and not merely in word.

[V. Ozolinsh] Well, since this is the case, then let the movement for perestroika actively include itself into the activity of the trade unions and help to elevate it to the level which is necessary today.

[G. Kotos] But in this case, won't there be a substitution or inclusion of the democratic movement within the framework of the trade union organizations? After all, this too is the very same organization. We must sharply elevate the level of social and political activity of the people. It is time to think and act independently. In short, we must give people the opportunity to be independent and not hinder them in this. To do this, we must rid ourselves of the habit of controlling every step, of the desire to rely on petty wardship always and everywhere. Some leaders will try to interpret everything, to chew it up and put it in our mouths for us, and then they themselves complain that their wards are not showing any independence either in thought or in actions. If we manage the Popular Front according to this scheme, then we can foresee its failure.

[V. Bogdanov] I agree. Initiative groups will not really be able to do anything if, for example, the question which worries people has already been resolved by someone else, if its resolution was prepared (and this happened most frequently in the not too distant past) outside the

zone accessible to public criticism. Therefore, informal associations have resorted to demonstrations and taken to the streets with posters and slogans—against the metro, for example. In short, there is initiative. Today we must dress it in more specific and effective forms. Already within the framework of the front it will be easier to find a system of interaction between those who will be a part of it.

[E. Melkisis] The movement will unite party members and non-party members, atheists and believers. The most active fighters for environmental protection and those who are to a certain degree indifferent to the problems of environmental protection may find themselves side by side there... That is, there may be every conceivable social variation, all shades of social aspirations (but, you understand, social!).

At the same time, this aktiv, if we may call it that, must involve other citizens into social activity. It must serve as an example for them, a kind of magnet which places citizens who were yesterday passive face to face with our common concerns.

[M. Baydekalns] The main thing now is to find that rational principle which can unite people within the framework of this Popular Front. We must also remember that there are already groups which at this moment believe they have the moral right to create such a movement. We must clarify their positions. After all, it is not by accident that the question arose: Is the Popular Front capable of representing all the people, and who specifically has the right to represent it? If we do not develop such a mechanism with the aid of competent specialists, such a mechanism which would allow the formulation of the Popular Front in a truly democratic way, then we will get a grotesque form with an advertisement sign which will serve the ambitions of individual leaders, and nothing more.

I am saying that the Popular Front must ensure the individual attention of each person to any initiative, the consideration of the individual position of each of its participants.

[A. Kudryashov] And what do you consider to be the principle which is today capable of uniting everyone?

[M. Baydekalns] The solution of those problems of which we speak openly, but do not know how and on what levels to solve, or how we can ourselves specifically participate in their solution. Yet is it always the one who presents the initiative who must inevitably, speaking metaphorically, "dig the ditch"? Quite often it happens that the person who has presented an initiative or who has expressed disagreement is immediately asked: And what have you yourself done? This absurd approach must be excluded.

### Priorities and Authority

[E. Melkisis] We should not be afraid of different opinions. Before we pretended that any question could be resolved only in a unanimous manner. As it turned out, arguments and polemics are not simply needed, but absolutely necessary. And the Popular Front, in my opinion, must be not only and not so much a tribunal for polemics and comparison of opinions as a mechanism of coordination. After all, we will have to come to some final decision. We will have to find, as we have already said here, the points of convergence, and work from there.

And we should not, I believe, see anything too unexpected in the very fact of emergence of initiative groups. Let us turn to the resolution of the 19th Party Conference entitled "On the democratization of Soviet society and reform of the political system." Point five states: "We should view as a positive phenomenon the recent emergence of new social associations and groups whose purpose is to aid in the cause of socialist renovation." And further: "For its part, the party will aid in every way possible... in continuing to develop the all-people's patriotic movement in support of the line for perestroyka."

[L. Dribin] The main thing is that this movement be in support of perestroyka. As for the leading role of the party, here is what I think. If the movement recognizes the leading role of the party in our country, then in doing so it defines also the line of its political behavior. We cannot agree with the point of view expressed here that the Popular Front must be a political movement, even so much as a political organization.

[V. Kononov] The time for this movement or front about which we speak has long been ripe. It could have existed long ago had it not been for certain distortions in our development. The future front or movement must be long-term. And if it unites various organizations, then the unification principle common to all these organizations is the reflection of the interests of all society. Therefore, the question of the local on-site functioning of this movement seems important to me. We have spoken here of the principles of rather extensive freedom of acceptance and membership in this front, and of organizational structure. A person who is a member of the Popular Front can on one hand resolve the questions of his own enterprise and collective, and on the other—problems at his place of residence which are no less acute. Shouldn't we use such a simple means as the inclusion of the labor collective councils to involve the broad masses in this front?

[L. Yushchenko] I am against involving any and all organizations in this movement. Members of these organizations—please, welcome! Why, if we expand this, then it will turn out that the trade unions in their entirety would be able to join this movement. I do not agree.

[V. Bogdanov] Why not? They would act within the framework of a single program, and then, no one would have an advantage over anyone else.

[L. Yushchenko] Let only individual members join. There should be no obstacles set before anyone here.

[V. Bogdanov] And yet I insist: The entire matter consists of the relations within the Popular Front. Within it, no one should have any advantages. Everything must be decided by conclusion and argumentation. Whoever's is most convincing—that one is right.

[L. Yushchenko] I am in favor of individual membership. We are speaking, as far as I understand, also of winning the trust of the people. Every member of the front must recognize what he has done for this. This is a very important condition. It is no secret that certain public organizations enjoy practically no authority or trust of the people. Let us take, for example, the Society to Promote a Sober Way of Life. We at the hospital do not feel that there has been a reduction in the number of people who have become our patients due to alcohol abuse. Worse still, recently the number of such patients, unfortunately, has increased. If the functionaries of the Society for Sobriety are working somewhere, it is only in their offices. Yet action is necessary.

[V. Danilin] I agree. The authority of people's control is also not too high, at least in our enterprise. Here is what I think in this connection. If we really increase the level of activity of all of the existing public organizations, then, in my opinion, we won't even need the Popular Front.

[Correspondent] Do you doubt the expediency of its creation?

[V. Danilin] I can't answer that question precisely right now. At the plant too, as I have had occasion to note, there are differences of opinion. Some are for and some against it. I believe that I myself would not join the Popular Front. And here is why. I am not sure that it is in a position to do very much.

[A. Kudryashov] We are appealing for the unification of efforts by representatives of all confessions who are acting on the republic's territory. We agree with the principal conclusion that the faithful are active fighters for perestroika along with atheists, that we must continue to apply our efforts to see that the contribution of the faithful to the cause of creating a renewed socialist Homeland is as great as possible. We do not only preach. We also act. Specifically, we are collecting monies for the peace and culture fund. This year we have contributed 4,600 rubles to the Culture Fund. My parish has given over 2,000 rubles to the Peace Fund. In short, everyone must define as quickly as possible the specific goals and begin to act so as to direct the energy of people who desire good (and this is a huge energy) toward the solution of the most current problems, and primarily, I

believe, social problems. We are ready to help the people's initiative movement. The faithful can, for example, give aid to hospitals in caring for patients, knowing the acuteness of the problem of the shortage of junior medical personnel. Obviously, this would be on a volunteer (unpaid) basis.

[L. Yushchenko] Any person living in the territory of the republic has the right to enter the people's initiative movement: a Russian or a Latvian, a worker or kolkhoz farmer, a believer or an atheist... We have already spoken here of the initiative of Orthodox parishes ready to care for the sick. This is an excellent example of going from words to deeds. After all, I know firsthand how great the shortage of medical nurses is. And if there are volunteers ready to ease the fate of the sick on an unpaid basis, that means that not only has a specific step been taken on the way to solving this acute problem, but the people themselves have become convinced that charity is not an empty word, and that it is no accident that it is one of the most respected moral values.

[Correspondent] We have touched upon the problem of competency, the capacities of the movement to influence the resolution of a certain socially significant problem. How, in the opinion of those present, will this be implemented on a serious level, and not just at the level of holding elementary meetings?

[V. Bogdanov] The Popular Front must have the right of legislative initiative. Also, this movement may nominate its representatives to the Soviets at all levels. It must also have the right of initiative in holding referendums.

[A. Maltsev] The resolution of the Writer's Union Plenum, with participation of leaders from other artist's unions and scientific consultants, presented the idea of creating a so-called independent commission of experts. This is an interesting proposal. Let us say, a republic program for development of a certain sphere is being prepared. It is developed by specialists upon assignment from the government. However, an independent commission of experts may also express its opinion about it, i.e., a commission which is not associated with the governmental task, which will rely on its own calculations and issue its own substantiations and recommendations.

[Correspondent] In other words, alternative variants?

[A. Maltsev] Yes. But this is not a contradiction. There will be different points of view formulated within the framework of a single program. It never hurts to compare them.

[E. Malkisis] In connection with this, I would like to say that the Popular Front should not strive to take on the functions of power and control. Its task, if it will indeed be created, would be to help in the implementation of power in the interests of the people.

[G. Kotov] Not simply to assist, but to participate.

[E. Melkisis] But in what form? If there is participation, then I see it as the development of proposals, the discussion of projects, decisions and legislative acts.

And also in the fulfillment of decisions. Yet, of course, only the competent state, economic management and other organs will make these decisions.

[Correspondent] Let us also focus on the following important moment: Will the members of the Popular Front and the persons whom they attract always and in all cases work on a voluntary basis, or will there be some paid apparatus, possibly with simultaneous incentives? Let us suppose, for example, that a group of experts is created to review some problem or conception. Will it do this for money, or just like that? This is a very important consideration.

[A. Maltsev] I will remind you that at the very beginning we said that this movement is patriotic. Is it possible for patriotism to be combined with material interests? Hardly! And yet, if we speak of a specific organizational form, then sooner or later the discussion of a material base arises in one way or another.

[Correspondent] We often say: "We are learning democracy!" You might say we consider ourselves students. The movement, in our opinion, can give that social practice which will help us to make the transition from student days to adulthood.

[Ya. Poriyetis] Then it is important for us to discuss now also that transition to practical application. In my opinion, we need some kind of constituent congress. Let the initiative groups set the time and place for holding it, and the maximal number of participants. This congress will make the final decision. At this forum we can discuss who will undertake the mission of being the public coordinator, who will be able to authoritatively appeal to the population to participate in the Popular Front, and who will begin to perform specific explanatory work on site, at the local collectives.

Evidently, a two-step approach is the most suitable. First—a general meeting which will make some preliminary decision, and then a constituent congress as an organizing principle.

[Correspondent] In this case the initiative groups must necessarily represent the labor collectives and the broad community at the congress, and in equal measure, in a quota variant, also the various nationalities living in the republic.

[Ya. Poriyetis] Of course. The defined initiative groups will have to consider this, just as they will the social stratification of the future People's Front.

[V. Bogdanov] And before the general meeting is held, each of the initiative groups poll everyone living in the republic. The public response to these appeals will serve as the indicator of the popularity of their programs and their positions, and will determine whether or not they will be able to lead the people.

The circle of questions which was introduced for discussion by the roundtable participants and which arose in the course of these discussions is rather broad and controversial, since there has not yet been a precedent in our society for creating such formations. Therefore, those present tried to jointly develop only a certain conception or model which might serve as the point of departure in the organization of the movement of the Popular Front. Yet what it will be like remains for all of us, without exception, to decide together. We invite our readers to participate in this.

12322

#### **GDR Organization Viewed as Model for Latvia's Popular Front**

*18000661b Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
26 Aug 88 pp 2-3*

[Interview by SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA correspondent V. Selyevskiy with A. Rubiks, chairman of the Riga gorispolkom: "Rostok: Everyday Practice of the National Front." First two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] Recently our editorial office held a roundtable meeting, whose participants discussed the activity of the initiative groups directed at creating an all-people's patriotic movement in support of perestroika (reported under the title "On the Wave of People's Initiative," published in SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA on 29 July). Riga Gorispolkom Chairman A. Rubiks was also invited to the discussion. Speaking out, he reminded us of the role which the National Front plays in the GDR, where it was created for the purpose of unifying all the forces helping to bring to life the policy of the SUPG [Socialist Unity Party of Germany]. However, the framework of the roundtable format allowed him to say only a few phrases regarding the activity of the National Front. Yet this experience of our German friends, in our opinion, deserves more detailed explanation.

SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA Correspondent V. Selyevskiy met with Riga Gorispolkom Chairman A. Rubiks and asked him to share some of his impressions about the everyday practice of the National Front in the GDR.

"I gained these impressions during my recent trip to Rostok," said Alfreds Petrovich. "As I already said at the roundtable, the purpose of the National Front is to unite the initiative of the people and to lend a hand in a specific endeavor. They do not have to go far in search of this endeavor. They begin with their own house, yard,

block, rayon or city. Its practical experience, in my opinion, presents undoubted interest for all of us specifically now, when we are speaking of creating a Popular Front in Latvia."

I will start with a simple, everyday example for the GDR. We became acquainted with the public center of one of Rostok's microrayons. We learned that on 25 September the day of the street will be celebrated in the microrayon. Everyone is preparing for it. They are thinking about how to thank and congratulate the most active street leaders who have worked diligently all year long, what children's games and sporting events to organize, and how to reward the winners of the various competitions. All this is being managed by the National Front.

Last year the first city celebration was held in Riga. I believe it was probably unsuccessful. Yes, there were meetings and various general measures. They were televised and described in the press. But this is not what determines the face of a city. In the GDR such an action becomes a holiday for every family and every household. This is what represents the true value of such a measure: for everyone all together and for each person individually. The primary organization of the National Front sees to this. In Rostok (by its population it is slightly larger than the Moscow or Proletarian rayon of Riga), every block has its own front primary organization. It is engaged in various aspects of life of the population. Here it is interesting to take a look at the structure of the National Front. It can be seen very clearly in the example of Rostok.

There are 150 microrayons in the city, with about 1,700 residents living in each one. Of this number, approximately 1,200 have electoral rights, i.e., they are over 18 years of age. A National Front committee consisting of around 20 people is active in the microrayon. How does one become a member of this committee? There is only one way. The primary organizations of all the parties existing in the GDR, the groups of the Democratic Union of Women, and any other public organizations send representatives to this committee. And, I would like to stress that the committee itself, working through the house committees and schools, through the kindergarten workers, appeals to the interested residents of the microrayon with the proposal to participate in the activities of the National Front.

So as not to speak in empty words, let me concentrate on the experience of the work of the NF committee in the Rostok microrayon of Lyutten-Klein. There are 30 people on this committee: representatives of all parties, non-party members, representatives of various public organizations and groups, and members of the Union of Free German Youth. The possibility of cooperation on the basis of common interests is presented. The committee members meet, as a rule, every other month. There is a plan of work for one year, and it is published. Each microrayon NF house committee receives specific assignments.

A microrayon committee which works well has an "Order and Safety" work group consisting of 10-18 microrayon residents. It meets two times a quarter to analyze the course of fulfillment of the tasks placed before the committee. The basic condition for successful activity is the proper selection of cadres. Experienced house committee chairmen also become members of the committee. And active residents with initiative, in turn, become chairmen of the latter.

Here is a most interesting detail. No one is elected or voted on in the NF microrayon committee. The people themselves feel the need to participate in the activity of the National Front. They come to the committee and say: I can help in such-and-such specific work. For me as a gorispolkorn chairman it is particularly interesting that they come not only with criticism—this is wrong, that is bad, help us with this, correct that...—but with the desire to do something to make things better. To do it themselves! In this I see a high level of public activism. However, it is necessary to instill a similar civic position from childhood, to create the appropriate conditions for it. In the GDR one such condition is the existence of the National Front.

I foresee the question: but what is the moral and ideological foundation of the NF? What do its participants have the right to do? First of all, they must hold a constant political dialogue with the population on all questions of SUPG domestic and foreign policy, and help to clarify complex situations. The primary moral criterion is sincerity and trust in each other.

Secondly, the National Front committee helps the state apparatus to inform the population on social questions, on the directions of SUPG policy, and on the implementation of its decisions in various spheres of the life of society. It consults with the population on how this should best be done. For this purpose, the NF microrayon committee calls together the chairmen of the house committees 2-3 times a year to discuss current political questions with them. The chairmen in turn discuss the pressing everyday problems at general meetings of the house residents. This paves the way for practical activity in the implementation of SUPG policy on improving life and elevating its level.

In Rostok they told me that last winter, when there was very much snow, the NF committee helped to call together residents to clear the territory of the microrayons—in the name of safety both for the pedestrians and for transport. This is a specific example. In principle, however, every annual plan contains so-called "citizen initiatives." As a rule, these are measures of an economic character, as for example the collection of recyclable goods. We wonder: Why are they so interested in newsprint in the GDR? The answer is all too simple. It turns out that it is a good source of income, as is the collection of food waste for recycling. Among the initiatives is the



performance of various Saturday work days during which children's playgrounds are repaired, help is given to the elderly and to invalids in repairing their apartments, and much else.

The NF committee has its own account at the bank, and there are funds in this account. Where do they come from? For example, the residents of a microrayon conclude an agreement through the NF committee with the gardening trust regarding the regular maintenance of some park, shrubbery, bushes, etc... Such work pays well. This money is then spent on the renovation of the microrayon territory, individual blocks or house facades. Let us say for example that the residents cannot themselves lay a sidewalk. Then they conclude an agreement for performing integrated work with specialized organizations, and pay them for this work.

Money comes into the NF account also in the form of voluntary contributions from citizens. All the funds which are collected and earned are in some way returned to the population. They go for the organization of various measures for all the residents, and sometimes also for material aid to those people who are in need of it.

There is also a National Front city committee in Rostok. It too is non-elective. The party and mass organizations delegate their members for membership in it. These people have assignments from the groups which have sent them. The retired secretaries of various party and social organizations also become members of the NF city committee. A committee secretariat is formed. In Rostok the National Front gorkom numbers 95 people. They meet 2-3 times a year, while the secretariat meets twice a month. It actually performs all the coordination work.

In our practice, social work at the place of residence is, as a rule, assigned to pensioners. In Rostok, however, I was quoted the following figure: The pensioners make up no more than 15 percent of the membership of NF microrayon committees. The rest are activists—people in the very prime of their physical strength.

I must mention one other aspect of activity of the National Front—its interaction and cooperation with the deputies of the local organs of people's authority. In the GDR this is a principle question. The deputies do not necessarily have to be members of the NF committees. But to cooperate, as they say, is their holy cause. We might add that the committee is responsible for seeing that the deputies meet in a timely manner with the population at general meetings and tell about their political tasks. They, obviously, are not prohibited from becoming members of the committee. In this case, however, they would be acting already not as deputies, but as citizens.

Now let me say a few words about the relations of representatives of the artist's unions with the National Front. They are representatives of their unions in the

district committees to which they have been delegated. If they have become members of the microrayon or city NF committee, then, like the deputies, they also act in the role of citizens.

"The Rostok municipal authorities evaluate the activity of the National Front committees very highly," concluded A. Rubiks. "They believe (and not without reason) that with the aid of the population it is possible to resolve such questions and tasks which bring great practical benefit to the country. The population creates material and spiritual values through its own initiative. This makes it possible for the state to save funds and to direct them where they are most needed at the given moment. Political dialogue with the population is very highly valued. As a result of this dialogue, each person understands the essence of the policy of the SUPG and the GDR government. This is particularly important if we consider that not everyone is employed in the national economy. There are also housewives and pensioners. All the social strata of the population are represented in the National Front committees, and is it possible to study everyone's needs. And at the same time there exists for each person a broad field for realizing his own needs for participating in the management of the city and the country.

I will repeat the idea which I expressed at the roundtable discussion at the editorial offices of SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA. The everyday practice of the National Front in Rostok undoubtedly presents interest for all of us, if only because there the people repair a roof with their own hands, without prefacing this repair with arguments about what flag should be flown from it.

12322

#### **Belorussian Rayon Official Describes Stalinist Purges of His Village**

*18000665 Minsk SELSKAYA GAZETA in Russian  
21 Aug 88 p 3*

[Article by V. Leshkovich, chairman, Molodechnenskiy Rayon Council of War and Labor Veterans: "Only the Truth Shall Prevail"]

[Text] Why do we return to the past? Why do we stir up events which occurred in times gone by, once more turning over and looking closely at the pages of history, at the fate of relatives and those dear to us, at our own life, sometimes experiencing unbearable pain? We do this not to remind ourselves of what we, the older generation, have endured, have suffered. We do this to dig out and destroy forever the roots of the terrible evil which caused a great amount of harm to the cause of socialism, to insure the impossibility of deviation from Leninist norms in our life. This is why millions of Soviet people of all ages have welcomed with heart and hand the resolution passed by the Politburo of the CPSU

Central Committee to erect a monument to the innocent victims of repressions and lawlessness of the Stalinist period, which has been condemned and rejected by the Soviet people, by the party.

At that time I was a very little boy and did not understand very much. I did not understand why in our small village of Lesniki (presently Logoyskiy Rayon) houses which were perfectly livable were empty and what "dispossession of the kulaks" meant. As in a bad dream, I remember the 18th of March 1933, which happened to be Paris Commune Day: our village resounded with crying and shouting. An armed convoy was taking away (where to?) many men of the village, men who were highly regarded for their love of labor, conscientiousness, and kindness. Their families were left in grief and despair.

Our hut was not spared. On that bitter day, our father, a rural activist, was taken away from us—a family of seven children (with the oldest a boy of 13 and the youngest a daughter of only nine months). I do not know for sure what his fellow sufferers were charged with, but as for my father, as I found out many years later when a military tribunal reviewed his case after his death and rehabilitated him completely, the charge was declared to be monstrous. It seems that he was accused of shooting his father—my grandfather—and later maintaining "espionage" contact with agents of bourgeois and landlord-ridden Poland. Only a wild and savage imagination could "invent" such nonsense. Everyone in the village knew that one evening Bulak-Balakhovich bandits broke into our hut, seized grandfather, and, right there, at the entrance to the house and in front of the family, shot and killed him. Grandmother, who lived to be almost 100 years old, never did permit anyone to fill in the bullet holes in the door or wash away grandfather's dried blood as long as she lived. After this came the absurd and wild accusation against the son and his illegal punishment...

I remember suffering the terrible and desperate perplexity of a child: What for? Why did they take Daddy away? Only later did I find out: for no reason whatsoever. I learned that no amount of torture could break father's will and force him to admit to the insane and fictitious charge. This very courage and fortitude saved his life, since he was sentenced to "only" several years of forced labor in remote Kazakh steppes, never to return to his native village...

We, the children, left with a mother who had suddenly aged, did our utmost to help and comfort her. On school holidays we would all go to the kolkhoz to work, never shunning any labor, whether in the field or on the farm. Although our family was officially branded as an "enemy of the people," the good people did not leave us to our fate: they helped us as best they could. The warm-hearted and thoughtful Mikhail Shkel, the kolkhoz chairman, made an indelible impression on me. As we know, the concern shown for us could have caused them a great deal of trouble.

In 1937-1938 our village was "cleaned out" once more. This time the repressions touched father's brother—Uncle Petrus. He, the kolkhoz builder, was valued for his being very handy with tools. He was sent to an agricultural exhibition being held in Moscow as a reward for his shock labor accomplishments. I remember how he returned from the trip, inspired and full of impressions. But he was not given a chance to tell his neighbors about any of this... The "Polish agent" was sentenced to capital punishment... Uncle Petrus' rehabilitation process produced a piece of paper denouncing him for supposedly meeting with a friend of his youth who had fled the country and for receiving assignments to carry out sabotage from him and from his own brothers and sister living in the Vileyskiy area. Poor Aunt Hannah, "running sabotage activities" and "author" of anti-Soviet leaflets! She, a poor, illiterate peasant woman, could not read or even sign her name...

That was when our kolkhoz blacksmith, Boris Iosifovich Karpovich, was also shot. He was a wonderful person, sincere and just. When I lost my father, he tried to comfort me, to instill a liking for work. I visited his shop many times and was treated to "rabbit snacks." Then he too was gone...

When the fascist invasion began, Boris Iosifovich's wife, Mariya Petrovna, who had cried her eyes out over her husband, became a real Soviet patriot. Her hut, which stood on the edge of a forest, became an overnight shelter for partisans. The family, which itself did not have enough to eat, shared its last crusts of bread, its last morsels with the warriors of the forest. Mariya Petrovna served as a messenger for the detachment, carrying valuable messages back and forth. On one occasion Hitlerites burst into the house and, under the threat of death, demanded that she tell them the names of all those who were helping the partisans and point out the road that led to them in the almost impenetrable Yaskovo Swamp. She knew these people, who were loyal to their comrades, and she knew the road, but she remained silent. The enraged fascists fell upon the woman and beat her to death.

But is it possible to kill honor, integrity, or, finally, the memory of that which should not be forgotten? It is heartwarming to think that fellow villagers and children are cherishing this memory and are themselves living their lives with integrity. Peter—the son of Boris Iosifovich and Mariya Petrovna—is one of the best field crop brigade leaders in the Logoysk area. He has been awarded the Badge of Honor. Daughter Yanina worked for many years as a milkmaid; she was awarded the Order of Lenin. Also outstanding is the youngest—Viktoriya. A good generation was produced by a good seed, which did not perish in the dark waters of oblivion and ingratitude. We are eternally grateful to all those who maintained their humanity under the extremely adverse conditions and retained their purity and loyalty to the motherland.

I would also like to talk about another patriot whose life came to a tragic end in the years of the Stalinist cult—Zakhar Andreyevich Stankevich of the village Zatsenye, located near Pleshchenitsy. He was a former Baltic seaman who had participated in the Great October and in the storming of the Winter Palace. A devoted son of the Soviet people, even in the kolkhoz Proletarskaya Pobeda he was counted among the best workers.

The former commander of a detachment of revolutionary seamen, Stepan Vasilyevich Pinchuk, was to write later to Anton, the son: "He was the first to climb the courtyard gates, seize the key, and open the gates wide. When the storming party burst into the palace, he was the first to run up the stairway, climb onto the roof, and tear down the imperial flag which was hanging during the time of Kerenskiy... He was devoted to the cause of the revolution and the working class."

I myself saw that letter, which was declared genuine by the then Pleshchenitsy party raykom, in 1959. The heroic seaman's successors—grandsons Mechislav, Aleksandr, and Vladimir, officers in the Soviet Army—are continuing the search for documents related to their grandfather's biography. This is extremely difficult due to the amount of time that has passed. But is this merely a family affair? Why not enlist the services of historians and archivists to assist in the search for our countrymen's participation in revolutionary events? It is impossible, it cannot be, that that which can still be recovered has disappeared without a trace. It is our civic duty to render due respect to the heroes of our glorious though difficult and at times tragic history, to them who protected and built the socialist motherland in spite of the evil deeds committed by those who ignored Lenin's legacy, to them who continued to believe in these ideals throughout all trials and terrors.

Counted among the above is the brother of Zakhar Andreyevich, Mikhail Stankovich, former education director at the Velikodolets middle school of Ushchanskiy Rayon. In the war he was a courageous member of the underground. His story is told in glowing terms by

Hero of the Soviet Union V. Ye. Lobanok in the book "Fighting for the Motherland." Teacher Stankovich preferred death to the contemptible lot of a traitor offered him by the fascists.

Likewise, there were no traitors in my native village. Everyone who could carry a weapon fought the enemy at the front or as a partisan. My brother Viktor did not return from the war. I myself marched on fiery roads from 1942 until the day of victory. While fighting near Leningrad I joined the Komsomol; near Narva I was accepted into the party. I can still see as clearly as if it happened yesterday how, on that March day in 1944, the well-liked Regimental Commissar Guards Major Zaychenko arrived at our machinegun company. He requested that the men stand in formation and thanked them for their valor in combat. But he told me and several other men that he intended to recommend us for party membership. This was the greatest reward I could imagine. How lucky I was that my father lived to see that day!

It would seem that I now would be able to enjoy peace of mind, knowing that the good name of my father, the same as that of hundreds of thousands, even of millions of honorable Soviet people who suffered needlessly during the years of the Stalinist cult, has been returned to the people, to the country's history. Also known are the names of many base slanderers whose evil calumny caused loyal sons of the party to suffer torture and death. But I ask myself again and again: Have we done everything we can so that manifestations of the cult eras, of any kind whatsoever, can never occur again? Is each one of us acting selflessly in everything he does, furthering the cause of perestroika, just as our fathers and grandfathers fought for socialism?

In the revolutionary transformation of our life—and this was discussed passionately by the delegates to the 19th All-Union Party Conference—truth and conscience will prevail, along with the eternal memory of those whose thoughts and deeds were pure and sacred. They will continue to live if we are able to fully realize their dreams, their hopes. This would be the best memorial to those dear people. And we will place flowers in grateful memory at the monuments and memorial plaques.

13005

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.