

JPRS-UPA-88-031
11 AUGUST 1988

270063



JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

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

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

19980812 101

10
28
Aφ3

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-031

CONTENTS

11 AUGUST 1988

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

- Role of Non-Russians in Histories of World War II Criticized
[V. Muradyan; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 28 Jul 88] 1

RELIGION

- Metropolitan Aleksey Discusses Orthodoxy's Significance for Baltic Republics
[V. Ivanov; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 4 May 88] 4
- Academician Says Freedom of Conscience Must Be Guaranteed By Law
[G. Vorontsov; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 12 Jun 88] 6
- Exhibit Attests to Religious Repressions of 30's
[Ye. Molchanova; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 12 Jun 88] 9

CULTURE

- Exiled Director Lyubimov Interviewed in Moscow *[M. Shvydkoy; IZVESTIYA, 30 May 88]* 10
- Writers Assail Criticism of Brodsky's Poetry *[V. Yerofeyev, T. Tolstaya; OGONEK 30 Apr-7 May 88]* 11
- Reader Challenges Critical PRAVDA Review of 'Doctor Zhivago'
[M.S. Zanadvorov; OGONEK, 4-11 Jun 88] 12
- Leningraders Defend Academician Likhachev *[A.N. Alekseyev et al; OGONEK, 11-18 Jun 88]* 13
- Tvardovskiy's Widow Questions Jury Selection for Monument
[M.I. Tvardovskaya; OGONEK, No 11, Mar 88, No 24, Jun 88] 13
- Ryazanov Protest of TV Censorship Rebutted *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 16 Jun 88]* 14

SOCIAL ISSUES

- Moldavian Procuracy Notes Increase In Crime Rate
[Kishinev; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 4 Jun 88] 17
- Jurist Reports on Work of Criminal Code Commission
[N. Kuznetsova; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 12 Jul 88] 18

REGIONAL ISSUES

- Lithuania's State Administrative Apparatus Restructured 21
- Ukase on Changes in State Administrative Organs *[Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 28 May 88]* 21
- New Appointments to State Administrative Organs *[Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 2 Jun 88]* 22
- Lithuania's Cardinal Sladkevicius Interviewed *[Cardinal Sladkevicius interview; TIESA, 15 Jul 88]* 22
- Soldiers, Students Help Restore Georgian Monument *[Khakhutaishvili; KOMUNISTI, Apr 88]* 23
- Georgian 'Political Prisoner' Rejects Dissident's Help *[Tbilisi, KOMMUNISTI, May 88]* 24

Role of Non-Russians in Histories of World War II Criticized

18000566a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 28 Jul 88 p 6

[Article by Guards Col (Ret) V. Muradyan, doctor of historical sciences, from Yerevan: "The Complete Truth About the History of the War"]

[Text] I read with extreme interest in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA (2 February 1988) a talk by your correspondent with the prominent military historians M.M. Kiryan and Ya.Yu. Kirshin. As a direct participant in the war (I left for the front from the third year on the university history faculty as a company political instructor, I was a regimental commissar, the deputy head of the political section of a division and ended the war in Prague as the chief of the political section of a rifle division), and as a historian who has studied the activities of the CPSU during the war years, I would like to continue the discussion commenced in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA.

In our days, when Soviet historical science is analyzing the events of the past from the positions of restructuring and glasnost and when under the conditions of the cult of personality and the stagnation phenomena, the examination of these was of a speculative nature, each new appearance in the press on these questions evokes lively interest not only for historians but also readers. I must agree with the opinion of Mikhail Mitrofanovich Kiryan and Yuriy Yakovlevich Kirshin that there still are many "blank spots" in our military history, there are unexplored pages, figures who are unnecessarily extolled as well as forgotten heroes. But since in the conversation of the correspondent with the military historians they did not touch upon the "blank spots" in the area of nationality relations in our country during the years of the Great Patriotic War, I would like to take up precisely these questions.

The Leninist nationality policy of our party not only brilliantly withstood the harsh testing of the war years, but was also enriched with new content and new forms of its manifestation in all spheres of the life of the multinational Soviet people and their militant vanguard, the Communist Party. But can it be said that the nationality policy of the CPSU and the nationality relations in the USSR under the conditions of the war have been analyzed with sufficient profundity and justness in the fundamental works relating to the Great Patriotic War? It would be difficult to give a single affirmative answer.

It is interesting to note that in the abundant literature published in our nation over the last 15-20 years, there has not been a single special work on the question of nationality relations or one devoted to the nationality policy of the CPSU during the years of the Great Patriotic War. At the same time, in the examination of this problem there are both overlooked pages, obvious underestimations and even errors.

For example, let us look at the third volume of the six-volume "History of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union of 1941-1945." On page 227, where they discuss the efforts of party-political work in the troops in 1943, we read: "Political work was developed widely among the soldiers of non-Russian nationality who in certain armies comprised one-fifth of the personnel." This is a flagrant mistake which belittles the role of the non-Russian peoples of the USSR in the fight against Nazi Germany. In essence this plays into the hands of the ideological sword-bearers of imperialism who have spread the notion that the non-Russian peoples of the USSR did not wish to fight for "mother Russia."

I feel that the ten-volume work which is being prepared should give a prominent place to the unmasking of the bourgeois falsifiers of CPSU nationality policy. The history of the struggle of the multinational Soviet people against the Nazi invaders provides very rich material for this. For example, authentic documents taken from the Central Archives of the USSR Ministry of Defense clearly indicate that all the Soviet peoples took an active part in the defense of the socialist fatherland. The Russian people, having assumed the main burden of the war on their shoulders, fielded many more soldiers than all the other Soviet peoples taken together. For example, in the divisions organized on the territory of the RSFSR, soldiers of Russian nationality comprised from 60 to 80 percent. In the national autonomous republics of the RSFSR, in the combined-arms divisions, the number of men of non-Russian nationality approached 40 percent. This must be mentioned as it was the actual truth.

The involvement of the other fraternal peoples in the war must also be properly described. Contrary to the assertion of Volume 3 of the six-volume edition, this involvement was expressed in much more impressive figures.

Now a word about the percentage of men of non-Russian nationality on the fronts. In the legendary 62d Army which directly defended Stalingrad, 51.6 percent of the personnel was made up of Russians while the remainder belonged to men of non-Russian nationality. In the summer of 1942, over 42 percent of the personnel in the Northern Troop Group of the Transcaucasian Front were men of non-Russian nationality and on the Kalinin Front, the number of soldiers and junior commanders of non-Russian nationality in individual formations approached 46 and more percent. All these data which were taken by us from the TsAMO SSSR, and they could be continued, persuasively repudiate the assertions of the six-volume edition.

We must also discuss one other collective work. This is the question of the publication "Party-Political Work in the Soviet Armed Forces During the Years of the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945" (Voyenizdat, Moscow, 1963). On the level of the problem raised by us, I would like to point to a series of lamentable oversights by the authors.

Two chapters of this work are devoted to the defensive engagements between the Don and the counteroffensive by our troops at Stalingrad. You read and marvel. How could the authors of these chapters overlook a series of important events in the life of the nation and army related to the party's measures to further strengthen the friendship of the Soviet peoples and the combat fraternity of their soldiers? As is known, due to the fact that in the spring of 1942 the operational army began receiving large reinforcements from the national republics and many of the new recruits had not undergone military service, their knowledge of Russian was poor or completely lacking, the GlavPU RKKA [Main Political Directorate of the Worker-Peasant Red Army], upon instructions of the VKP(b) Central Committee worked out an entire range of measures to further strengthen the international solidarity of the personnel. These measures were set out in the directive of the GlavPU RKKA, No 012 of 17 September 1942 "On Indoctrinational Work With Red Armymen and Junior Commanders of Non-Russian Nationality." Party and Komsomol meetings were held everywhere in the units and these were devoted to the practical implementation of the tasks set out in the directive.

Cannot one be amazed that in such an extensive work devoted to party political work in the Soviet Armed Forces during the war years, this directive is not even mentioned? Or let us take the following example. At the very peak of the battle on the Volga, on 31 October 1942 PRAVDA published a letter from the Uzbek people to the Uzbek soldiers. Over the first half of 1943, the Kazakh, Armenian, Kirghiz, Turkmen, Azerbaijani, Tajik, Tatar, Chuvash and other peoples sent letters to their fellow compatriot soldiers. Millions of people put their signature to these letters. The letters were printed in PRAVDA as well as in the central and republic newspapers and were discussed on the fronts. The soldiers of non-Russian nationality of the various fronts reported to their peoples on the carrying out of their commands. The response report letters were also published widely. There is no need to show what an enormous role this played in increasing the patriotic and international solidarity of the troops and their battleworthiness. But, unfortunately, the compilers and authors of the work on party-political work in the Soviet Armed Forces during the war years did not point this out.

Nor did they point out one other very major event in the life of our Armed Forces and the party organizations of the Union and autonomous republics. At the very peak of the Battle of Kursk, at the end of July and the beginning of August 1943, a 20-day Army-Wide Conference of Front and District Agitators Working Among the Soldiers of Non-Russian Nationality was held in Moscow. The work of this seminar conference was directed by the Candidate Member of the Politburo, the Secretary of the VKP(b) Central Committee and Chief of the GlavPU RKKA, A.S. Cherbakov. Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin made a major speech to the agitators. Also giving lectures were D.Z. Manuil'skiy, Ye.M. Yaroslavskiy and

A.M. Pankratov and responsible workers from the Union and autonomous republics. Some 25 front agitators of different nationalities shared their experience. The conference participants determined the methods of party-political work in further strengthening the international solidarity of the troops in the course of the new offensive operations by the Red Army. However, in the special chapter of the above-indicated work and entitled "Party-Political Work in the Battle of Kursk and in the Crossing of the Dnieper" (pp 263-290) there is not even mention of such a major event.

The above-indicated shortcomings and the underestimating of important events in the life of the party, the people and the army relate not only to the work devoted to an historical review of party-political work in the troops during the war years. Certain other publications also suffer from these.

In the conversation of the SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent with the military historians, mention was made of the preparing of a new edition of the Military Encyclopedia. I would agree that in the Encyclopedia the style is almost telegraphic. But when it is a question not of one or another individual, but rather such sagas as the Battle of Moscow, the Battle of Stalingrad, the Battle of the Caucasus and so forth, such terseness is not justified. We have in front of us the bulky "Encyclopedia of the Great Patriotic War" published by Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya. It, naturally, mentions the Battle of Stalingrad. But there is not a single word about the combat fraternity of the defenders of Stalingrad. Was there really nothing to say?

The same criticism could be leveled against the material devoted to the Battle of the Caucasus where an enormous role was played by the strong rear of its defenders, the multinational Transcaucasus. The Battle of the Caucasus involved 19 minority divisions of the Azerbaijani, Armenian and Georgian peoples. It would be possible to give many examples showing that one of the chief factors ensuring the strong defense of the Caucasus was the fraternal friendship of the peoples. The enemy planned to put the peoples of this multinational region against the Russian people, but was worthily rebuffed. The representatives of the peoples of Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia meeting in Tbilisi on 23 August 1942 at an anti-Nazi meeting adopted an Appeal to Their Peoples which proclaimed: "There is no force in the world which could split the Transcaucasian peoples or separate them from the great Russian people, our elder brother...."

I assume that the new editions of the Encyclopedia as well as the ten-volume edition will eliminate such "blank spots." I feel that it is completely valid to mention the arbitrariness of Stalin who was responsible for sending entire peoples of the Northern Caucasus from their homeland.

As is known, in the course of the war there was a territorial shift of millions of Soviet people related to the evacuation of persons and valuable equipment from the western regions of the nation to the East. The measures related to the organizing of the relocating of industrial enterprises and their insulation in the eastern regions of the nation have been widely taken up in the war's historiography. But, in our view, there has not been a sufficiently profound elucidation of the role of national relationships in the process of settling enormous masses of people in the eastern national republics where these people did not know the languages, customs and mores of the local population. Certainly they had to live and work together for the front under the difficult wartime conditions. But here also there is something to be said about the nature of the Soviet system and about the principles of socialist internationalism.

Being concerned for these problems for many years I have become convinced that one of the reasons that the nationality relations in our country during the war years have not been properly taken up in the general works is that virtually no scholars from the Union republics have been involved in preparing them. It is not difficult to be persuaded of this, in looking at the membership of the author collectives.

To substantiate such a criticism, let me give one other example. I happened to speak at the All-Union Scientific Conference in Moscow devoted to the 40th anniversary of the victory. I sent one major contribution to the conference Organizing Committee. The program compiled by it did not reflect neither the multinationality of our nation or the international nature of the victory itself. Of the 52 speakers and reporters, 48 came from Moscow, there was 1 each from the Ukraine, Belorussia, Transcaucasia and Central Asia. The conference presidium recognized this criticism, but neither historical science nor the friendship of peoples was the richer for it.

Presently, under the conditions of glasnost, I can write openly about these negative phenomena. Their roots go not only into the period of stagnation, but much deeper. Thus, during the war years more than 200 soldiers and partisans blocked the firing slit of enemy pillboxes with their bodies and, having taken the fire on themselves and at the price of their lives, ensured the success of the advancing extended chains of their subunits.

It has been established that the first in the war to carry out such a great feat of self-sacrifice was the former Vologda worker and young political leader, Aleksandr Pankratov. In the fighting at Novgorod, at a crucial moment of combat, he, in leading the men of his company forward, threw himself on an enemy machine gun and blocked its fire with his body. Later, in 1941, he was posthumously awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union. During the counteroffensive of our troops at Moscow, the same feat was carried out by Sgt V.V. Vasilkovskiy, on the Kalinin Front by the soldier Ya.N.

Paderin, on the Voronezh Front by the Kirghiz youth Cholponbay Tuleberdiyev and many others.

At the same time, the only extensive treatment has been given to the feat of Aleksandr Matrosov who carried this out in February 1943. From Pankratov to Matrosov there were 53 soldiers of different nationalities who carried out analogous feats. Stalin drew attention to the newspaper information about Matrosov's feat. And hence the erroneous phrase that all the heroes who sacrificed themselves for the sake of the socialist fatherland supposedly "repeated" the feat of Matrosov. We feel that no one repeated someone else's feat. Each of these 200 patriots carried out his own feat.

Finally, one other question. In the literature on the Great Patriotic War, it is pattered that prior to the revolution many peoples of the nation were not involved in military service and the Tsarist government did not trust them with weapons. But Soviet power involved all the peoples of the USSR in the armed defense of the motherland. This is a very great and interesting problem which cannot be exhausted by several brief phrases. I feel that in the ten-volume edition, one must show in detail why, in World War I, when the Tsarist government wanted to mobilize several age groups of the male population of Central Asia for digging, that is, excavating work, the entire region put up strong resistance. But during the years of the Great Patriotic War hundreds of thousands of the sons of the Uzbek, Turkmen, Tajik, Kirghiz and other peoples of the nation arm in arm with Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians and the representatives of the other Soviet peoples rose to the defense of Soviet Russia. In military history science this is yet another "blank spot."

The history of the Soviet multinational state and all its peoples, the history of their great accomplishments against German Nazism is rich in vivid events and stirring documents which convincingly show the role of the combat cooperation of the Soviet peoples headed by the great Russian people in achieving our victory.

The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, M.S. Gorbachev, in his report "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Continues," in speaking about the viability of the socialist system and about the strength of the multinational Soviet state, in particular, commented that we withstood the merciless testing of the war because the war became a question of all the people and because "everyone rose to defend the fatherland: the old and the young, the men and the women, all the nations and nationalities of the great nation."

The truth of history requires that in the subsequent editions of works on the history of the war, all the sources of victory be described thoroughly. Certainly there should be proper treatment of the party's activities to turn the friendship of the Soviet peoples into one of the main factors determining the outcome of the war in favor of the multinational Soviet people.

**Metropolitan Aleksey Discusses Orthodoxy's
Significance for Baltic Republics**
*18000369 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in
Russian 4 May 88 p 3*

[Interview by V. Ivanov with Metropolitan Aleksey of Leningrad and Novgorod: "Serving the Brotherhood of Peoples". (First two paragraphs are source introduction).]

[Text] There is less than a month-and-a-half remaining until the start of the celebration dedicated to the millennium of the christening of Rus. This anniversary date is a notable event not only in the life of the Russian Orthodox Church. It is impossible to overestimate the significance of the introduction of Christianity into Kievan Rus as a state religion. This act joined the eastern Slavic tribes to the rich treasure-house of Western culture. It marked the creation of a strong centralized state, which took a worthy place in the ranks of the European powers. The christening of Rus laid the foundations for the formation of the Russian nation, and gave a new impetus to the development of original art, science and handicrafts by our distant forebears. This is why today we view the upcoming anniversary in close association with the history of the Russian people, as well as all the peoples populating our country, and with the historical and cultural memory of all mankind. It is no wonder that UNESCO called for the millennium celebration of the Russian Orthodox Church to be viewed as a major event in world history.

On 29 April CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev met at the Kremlin with the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Pimen and the members of the Russian Orthodox Church synod. Metropolitan Aleksey of Leningrad and Novgorod also participated in this meeting. He is already familiar to readers of SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA from the interview entitled "A Vitally Necessary Task", published by our newspaper on 6 September of last year. He has devoted about 2 decades to the study of the effect of Christianity on the development of the Prebaltic peoples and their interactions with their neighboring Slavic tribes. The result of this work of many years was the lengthy monograph for a doctoral dissertation in theology entitled "Outlines on the History of Orthodoxy in Estonia", which examines not only the religious aspects of the selected topics, but also traces the means and results of the mutual influence of peoples populating this region in various times in a cultural, geographical, ethnographic, military and political plane. These questions have become the main topic of the conversation which we present for your attention today between our correspondent and Metropolitan Aleksey—the head of the Tallinn and Estonian diocese.

[Question] Honorable Metropolitan, first of all: what was it that evoked your interest as a scientist and researcher specifically in this topic?

[Answer] The history of Orthodoxy in Estonia is an inalienable part of the history of the Russian Orthodox Church and all-church history as a whole. Orthodoxy has never been the leading religion here, but its importance goes far beyond the boundaries delimited by "pure" statistics. The determining factor here was not the number of believers, but the very spirit of Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy has a special place in the historical fate of Estonia and the entire Prebaltic region. It greatly facilitated the fact that Estonia, which found itself at the crossroads of a clash of Western and Eastern influence, was inclined in favor of unification with Russia. This was a categorical imperative for the history of the Estonian nation.

But this does not delimit the significance of the history of Orthodoxy in Estonia. In this small Prebaltic region, where Orthodoxy, Catholicism and Protestantism entered into direct contact and conflict, a unique experiment was conducted, in which the three Christian religions manifested themselves in practical application, under the same life situations, and in real interaction with one another. Many questions were resolved in this historical experiment, which in our day have taken on particular current importance and acuteness, but already on the scale of the entire ecumen.

Moreover, I will dare to affirm that the significant softening of the former antagonism between the Lutheran religion and Orthodoxy in Estonia which is taking place today within the framework of the ecumenical movement has its roots in ancient times, when the church intestine wars reached the proportion of armed conflicts. Irreconcilable opposition did not bring the desired results, and history teaches us to extract lessons from previous errors, to seek means of rapprochement and interaction instead of intensifying the contradictions.

[Question] Honorable Metropolitan, we know that the authors of numerous historical studies in the West, particularly former Prebaltic Germans, are trying today as they have in the past to show Catholicism and Lutheranism as the basic forces which seemingly facilitated bringing culture, and more precisely Western culture, to the Prebaltic peoples. At the same time, they almost never pass up an opportunity in their efforts to prove that Orthodoxy in the Prebaltic region supposedly played the mere role of a force which aided in the Russification of the area and the imposition of "barbaric Eastern" culture and faith which were "foreign" to the local population. In your doctoral work you referred to the works of religious and secular historians, archeologists, and ethnographers, including Estonian and Russian clergy of various Christian religions, as well as scientists—authoritative specialists. What can you say regarding such affirmations by Western researchers?

[Answer] A study of the history of Orthodoxy in Estonia convinces us that this religion was successively a faith of peace, conviction and brotherhood, of the protection of the oppressed, rather than a faith which was imposed by

force or fear. It largely facilitated the enlightenment and protection of the national interests of the local population against the oppression of the enslavers. The demonstration of this fact on specific historical material is all the more important, as the falsifications of the history of the Prebaltic region have not ceased even to this day.

It is a generally known fact that the forebears of the present-day Estonians, the Ests, neighbored the Slavic tribes since ancient times in this region, even before either of them had turned to the Christian faith. These neighborly relations were not always peaceful. Sometimes there were conflicts. Nevertheless, generally their relations were characterized as cooperation—in trade and exchange of goods, in repelling attacks by common outside enemies, and there were common interests in other spheres as well. According to the testimony of Academician H. Moore, "the processes of formulation of the Estonian people were not only associated with the history of formation of the other Finno-Ugric peoples, but were also closely intertwined with the ethnic development of neighboring Indoeuropean peoples, specifically the Baltic peoples, as well as the nearby Slavic and Germanic peoples."

Thus, there is nothing remarkable in the fact that Christianity, which came to the Russian land sooner than to the Prebaltic region, could penetrate here specifically thanks to the close ties with the Slavs.

Also speaking indirectly in favor of such a supposition is the fact that, according to the affirmation of the Estonian archeologist V. Trummal, the close ties of the Ests with the eastern Slavs may be traced back at least to the middle of the first millennium A. D. Thus, the path of Christianity from Byzantium through ancient Rus to the regions of present-day Estonia seems historically more realistic than through Catholicism.

The christening of Rus took place at the end of the first millennium A. D. Already in 1030 the son of the christener of Rus, the great Prince Yaroslav the Wise, who bore the Christian name of Yuriy (Georgiy), founded the city of Yuryev—the present-day Tartu. During these same years, according to the chronicles, he built two churches here—the Church of Saint Georgiy and the Church of Saint Nikolay. The remnants of the foundation of the Church of St. Georgiy were of later, stone, masonry, evidently erected on the site of the destroyed wooden church, and were found during archeological digs on the territory of the Botanical Gardens of Tartu State University in the early 80's of this century.

It is notable in this connection that the researcher of that period in the Prebaltic region, Soviet scientist-historian E. Migurevich, draws the following conclusion on the basis of the archeological excavations: "...The finds of small crucifixes, as well as other cult objects on the Prebaltic territory confirm the evidence of literary sources regarding the spread of Christianity on this

territory prior to the incursion of the German crusaders". And further Migurevich writes in his dissertation: "Although traders from other countries often travelled over the transit routes,...nevertheless these routes were controlled by the local peoples, who had created state formations during the period in question. This process was interrupted in the 13th century by the incursion of German traders and crusaders, who seized all the territory and the trade routes." Thus, the western Christian conquerors did not so much aid in the introduction of the Prebaltic population to world culture as they hindered the natural development of the local culture, imposing their own customs and mores in this area.

[Question] Excuse me, but as far as I know, the Russian princes also did not always act in the Prebaltic region only as protectors or trade partners. Yaroslav the Wise himself, as well as many of his successors, levied tribute against the local tribes, acting with armed force...

[Answer] We would be committing a sin against historical truth if we maintained the opposite. But it is also true that the Russian princes, in levying tribute against the Prebaltic tribes, did not touch upon their religious or domestic political life and did not oppress them in questions of faith. Orthodoxy was not spread by force. It was joined only by those local residents who themselves wanted to accept the Christian faith. Such cases, we must believe, took place quite often. We know, for example, that already in the first half of the 12th century in the Novgorod and Pskov diocese there were special rules which had to be followed in proclaiming the newly christened Ests.

At the same time, according to the testimony of the chronicler Genrich the Latvian ("Litvonian Chronicle"), while conducting raids on the Ests and Livonians, the crusaders forced them to accept Catholicism.

[Question] History tells us that the Novgorod Prince Vyachko headed a detachment of 200 Russian soldiers in courageously fighting on the side of the Ests in defense of the city and fortress of Yuryev in August of 1224, and that he died here, even though the bishops Albert and Herman, who led the siege, repeatedly offered him the chance to abandon the Ests and leave the fortress, promising him free passage with all his weapons and horses. Is there other evidence of such noble interaction between the forebears of our present-day Estonians and the Russians?

[Answer] Since we have mentioned the city of Yuryev, let me cite the following example. In 1234 Prince Yaroslav Vsevolodovich approached Yuryev with his Novgorod detachment, defeated the Germans near the Omovzhe (the ancient Slavic name for the Emayogi River), and forced them to accept a peace on his terms.

However, the positive significance of the contacts of Estonia with Rus, and later with Russia and with Orthodoxy as a faith, is certainly not limited merely to the military aspects. So as not to delve too deeply into grey antiquity, let us turn to relatively recent history.

The chronicle of the Orthodox Church in Estonia is at the same time a sort of mirror of the many centuries of struggle which the Estonian people waged against German oppression, and particularly against the spiritual enslavement, in which the German Lutheran Church played a leading role. I would like to especially stress the fact that we are speaking here of German Lutheranism, since Estonian had not yet been formed at that time as an independent confession.

In the mid-1840's the Orthodox Church opened the first schools, where reading and writing were taught in the local language. At about the same time, Orthodox churches began to conduct services in Estonian. Soon this forced the Lutheran Church to also devote greater attention to public education in the Estonian language. By the 1860's a new, national Estonian intelligentsia began to be formed, which aligned itself with the struggle against Germanization. It is true that this struggle was rather fierce, and that the influence of German pastors and of the Lutheran Church in general, on the part of the intelligentsia educated by them (particularly within the walls of Tartu University) was significant. This led to a schism in the ranks of the Estonian intelligentsia into opposite directions: the so-called "Baltic-German party," which was oriented toward the Germans and Lutheranism, and the "people's party," which fought for national rights and against the oppression of the landowners and pastors.

Of the many aspects of this struggle we must, in my opinion, particularly isolate the work of Karl-Robert Jakobson—a great Estonian teacher and humanist and the founder and first editor of the first progressive Estonian newspaper SAKALA, which was published in Vilyandi. All the researchers of the history of Orthodoxy in Estonia speak with gratitude about this man, although Jakobson himself was a Lutheran by faith. However, his work was objectively the brightest page in the struggle against German oppression in Estonia in the 19th Century.

The newspaper SAKALA began publication in March of 1878. From its very first issues, it expanded broad criticism of the vestiges of serfdom in Estonia. Although the censors greatly limited the possibilities of the newspaper and crossed out references which hinted at subversion of the authority of the Czar, the landowners and the pastors, Jakobson nevertheless found possibilities for sharp criticism of the important landed gentry and the orders within the Lutheran Church. This, by the way, was facilitated to a significant degree by the presence of serious contradictions between the landowners and the czarist government, which was swaying under the growing pressure of the revolutionary sentiments of the

masses. Even more, it seems, Jakobson's work was aided by the circumstance that the censors at that time were progressive-minded Estonians, and specifically the Orthodox priests N. Leysman and Yu. Trusman, who sympathized with SAKALA and encouraged its editor. I might add that I referred to their research on the history of Orthodoxy in Estonia in writing my doctoral work.

K.R. Jakobson's newspaper enjoyed broad notoriety and support among the rural Estonian intelligentsia and the peasantry, since it defended their interests.

[Question] Can we speak today of the continuation and enhancement of the traditions of serving the fraternity and unification of peoples which, as I understand, are characteristic of the Russian Orthodox Church as applied specifically to Estonia?

[Answer] Undoubtedly. I have already spoken about this more or less in my previous interview with your newspaper. Today I would only like to add that, as we hope, representatives of all confessions active on Estonian territory will take part in the celebrations which will be held in Tallinn in honor of the millinennium of the christening of Rus. This would hardly be possible if those traditions of which you speak did not exist...

12322

Academician Says Freedom of Conscience Must Be Guaranteed By Law
18000472a Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jun 88 p 3

[Article by G. Vorontsov, doctor of historical sciences and professor: "Guarantees of the Freedom of Conscience"]

[Text] The principles of true freedom of conscience implemented in our country were developed by V. I. Lenin even before the victory of Great October. Vladimir Ilyich saw the most important guarantee of the freedom of conscience in the separation of church and state and school and church, in the full equal rights of all citizens regardless of their attitude toward religion, and in creating the necessary conditions for ensuring the freedom of religion as well as atheist views.

These demands first found their legislative expression in the Decree "On freedom of conscience and church religious societies" (February 1918), which separated the church from the state and the school from the church, and legislatively secured true freedom of conscience. In editing the draft of the decree, V. I. Lenin introduced many additions to it and gave particular attention to the fact that all citizens are ensured equal rights, regardless of their affiliation to one faith or another. To the third article of the decree, which stated: "Every citizen may practice any religion or not practice any at all", Lenin

made an important addition, according to which any mention of religious affiliation or non-affiliation of citizens was eliminated from all official acts.

Proclaiming freedom of religion, the decree focused attention on ensuring its guarantees. A special article formulated by V. I. Lenin was added to the decree. According to it, the buildings and objects intended for church service purposes, based on the resolutions of the state agencies, were handed over for free use by the religious societies.

For the first time in history, the decree legislatively secured not only the freedom of religion, but also the freedom of atheism. V. I. Lenin stressed that true freedom of conscience is closely tied with the right to conduct atheist propaganda. At the same time, he repeatedly warned of the inadmissibility of insulting religious feelings.

These Leninist demands became the basis of the constitutional guarantees of freedom of conscience, and found their most complete expression in the USSR Constitution of 1977 in Articles 34 and 52.

At the same time, today in solving the current tasks of continued democratization of Soviet society, the full restoration of Leninist principles in the matter of the attitude toward the church and toward the faithful is taking on great importance.

An important condition of this process is the continued implementation of the Leninist principles of freedom of conscience and the development of the relations between church and state on this basis. A notable landmark along this path has been the series of state measures on creating the most favorable conditions for the celebration of the 1000-year anniversary of the introduction of Christianity to Russia. These measures were highly evaluated by the leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church in their remarks made to the press. We will remember that the church was granted its request that a number of monasteries be handed over for use by the faithful, and primarily the St. Danilov Monastery in Moscow, where the theological-administrative center of Russian Orthodoxy will be located. Conditions have been created for expanding the publication capacities of the Moscow patriarchy. The Bible is being printed in Russian, and religious-theological literature is being prepared for publication.

Measures are being taken for aiding the church in expanding the production of candles and church-plates, in restoring the building of the Moscow Theological Seminary which sustained considerable damage from fire, etc. These measures have also affected the Leningrad metropolity of the Russian Orthodox Church. The question of handing over a number of places of worship to the faithful (at their request) is being resolved in a positive manner. The chapel of the Blessed Kseniya of Petersburg at the Smolensk cemetery has been handed over for use by members of the church parish, as this cult

is very widespread among the faithful. Conditions for the activity of the Leningrad Theological Academy and Seminary are being improved.

One of three international scientific church conferences devoted to the millennium of the christening of Russia was held in Leningrad. Aside from theologians, scientists—historians and specialists in literature—took part in its work.

We could continue the listing of such facts. However, the point is not in their number, but rather in the general tendency associated with the activity of the Soviet state in ensuring effective guarantees of freedom of conscience.

Nevertheless, the opinion does exist that all this is "just separate temporary concessions" by the state in regard to the Orthodox Church. This view ignores those deep-seated processes which are taking place today in the sphere of interrelations between the state, the church and the faithful under conditions of reorganization of the political and spiritual life of society. "The attitude toward the church and toward the faithful," said M. S. Gorbachev at a meeting held in the Kremlin with the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Pimen and members of the Russian Orthodox Church Synod, "must be defined by the interests of strengthening the unity of all the workers and all of our people. We can clearly see the entire depth of our ideological differences, but at the same time we realistically consider the existing situation. The faithful are Soviet people, workers and patriots, and they have a full right to express their convictions in a fitting manner".

The time has long since passed when church leaders of reactionary sentiment took an active part in the struggle against Soviet authority. The overwhelming majority of the cult worshippers changed over even before the Great Patriotic War to loyal positions in regard to the Soviet state. In the harsh years of 1941-1945 the church took a deeply patriotic position and called upon the faithful to rise up in the struggle against the common enemy. The peacemaking activity of the churches and religious leaders under current conditions is well known. As for the broad masses of faithful, they in their overwhelming majority are patriots of their Homeland and sincerely support the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state, making a significant contribution to the realization of the plans for the social-economic acceleration of the country and to the development of democracy and glasnost. Under these conditions, any infringements on the legal rights of the faithful, any condescending attitude toward them as toward people who by virtue of their religious views seemingly cannot be active members of society, are particularly intolerable.

Thus, the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state in regard to the faithful is not the policy of temporary "concessions" or "advances," but rather a long-term policy associated with the involvement of millions of

people into the active labor and social life of the country. We are speaking not only of the relations between the state organs and the Orthodox Church. The laws of the Soviet state which define the interrelations of the state agencies with the religious organizations stem from full equal rights of all religious faiths. According to Soviet law, any special privileges to one specific church are inadmissible.

The Soviet organs, and primarily the Council on Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers, are today conducting extensive work on improving relations with all churches and religious associations in the country, which represent 40 different faiths. This has found its expression in the approval for construction of new mosques and other buildings of worship, in the registration of new religious associations, including Evangelical Christian-Baptists, Seventh Day Adventists, Pentecostals, and other religious directions in various regions of the country. Thus, for example, in the late 70's a community of Lutherans was registered in Leningrad, and three communities of Pentecostals. The restoration of a Muslim mosque has been under way for a number of years. According to the laws, this mosque (as operational) must be restored by the Muslim community at its own expense. However, considering the significance of this monument, as well as the character of the complex and expensive work, the state agencies have taken on a large portion of the expenditures for restoration of the mosque.

Like the Russian Orthodox Church, other religious organizations have the right to publish religious literature and to train cadres of cult workers. The training of church cadres is performed in Catholic seminaries, the Muslim academy and medres, the theological academy and seminary of the Armenian-Grigorian Church, and in the Jewish yeshiva. There are courses in theology offered by the Evangelical Christian-Baptists and the Georgian Orthodox Church. Religious organizations have their own periodical publications and print prayer books and other religious literature. They have institutions at their disposal for making religious cult objects, etc.

It is also important to note that the faithful of the most varied religious directions actively support the processes of renovation taking place in the country today. This is evidenced, for example, by the speeches presented by the leaders and representatives of churches and religious associations at the meeting held on 23 May of this year at the Trinity-Sergeyev Monastery on the occasion of the millennium celebration of the introduction of Christianity to Russia. The meeting participants noted that the processes of perestroika, democratization and glasnost which are taking place in the country are creating more favorable possibilities for the realization of the pastoral and peacemaking mission by all the churches and religious associations.

As we have already said, a most important condition in guaranteeing the freedom of conscience is the strict adherence by the Soviet organs to the Leninist demands

for freedom of conscience, which have been reflected in the Legislation on Religious Cults. However, many points of this legislation, particularly those relating to the years 29-30, have become outdated. Excess regimentation has often led to violations of the rights of the faithful and of religious associations, and to a distortion of the Leninist principles of freedom of conscience.

To this we must add that in the 60's on a background of stagnant phenomena manifested in various spheres of social life, a simplified understanding of the means of overcoming religion in the consciousness of the people became widespread, and the success achieved in the sphere of atheistic upbringing was overexaggerated. Forgotten were Lenin's directives on the need for long-term, persistent and careful work on freeing the consciousness of the masses from religious views, and on the connection of this work with the solution of vital social problems. It is no accident that specifically at this time there were more frequent cases of unsubstantiated decisions to close down churches and houses of worship, which were made without consideration for the feelings and desires of the faithful.

Our party and government have decisively condemned these illegal actions associated with the violation of rights of the faithful and the religious associations. Many of the errors which were allowed have been corrected. The laws on religious cults are now more strictly observed. At the same time, the most complete restoration of the Leninist principles on the relations toward the church and the faithful is closely tied with the continued democratization of Soviet society, and is the main guarantee of the continued implementation of freedom of conscience.

Of great importance in this connection is the directive presented in the Thesis of the CPSU Central Committee to the 19th All-Union Conference. It says that the state must show constant concern for strengthening the rights and freedoms of the Soviet people, and must bear the responsibility before the citizens for adhering to the laws ensuring their rights and freedoms.

As applied to the principles of freedom of conscience, this means that the state must demand responsibility in equal measure for the fulfillment of laws by religious organizations, by believers as well as non-believers alike, as well as by the state agencies. We must remember that in accordance with Article 142 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, it is a criminal offence to deny citizens acceptance for work or entrance to an educational institution, to dismiss them from work or to exclude them from an educational institution, to deny citizens the established privileges and benefits, or to impose any other significant limitations on the rights of citizens based on their attitude toward religion.

It is important that these requirements are strictly enforced, so that the guarantees of freedom of conscience are ensured in deed and are reinforced not only by

material, but also by legal conditions. An important place in the solution of this problem will belong to the law "On Freedom of Conscience" which is being developed at the present time. This law must reflect most fully the Leninist principles of the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state in regard to religion, the church, and the faithful, and must define the guarantees which effectively ensure the implementation of true freedom of conscience.

12322

Exhibit Attests to Religious Repressions of 30's
18000472b Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 12 Jun 88 p 3

[Article by Ye. Molchanova, associate of the Museum of the Great October Socialist Revolution: "A New Theme, A New Sound"]

[Text] For the first time, the exhibit entitled "Confirming the Freedom of Conscience" has opened in one of the exhibition halls of the State Museum of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The fact that its opening coincided with the days of celebration of the millennium of the adoption of Christianity in Russia is yet another sign of the changes in mutual relations between the Soviet state and the Orthodox Church which are taking place at the present time.

The practical implementation of Lenin's decrees, the understanding of their deepest political sense, the moral problems inevitably arising during the breaking of ancient, centuries-old customs and traditions—all these questions were illuminated in the display exhibits. Tens of photographs, original historical documents, posters, placards and books become for us a testimony of 70-year old events.

The authors do not try to evade acute problems in depicting certain historical periods and facts. Let us take, for example, the 30's. In the history of the Russian Church they became years of irretrievable detriment and

loss. Cathedrals, churches, and model houses were mercilessly torn down. At that time they didn't think much about the fact that they were destroying not simply places of worship—they were destroying unique monuments of history, the creations of the great masters. Priceless works of the best Russian icon makers and rare manuscripts perished in the flames. Many clergymen were subjected to mass repressions... The exhibits also tell about this.

An extensive section is devoted to the present day. An entire series of rare photographs, material displays and documents have become a bright illustration of the current changes both in the sphere of attitudes toward the church, and within the church itself. Its active peacemaking activity is highly valued by the Soviet government. Today the Russian Orthodox Church takes an active part in the work of the most authoritative forums, congresses and social organizations in our country as well as abroad.

We must say that it was certainly not easy to prepare such an exhibit. Often the huge museum funds not only did not have enough historical documents, but also did not possess enough materials on the present day. Extensive scientific-research work was needed. The search was conducted in card catalogues and vaults of other museums, and in the archives of cinema-photographic document sources. Scientists and specialists came to the rescue. Certainly the future visitors to the exhibit would be interested in knowing that the rector of the Leningrad Theological Academy V. Sorokin was an active assistant in gathering the materials and a consultant in writing the annotations.

For the museum this exhibit has become an event in a certain sense—a new topic, a new sound, the birth of a new collection. Obviously, not everything could be displayed as we had wanted, and the hall is a bit small...Nevertheless, we will leave it to the visitors to judge its advantages or shortcomings.

12322

**Exiled Director Lyubimov Interviewed in Moscow
18000417a Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 May 1988 p 4**

Interview by M. Shvydkoy: "I Do Not Want To Create a Sensation; I Want To Work...: Second Interview with Yuriy Lyubimov for IZVESTIYA"]

[Text] "But what is the point of it?" Yuriy Lyubimov said to N. Gubenko and me, annoyed by the questions put by a Hungarian television correspondent. Our Hungarian colleague was attempting to obtain the answers his editors wanted in a clear-cut, straightforward form, phrased aphoristically and harshly. "Sensible people will understand that I have said all that has to be said in my interview on Hungarian television. Only why do they want to pour salt on the wound in public and cause people pain? Why do journalists have this strange need to cause pain? What is the point of it? Didn't I tell the IZVESTIYA correspondent while we were still in Madrid, 'Let's spare each other's nerves...'"

It would be ridiculous to assume that all that has happened has not upset me nor given rise to any emotions; but I am in my eighth decade, and as we grow old, we grow sentimental. However, I do not like sentimentality. Not when there are facts to be considered. Today facts are more important and the facts are that: I am here in Moscow; I have been meeting with people; I am understood; I attended the rehearsals for "Boris Godunov;" I was at the premier of "Vladimir Vysotskiy," which was banned in 1981. These are the facts. These are deeds and acts. They are more important than any words. And these facts cannot be refuted by those who are opposed to the positive forces currently operating in this country. Of course, I am here at the personal invitation of Nikolay Gubenko and have come as a private individual. I have come, first and foremost, to visit the graves of those who are dear to me and to see my theater, my plays. But, as I see it, this is only the beginning... And, naturally, I get annoyed when people try to fit my acts into a narrow journalistic formula, when they want to turn my every word into a sensation. I do not want to create a sensation. I want to work in my theater. We must speak to each in a way that is more normal, more human, more natural. Life today demands this. At the same time, this life has grown harder and sterner, a social battle is in progress, various opinions and positions, frequently polar opposites, are clashing. And in this stern time, as at no time in the past, what is needed is deeds, and not talk about what feelings people have. If words are tossed around, they cease to have effects.

I have already been in the thrall of words that did not express my true thoughts. When I agreed to sign "Manifesto 10," the one that was published in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, I thought it would be beneficial to restructuring. But just the opposite occurred. You must understand that I did not know about the sensational headline which preceded the letter. The Western press

generally has special people to think up headlines and all they care about is making them as racy and sensational as possible. In addition, joint letters never express the feelings of the individual and this was especially true in this case where they read me the final draft in English. You know how it goes, someone will insert some phrase or other that you don't like and would prefer to replace with another. But why go into it, everyone knows about such things. For a long time, there in the West, I could not disentangle myself from this "Manifesto," so I categorically refused to participate in this type of collective appeal. And I have no intention of doing so in the future.... I am an artist, not a politician, and I do not intend to get involved in politics. Thank God, today we have enough artists in politics and they are a great deal better at such matters than I. As everyone knows, even great politicians make mistakes, and I am an artist. I am here today talking with you, although I am sure that the decision to allow me to come was not an easy one.

Art today must arouse humaneness and humanity; it must be filled with concern for maintaining man's tenure on this planet; it must make people understand that they are interconnected and need one another. And in our nation art must affirm the irreversibility of those processes of social renewal of which we have dreamed. This life-giving process so essential to our Fatherland must not stop, must not be interrupted as, unfortunately, happened in the days of N.S. Khrushchev.

Our Theater on Taganka was created through impetus generated by the XXth and XXIIth CPSU Congresses. We slipped in through the door which was flung open during the mid-fifties. If our theater had been formed just slightly later, nothing might have happened. Even as it was, they tried to close us down in 1964. They tried to put a stop to our presentation of students' work. We were saved by PRAVDA, by Konstantin Simonov's article on the "Good Woman of Szechuan." We were saved by workers from two plants, "Stankolit" and "Borets," who had been brought to the school imeni B.V. Shchukin because they were expected to say that this art was unnecessary and incomprehensible to them, the workers, and was nothing but formalism... But the workers watched and were delighted with it. "Couldn't this play or something like it be brought to our plant?" they said to the people who had invited them only so that the play could be shut down, in the name of the working class, as it were. They said this and shook the hands of those who had brought them there. I can remember it clearly. I was standing nearby, but I really had no part in it... We were helped by our audience to whom our art was necessary.

We were lucky and we established our theater. The critics and, indeed, the public as a whole got the impression that we were the darlings of fate. But this is not so. Everything that was accomplished was accomplished with incredible difficulty. I was fired twice. More than once I was on the verge of being fired and the theater was under the threat of being reorganized. I was given obvious hints, "We will not hold you. You are free to go

there." In the February issue of the journal TEATR for this year, V. Smekhov, an actor with Taganka, has described our misadventures. The reality was a great deal more dramatic. I remember the one public performance of "Vladimir Vysotskiy" permitted by the government in 1981. In order to get into the theater you had to pass between two lines of police, holding out your passport and a pass admitting you to the theater. And, for my sins, I had forgotten both of them. When in 1983, rehearsals for Boris Godunov were stopped, we were on the verge of disbanding. Our group's two last works had, in essence, been banned. None of the conditions required for normal work to go on were present...

Today I am here, I understand how much has changed. During this time, in spite of all the hard work I have been doing, I have been reading the papers, journals, and new books. I have learned about the life of our theater, about how Nikolay Gubenko has directed things, about how my plays have returned. I have learned that during a visit to the theater, which was then headed by A.V. Efros, M.S. Gorbachev inquired about the fate of my plays. I have learned that preparations are underway for a production of "Boris Godunov," Pushkin's chef d'oeuvre, one of the greatest achievements in world literature. This is the pearl of Russian letters which we handled with the greatest care. It is not for me to say whether the production of 1983 would have been like the one today, but only people who are pathologically suspicious could ban "Boris Godunov" and seek out allusions in it. Indeed, this could be done only by people who do not care about the history or the future of the Fatherland. In A.S. Pushkin's play, one can find resemblances and parallels with any times, with the past, present, and future, just as one can find them in "Hamlet," "King Lear," or "Woe from Wit." This is because the work is a masterpiece. It does not age. We, unfortunately, do age. The actors have aged and I have aged. But not A.S. Pushkin's tragedy, not the production we designed. True art is understandable to people of all ages. "The Battleship Potemkin" is understood by the youth of today and moves them... As I listened to the text of "Boris Godunov," I understood that it is needed today. It has always been needed, but especially today, because it engenders the noble emotions and ideas which are essential for the current renewal of our society....

After "Boris Godunov" I would like to see the Theater on Taganka return to "The Living" by Boris Mozhayev, which must be freed from its eighteen-year prohibition. And after that let them return to the projects which were never realized, works which were not permitted before: "The Possessed" from the novel by F. M. Dostoyevskiy, the brilliant drama by my late friend N. Erdman, "Suicide," and other such works. But first, if you will, I want to produce a work devoted to the poetry and prose of B. Pasternak. This is something I have wanted to do for nearly a quarter of a century. I had the honor of knowing him, I was visiting him at his summer place during the most difficult minutes of his life. We did not speak about that wave of wrath which was breaking over

his head (I would not repeat the things they were calling him at that time), but spoke instead of art, of poetry, of how his translation of Shakespeare's lines sounded on the lips of an actor. And this showed his great courage, his great dignity.

I want to work in my theater—I have long been attuned to restructuring, if you will pardon the play on words.

I have a number of contracts abroad, which I must fulfill. Otherwise I would be forced to pay huge penalties, which I myself cannot afford and which no one else would pay on my behalf. But I see nothing wrong in the fact that I will be working abroad rather than at home—propaganda in favor of our culture and our art is necessary to our Fatherland, now more than ever. But from now on, I want to consider all the offers I get in light of their compatibility with my plans to work in the Theater on Taganka, which is the most important thing for me, and, of course, with the requirements of art. I want to devote myself to art. One must maintain a healthy mind, warm heart, and good principles.

This is all I have to say. What else is there to add? We want to work and not to talk. These days people must work and not talk if they are to make sure that history does not turn back. The epoch of the swamp has ended and the swamp must be eliminated so that we no longer suffer from the stench and mosquitos. For this we must work together. We must save our nation, which is what wise people are doing and doing without let-up. One cannot merely watch from the sidelines. The times and the positive processes occurring in our nation demand active participation. They demand deeds and not words. And after all, we can always talk while we are working.

9285

Writers Assail Criticism of Brodsky's Poetry
18000417b Moscow OGONEK in Russian
No 18, 30 Apr-7 May 1988 p 3

[Letter signed by writers, Viktor Yerofeyev and Tatyana Tolstaya]

[Text] KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reacted very strangely to the letter from V. Mishenko of Kiev asking whether our readers know the poetry of Yosif Brodsky. The paper printed an article by P. Gorelov and a selection, not of Brodsky's poetry, but rather of additions to the article from their own correspondents abroad, which did not balk at subscribing to the opinions of the openly chauvinistic emigre journal VECHE. This piece achieved an outstanding level of tendentiousness and was highly reminiscent of the best traditions of bad times and rabble rousing anti-Semitic articles.

P.Gorelov's article implies that those of our readers with little or no familiarity with Brodsky's poetry have lost nothing and may even have gained spiritually since they have shielded themselves from a "blatant flow of rhymed

banalities, vulgarities and cynicism" and have protected their spirits from the monstrous encroachments of this worthless poet who simply "has nothing to say."

This is the point of view of our authority on Brodsky who has no intention of joining the foreign "authorities" (of course, the only sort of authorities over there are surrounded by quotation marks!) "in seeking out in his poems things that they do not contain, or seeing in them more than is there." Everyone has the right to express his point of view (indeed, the article was published under this precise rubric) on any subject they please, including Brodsky's poetry. But when an individual's point of view is published in a major newspaper, it should be substantiated if it is not to appear to be an arbitrary exercise of power, a blatant imposition of personal opinion on the reader.

How does the author of the article substantiate his position? He does not take the trouble to develop original arguments. All the techniques he uses in his criticism are borrowed from those resolutions and articles where they mocked Akhmatova and Zoshchenko, and reviled Pasternak...

Not long ago in Moscow there was a major poetry evening devoted to Brodsky. We both participated in it and must say that the level of interest in Brodsky is self-evident. This is no cause for fear. Brodsky is a complex and brilliant poet, whom the reader can be introduced to in the pages of NOVYY MIR and NEVA. Other selections will be published in the future. Brodsky's poetic teachers were Tsvetayeva and Pasternak, Mandelstam and Akhmatova, who in the 60's had a high opinion of the young Brodsky. Brodsky was born (in 1940) and grew up in Leningrad, which to this day he calls the most beautiful city in the world. In 1964, after persecution and a mocking article in the Leningrad paper, the poet was found guilty of "parasitism," despite protests from prominent cultural figures. After serving an 18-month period of internal exile, Brodsky returned to Leningrad where, as before, he was virtually unpublished and in 1972 he was compelled to leave his homeland. Now he lives in New York. It becomes clearer and more obvious as the years pass that Brodsky's departure was a great loss for our literature.

One can argue with many of the poet's political statements. But one thing is clear: his poems are not meant as political allusions. They are an affirmation of an eternal vital order, a penetrating depiction of good, as well as evil human emotions. The Swedish Academy awarded the poet the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1987 for his "multi-faceted creation, permeated with keen thought and deep poetry." When one reads a selection from the world press on the subject of the award of the prize, it is evident that the political aspect was of little interest to the press and, if THE HUMANIST did mention it (as cited in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA), then it also did not neglect to add that Brodsky is "indubitably, an

important poet." Brodsky himself asserted in an interview that "this is the prize for literature, not politics," and responded to a question about the reaction in Moscow by saying, "I do not know what kind of response there will be over there, but I am interested in what they will say."

P. Gorelov's point of view has already been made clear, but this is far from the only "response in Moscow." This is our point of view, one for which they could not find room on the pages of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda," "Ogonek," 1988.

9285

**Reader Challenges Critical PRAVDA Review of
'Doctor Zhivago'**

18000464a Moscow OGONEK in Russian No 23,
4-11 Jun 88 p 3

[Letter by M.S. Zanadvorov, Psychologist, Moscow]

[Text] I am deeply upset by the extremely unjust, in my opinion, and even insulting to the memory of Pasternak, review by D. Urnov of the novel "Doctor Zhivago" published in PRAVDA on 27 Apr 88. The novel has barely reached readers (with a 30-year delay!) and there are already attempts to debunk and destroy it. Thank God, this time they do not use political accusations as was the case 30 years ago.

The main notion of D. Urnov is the thesis that "Doctor Zhivago" is, as Gorkiy's "Klim Samgin," a "story of an empty soul," and that in spite of the author's intention, Yuriy Zhivago appears in the novel as a mediocre, worthless person, who even does not have his own thoughts, and, therefore, the novel is the greatest creative failure of the author, Boris Pasternak.

But wait a minute! This is, as Smerdyakov used to say, everything has been written about untruth. And what about the acute conscientiousness of Doctor Zhivago typical for the old Russian intelligentsia? And the deep thoughts of Yuriy Zhivago about history, Russia, and life and death? It is not a coincidence, probably, that the most philosophical poems of Pasternak, "Hamlet," "Gethsemane Gardens," and "Dawn," are those from the novel and are poems by Yuriy Zhivago to the same extent as by Pasternak himself.

And what about the strength of Yuriy's love for Lara, this "love for all time," those best pages of Russian lyrics? And the delicate aesthetic flair of Yuriy Zhivago (Beauty, Solov'yev used to say, is a form of truth and goodness)? Finally, such an understanding of nature and emotional coexperience with it (which was Pasternak's nature, of course) that nature in the novel becomes an ally of the doctor and his consoler, and, one may say, their mutual merging is taking place. Are all these features of an empty soul?

"Doctor Zhivago" is a great work because it is the first novel in Soviet literature of such a scale and such an understanding of events in the difficult, sometimes tragic, fate of the Russian intelligentsia, which like Akhmatova, Mandelshtam, Bulgakov, and Pasternak, experienced hesitations and doubts and went through the revolutionary events with tragic feelings, not because of their belonging to the "gentry," or lack of understanding or because they did not believe in the ideals of social justice, but rather due to their historic sagacity, they were afraid to lose their ideals (we are harvesting these bitter fruits from the 30's up to now). What the "wolf-hound century" means is what these people experienced for themselves. Comprehending the dialectics of revolution, which since the beginning of the 30's was replaced with Stalin's terror, has tragically reflected on their fate. And we should treat their quests and suffering with compassion and understanding which we still lack today, rather than with an arrogant chuckle.

D. Urnov debunks the image of Yuriy Zhivago. But it is clear to everyone that Yuriy Zhivago is the spiritual self-portrait of the author. Therefore, Urnov is aiming at the author himself. Were not there enough stones thrown at Pasternak in 1958, which, in essence, killed him?

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda," "Ogonek," 1988.

13355

Leningraders Defend Academician Likhachev
18000464b Moscow OGONEK in Russian No 24,
11-18 Jun 88 p 5

[Letter signed by worker A.N. Alekseyev, writer V.G. Popov, technical college instructor Yu.V. Frolov, and others (total 270 signatures), Leningrad]

[Text] We, residents of Leningrad, are surprised and indignant at the position of LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA concerning the Chairman of the board of the Soviet Culture Foundation, Academician D.S. Likhachev. An article "Should One Be Chasing Boyan In a Song?" was published on the front page of this newspaper on 6 Mar 88. This article is a direct insult to a world-reknowned scientist and public figure. The essence of the article is that they advise Academician Likhachev to quit his public activities and to pursue his studies of the ancient Russian manuscripts. As to his public statements defending humanitarian culture, LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA compares them with songs of Boyan.

LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA accuses D.S. Likhachev of incompetence in those "special" subjects about which he is writing. The subject of D.S. Likhachev statements and, in particular, his letter to PRAVDA (1 Mar 88) and a recent speech at the general meeting of the USSR Academy of Sciences, which had especially irritated the Leningrad newspaper, he was speaking about ethical problems of our science and culture. At the same

time, the city's newspaper casts a doubt at the moral authority of D.S. Likhachev whom all of us consider to be an example of a scientist's conscience.

On 3 April 1988, in response to numerous readers' protests, the editorial board of LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA made a statement that the article "Should One Be Chasing Boyan In a Song?" reflected only the "point of view" of the article's author V. Koshvats. While it did not publish a single one of the dozens of letters it had received, the editorial board justifies the appearance of this article by... the spirit of glasnost and democratization. It is a strange position for a Party newspaper, and a strange understanding of the spirit of the time. LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA's irritation at D.S. Likhachev's position could also be seen in the astonishing fact that in the article on 31 March 1988 he was not mentioned as one of the main organizers of the International Foundation for the Survival and Development of Mankind.

Unfortunately, an impression is created that those numerous efforts, which for the duration of many years were being made and are being made now by D.S. Likhachev, for preventing and developing the humanitarian culture of Leningrad, not only are met with misunderstanding, but are knowingly distorted in the articles of the city's Party newspaper. This does not add credibility and authority to the newspaper of the Leningrad Party obkom and gorkom.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda," "Ogonek," 1988.

13355

Tvardovskiy's Widow Questions Jury Selection for Monument
18000464c Moscow OGONEK in Russian
No 11, 12-19 Mar 88 p 7, No 24, 11-18 Jun 88 p4

[Letter by M.I. Tvardovskaya]

[No 11, 12-19 Mar 88, p 7]

[Text] The list published in the press of members of the jury which has to determine the artistic value of projects of the monument to Vasiliy Terkin to be built in Smolensk, aroused a feeling of dissatisfaction in many people besides us, members of A.T. Tvardovskiy's family. Made up on the principle of representing the organizations of the republic, the jury is noticeably short of people who knew the poet personally, studied his poems, wrote about his creative life, and, finally, acquainted wide masses of listeners with his poetry. Such literary critics as Yu. Burtin, A. Turkov, V. Lakshin, and actors Oleg Tabakov and Mikhail Ulyanov, to whom many listeners are indebted for their knowledge of Tvardovskiy's poetry, and such fine arts representatives as O. Vereyskiy and I. Bruni, who made illustrations for the poem and knew it from wartime, were not included in the jury.

I would like to mention another, even more delicate subject. Of course, in order to "promote action" we quite often disregard certain proprieties accepted in the world. Thus, in this case there is not a single member of Aleksandr Trifonovich Tvardovskiy's family on the jury.

At the present time, talk about closing ranks and forgetting conflicts is beginning. Of course, taking into consideration the proverb that a poor peace is better than a good fight, one should consider the talks about peace. However, is it not the same indifference, which during times past kept these peacemakers from being involved in conflicts, and now is causing them to advise reconciliation?

In our time, perestroika is taking place not only in industry. Perestroika is asking everybody for high exactitudes of himself and self-criticism. Since the day the "Letter of Eleven: What Is It That NOVYY MIR Is Against?" was published in OGONEK No 30, 1969, it was never reconsidered by people who had signed it. We protest against nominating to the jury writer P. Proskurin, who did not use his right "to resign for personal reasons" and boldly accepted his new responsibilities of a judge over Terkin and, by the same token, over the creator of this image.

How could he become a member of the jury?

And could we, and should we reconcile with it?

[No 24, 11-18 Jun 88, p 4]

[Text] I am forced to inquire about my letter published in issue No 11. It criticized the membership of the jury which is to discuss projects of a monument to Vasilii Terkin in Smolensk, and, in particular, to express bewilderment concerning the nomination to the jury of the writer P. Proskurin, who in his time has sharply criticized the position of NOVYY MIR and its editor A. Tvardovskiy.

The letter noticed by readers has caused responses. Today after the 23rd issue of the magazine has been published, readers are interested in knowing how the matter stands and what the result of the press action is.

The answer is short: nothing has happened.

We are facing again and again a situation typical for today, namely, democracy of talks in the press (discussions, proposals, etc.) while the departmental ranks continue their bureaucratic actions.

In our particular case, we see the tendency to take the criticism of the jury lightly and to bury the problem by deep silence. With the slow pace of our life, the silence many times has "removed" even more serious problems which "interfered with being in charge" or in any other way would irritate the authorities.

And what about P. Proskurin himself, what is the reason for his silence?

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda," "Ogonek," 1988.

13355

Ryazanov Protest of TV Censorship Rebutted
18000489 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 16 Jun 88 p 4

[Letter from USSR State Committee on Radio and Television Broadcasting: "What Eldar Ryazanov Omitted." Rebuttal to the article "Why I Left Television in the Epoch of Glasnost." First paragraph is source introduction.

[Text] The editors of SOVETSKAYA KULTURA recently received a letter from the management of the USSR Gosteleradio, which stated:

The article by E. Ryazanov, "Why I Left Television in the Epoch of Glasnost," published in OGONEK, No 14, prompted us to take pen in hand.

The natural question might arise: why does the rebuttal appear in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA KULTURA instead of in OGONEK itself? That is what we had hoped for when we asked OGONEK to print our reply a month and a half ago. Three times they assured us that the material would appear in the next issue. The last time, tired of waiting, we decided to officially withdraw the response, but the editors of OGONEK began to assure us that this would undermine the publication of the issue, would deprive people of bonuses, etc. We believed them and again were fooled. OGONEK came out without our material. Evidently, this journal understands democracy to be a one-way street. Under these circumstances, we decided to publish our response in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA.

We cannot deny that the article by Eldar Ryazanov in OGONEK is emotional and has a light, unfettered style of presentation. It also contains a number of correct observations. But it also contains many points that evoke a sense of protest due to frank over-exposures, overly free interpretation of the facts, as well as omissions which merely confuse the unenlightened reader. The most surprising thing, however, is E. Ryazanov's desire to belittle the changes taking place on television in recent years, to cast doubt on its capacity for perestroika and renovation. We have only to read a small portion of the letters from television viewers in order to understand that hundreds of thousands of people evaluate the place and role of TV in the life of society today quite differently from E. Ryazanov.

Even 3 years ago it was difficult to imagine that television broadcasts such as "Meetings in the Ostankin Studio" or the broadcasts of "Position," "Resonance," "120 Minutes," "View," "Before and After Midnight"

and many others would appear. The volume of direct, open broadcasts on current questions of our life has increased by more than 20 times. How can we imagine television today without "The Projector of Perestroika"? This laconic broadcast has broken all records in its popularity. Every month it receives over 20,000 letters.

Naturally, we are far from the idea that perestroika on television has already been completed. We also do not flatter ourselves with a count of the artistic merits of many of our broadcasts. We do have something to think about and work toward. Moreover, we are convinced that only the first notable steps have been taken, while perestroika in television itself must comprise a continuous process of renovation.

Therefore, the affirmation made by the article's author seems rather strange to us. That is, that "in one respect this mighty means of mass information has remained unchanged. All too often it builds all of its work, as before, on the desire to please. But—alas!—not to please the people".

Who or what is Ryazanov referring to this time? After all, earlier, in December when he spoke at the Plenum of the USSR Union of Cinematographers, he maintained that "television continues to work for the 15 television viewers who live in the European part of the Soviet Union."

This type of peremptory statement is very characteristic of Ryazanov. He also pronounces with equal facility some other "impromptu remarks" in television broadcasts.

Today television comes into every home. The young and old alike watch its programs. It is specifically for this reason that all those who develop television broadcasts cannot help but feel a high sense of responsibility for every word said on the screen, for every televised frame, for the reliability, truthfulness, believability, political accuracy and aesthetic value of the programs they televise.

Up until now it seemed to us that motion picture producer E. Ryazanov shared this point of view. Being the head of "Kinopanorama," he wrote in his book, "Unsummarized Results": "'Kinopanorama' is a rather powerful means of aesthetic education of the people. It has a huge audience numbering many millions of people. Therefore, the creators should always be aware of the feeling of human and creative responsibility." We cannot disagree with this.

It is true, however, that Ryazanov viewed this responsibility in a unique manner. In the same book he said frankly: "And when I understood that I could ruin my relations with my colleagues, I chose my own path. I simply refused to select films for 'Kinopanorama' and, consequently, to invite their creators. I pushed this

thankless job onto the shoulders of the producer and editor. And when one of my colleagues in cinema complains to me, I tell him with a clean conscience and a slight feeling of malicious joy that I am not involved with formulating the broadcast programming."

Now let us turn directly to E. Ryazanov's article, published under the pretentious headline, "Why I Left Television In the Epoch of Glasnost."

But first, let us make one short digression. The talented producer E. Ryazanov was not given his share of honors during the epoch of stagnation, and during those same years he became a popular television screen star. At the same time, thanks to television, he also took on the image of a spiritual teacher, whose word was heeded by millions of people. What would this word be? What does it bring to the masses? The television programmers who invite E. Ryazanov to their broadcasts must be deeply cognizant of this, as should he also be. After all, 140-160 people sit down around their television sets at one time. Ryazanov recalls his broadcast "In the Circle of Friends," which was aired in March of 1986. He complains of editorial intervention. Yet this broadcast contained many points which were in elementary bad taste, and the truth is that Elday Aleksandrovich himself agreed with this, and therefore corrections were made with his participation.

Quite recently Ryazanov himself saw the need for this. "The hands of the producer are always armed with saving scissors. With their help we can rid ourselves of the undesirable, the unsuccessful, of the imprecisely expressed, and sometimes of the erroneous." Doesn't it seem to E. Ryazanov that, in accusing the television programmers of editing his broadcasts, he cannot help but reject a strange position: all-permissiveness for himself and creative dictatorship in regard to others? Thus he writes in OGONEK in connection with his participation in the broadcast "Before and After Midnight": "I warned the production chief that if they cut anything out of my comments, I would ask that my performance not be aired at all."

That was the ultimatum. Nevertheless, in the aforementioned book, "Unsummarized Results," Ryazanov confessed: "Every time they put me before a television camera, I never knew where I was going to 'drift.'"

But let us return to the broadcast of "Evening in Ostankino." We had no doubts about the expediency of inviting E. Ryazanov to the concert studio on the occasion of his 60th birthday. In the process of preparing for this author's evening, we agreed that the basic content of the broadcast would be his conversation with viewers, his answers to their questions. As a rule, no more than an hour and a half is allotted for such broadcasts on Central Television. For example, the meeting with Academician D. Likhachev aired for exactly 1 hour and 30 minutes, the meeting with USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member S. Fedorov—also 1 hour 30 minutes,

and with Academician L. Koshkin—1 hour 15 minutes. Naturally, in reality the evening devoted to each of them lasted much longer. Ryazanov was on the air for 1 hour 42 minutes, but his author's evening lasted about 3 hours.

It is strange and even somewhat embarrassing to remind E. Ryazanov, a professional producer, that montage in cinema and on television is a necessary artistic means used for the purpose of creating a screen production which is meaningful in content, clear in form, and harmonic in composition.

In preparing the broadcast for airing, the producers asked Ryazanov to renounce a number of his banal judgements and various "whims." However, the birthday celebrant categorically rejected any kind of advice, and insisted on airing the material exactly as it had been recorded. Evidently, E. Ryazanov believes to this day that the viewer would have been spiritually enriched by hearing an anecdote on the topic of "Can one make love in a public square?" aired on television.

They tried to convince the author that his discussions about the army were carelessly formulated, that they sounded disrespectful to the war veterans, and that they belittled the sacred duty of service in the Soviet Army, especially in the eyes of the youth. E. Ryazanov perceived these recommendations as a distortion of his

"civil" position. They compromised and left this episode in the form which the celebrant had requested. Today we regret this deeply. The television station received a flood of letters with vehement protests. We were sharply criticized in the central newspapers.

In the beginning of his article in OGONEK, Ryazanov rightly notes that "we must show delicacy, humbleness, intelligence, even a certain shyness and refinement of manners, impeccable politeness—and then our intellect and nobility will immediately become apparent. Again, it doesn't matter whether it is of a department or an individual."

Does the screen image of Eldar Ryazanov correspond to his announced credo? That is for the television viewers to judge. However, in his relations with television editors, Ryazanov acted most unceremoniously. The phrase that he spent "two hours in a torture chamber with two executioners" is by far not his strongest expression. We believe that in the time of glasnost, when all of us are learning to live under conditions of democracy, blatant name-calling, pretensions of exclusiveness of one's personage, and author's dictatorship in a creative sense do not adorn anyone. They also do not adorn the author of the article appearing in OGONEK.

12322

Moldavian Procuracy Notes Increase In Crime Rate

18000475 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 4 Jun 88 p 3

[Appeal of the Board of the Moldavian SSR Procuracy to the masters of culture and arts, writers and journalists, composers, architects, and artists, engineers, actors, figures of cinema and theater, science, and public education, to all intelligentsia of the republic.]

[Text] The process of perestroyka taking place in the Moldavian SSR and the whole country has awakened initiative, has brought into motion energy of the masses, and stirred up people's interest toward economic, political, social, legal, moral, and other important problems.

The most important condition of fulfilling the tasks of renewing our society is to ensure Socialist law and order. As a result of large-scale measures involving the strengthening of organization and discipline, increased demands to personnel for the work assigned them, and persistent work to overcome hard drinking, we were able to stop the growth of the crime rate, decrease material and labor losses, and reduce other negative phenomena.

However, the state of law and order in the republic remains unsatisfactory and for certain types of crime the situation became even worse than before. Due to erroneous notions about the essence of democracy, legal nihilism and cases of social demagoguery and an attitude of "anything goes" became widely spread. Criminal and other antisocial elements became more active. They draw new accomplices into their ranks, form stable criminal groups, and corrupt young people. In the current year, the number of murders and grave, life endangering injuries have increased. Cases of rape, robbery, theft, and hooligan and extremist behavior have increased. In the capital and some other towns of the republic, arrogant attacks on innocent passers-by who are robbed of clothing, shoes, money, and valuables, are continuing. Cases of arbitrary reprisals directed against disagreeable people and caused by conflicts in the family, or problems of everyday life, are not unique.

Negative changes are taking place in the nature of criminal infringements themselves. They are often accompanied by unjustified brutality, cynicism, and inhumane treatment of the victims. In a number of places, perpetrators subjected their victims to sadistic tortures and humiliation. There are cases of atrocious murders of elderly people and infants, burning relatives alive, and violence toward mothers.

We are especially concerned by the fact that mostly young people, some of them under legal age, and teenagers, are involved in crime. It is alarming that the most common reason for illegal activities is greed, and sometimes, plain whim. Many crimes are committed either without any motive or for a minor cause.

Heavy drinking which is closely interwoven with drug addiction and toxicomania, sexual promiscuity, and mental deviations, remains the most unfavorable factor determining both the level and character of crimes. Negative effects of moonshining are on the increase. Drinking destroys families, good neighborly and friendly relations, and distorts the notions of consciousness, shame, and decency.

All the above mentioned facts provide evidence that violations of law and order are becoming more intolerable. We understand that the struggle against crime is primarily the task of law and order authorities, that is, the militia, procuracy, and courts. Their efforts are concentrated now on the inevitability of punishment of the guilty, prevention of criminal activities, and improvement of education on legal matters.

However, successful resolution of crime prevention tasks is possible only with the active support of the population and creation of an atmosphere of general intolerance toward any deviations from the law. Unfortunately, public support for strengthening law and order recently has dropped substantially.

Many voluntary people's patrols, comrade's courts, prevention councils, and other voluntary organizations are either idle, or do not significantly affect the crime situation. Harsh condemnation of drinkers, parasites, home brawlers, and even hardened recidivists, at the working collectives and places of residency, does not always take place. Even more, attempts to shield the guilty, to avert responsibility from them, to create an atmosphere of cover-up around them, are not unique. Many citizens and persons with authority have an "it is not my business" attitude.

Opportunities provided by the press, radio, and TV for public exposure of criminals who threw aside all restraints and for examination of the causes of criminal activities, are not fully used. Creative intelligentsia and the scientific community did not make their important input in this matter either.

Criminological studies show that origins of illegal behavior are based, first and foremost, on ignorance and a lack of spirituality, a lack of legal and general culture, and a moral deformation of the personality. The environment which produces a criminal is usually characterized by indifference and a lack of concern from the surrounding people. An extraordinary role in overcoming these vices, forming a healthy social climate, and educating people, especially youth, belongs to the Soviet intelligentsia, creative unions, cultural, educational, and scientific institutions, public organizations, and the mass information media.

The Board of the Moldavian SSR Procuracy, which is the coordinator in the struggle with crime, appeals to the masters of culture and arts, writers and journalists,

composers, architects, and artists, engineers, actors, figures of cinema and theater, science, and public education, that is, to all intelligentsia of the republic, asking them to take a more active part in the process of bringing the society to moral health, preventing crimes, and eradicating conditions and circumstances feeding crimes. This requires not only creating highly artistic works, and bringing knowledge and culture to the people, but also meeting more often with the working collectives and population, especially with young people, to influence the feelings, consciousness, and behavior of people, by their art, passionate artistic and publicistic word, and personal example. Literally the whole community must stand up to violence and brutality, lack of spirituality and promiscuity, indifference and lack of concern, and expose by all available means heavy drinking and drug addiction, selfishness and greed, and an antisocial, parasitic way of life. We must teach all people to respect the law and to have a real need to consciously observe the standard of socialist conduct. We must unmask the false romanticism of the criminal world, and strengthen fairness and decency, conscientiousness and generosity in mutual relations among people.

The Board expresses its confidence that the intelligentsia, whose voice is heard by the masses, will answer this appeal by action and will make its weighty input into the strengthening of law and order in the republic and into overcoming the antisocial phenomena that slow down perestroika.

13355

Jurist Reports on Work of Criminal Code Commission

18000521 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 12 Jul 88 p 8

[Interview with Ninel Kuznetsova, doctor of juridical sciences, professor, and chief of the Criminal Law Department, Faculty of Law, MGU by SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent: "The Law Is Becoming More Humane"; date and place not given; first four paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA KULTURA introduction]

[Text] The shortcomings of the legislation now in effect are evident, it seems, to everybody. The present-day conditions of society's development and perestroika, which is proceeding throughout all the spheres of our life, insistently demand a new approach to many of the statutes which would seem to be ensconced for all time in the Criminal Code.

Serious discussion of this matter also took place at the recently concluded 19th All-Union Party Conference. M.S. Gorbachev's report noted that many legal acts now in effect have become brakes on social development. It is not by chance, therefore, that among the other extremely important resolutions adopted at this conference there was also one entitled "On Legal Reform."

It was quite some time ago that a commission was created in our country for the purpose of working out new Soviet criminal legislation; the draft of the reform is almost finished, and it will soon be presented for discussion.

A SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent requested one of the commission members to tell us how the commission's work is coming along; she is N. Kuznetsov, doctor of juridical sciences, professor, and chief of the Criminal Law Department, Faculty of Law, MGU. Her answers are printed below.

[Answer] I want to emphasize right away that this is not a matter of routinely amending the code or even a new edition of it, but rather a fundamental change in the existing legislation. Just take the following fact as an example: we have already eliminated more than 40 existing articles basically having to do with petty crimes.

Our work began immediately after the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which had spoken about the need to develop new legislation in the very near future. A working commission was set up; it included legal scholars and representatives of the law-enforcement organs. And on 1 February we already held our first joint session. The timetable was very tight: no leaves were to be allowed, and as the first order of business, we dropped everything else we were doing and rushed to hold our regular sessions. The discussions and disputes at these sessions were hot and heavy. Nor is that really surprising: because, after all, every word in the Criminal Code is of great importance. For purposes of comparison here, we might recall the old schoolboy joke about the role played by the comma in the following sentence: "Execute, cannot be pardoned."

I won't conceal the fact that I was pleased that the authors of the adopted proposal on reform turned out to be primarily those scholars who had forecast the theoretical model of the Criminal Code. We had worked on it for a long time and set forth all our opinions in a book published last year under the title "The Criminal Law: An Attempt at a Theoretical Model." That's why, when the question of reform arose, the scholars were able to immediately put ready-made proposals on the table. And the commission's work proceeded as follows: we placed our "model" code on one side and the existing legislation on the other side. Then we decided what should be changed and what should not be changed.

[Question] Ninel Fedorovna, please tell us what principles constituted the foundation of the commission's work.

[Answer] Our overall task is the multifaceted intensification of criminal laws in the fight against crime. And the means to accomplish this task comprise decriminalization—the maximum reduction of the number of punishable acts, humanization—i.e., in charging a person with

criminal responsibility, we must observe the principle which we call "economy of repressions," and democratism—a broader participation by the public in the fight against crime.

It also seems important to me to enhance the role of norms concerning active repentance. If a person has made restitution for the harm he has caused and acknowledged his guilt, then there is no need to punish him. The importance of these norms has been substantially upgraded in the working drafts of the Fundamentals of the USSR Criminal Legislation and the RSFSR Criminal Code.

[Question] Judges and even investigators frequently complain that many articles in the Criminal Code have quite a few amendments. This greatly complicates practical work. Will the articles in the new code be more specific?

[Answer] After the adoption of the USSR Constitution in 1977 many legal scholars who, even prior to this, had pointed out shortcomings in the existing legislation began to note in their speeches and articles that this legislation needed to be thoroughly revised. But this matter did not go so far as a radical reform; everything was limited to some amendments and corrections. And so what we obtained was not a code but a kind of "Trishka's caftan," mended and darned all over. No sooner has a judge mastered a certain article than a new one appears in six months or so.

Many such examples were cited in December at the All-Union Conference of Jurists held at the MGU. Of course, instability in the legislation leads to instability in practical work. We have taken these factors into account in our work, but there are complications which are not so simple to avoid.

Take, for example, the so-called "blanket norms." These are references in the code to various sub-legal acts which it is impossible to indicate fully. There is an enormous number of regulations for the production of construction operations alone, and they are almost all different. In order to block the "arbitrariness" of blanket norms, we have specifically "attached" them to a particularly criminal-legal criterion of a crime. And already no kind of instruction will be able to alter our text. Let's say, for example, that the draft specifically indicates the responsibility of a person who has caused 2,000 rubles worth of harm, etc. Thus, the criminal-legal instruction has been maximally specified and formalized in the best sense of the word.

The same kind of work has also been done with the evaluative criteria of a crime. There is no longer any need to interpret such criteria broadly. Now it has been clearly written as follows: bribery on a large scale means more than 5,000 rubles, whereas larceny on a particularly large scale means more than 25,000 rubles. Of

course, there is also a downside here. Suppose a criminal is just three rubles "short" of reaching such a total, what should be done with him? We need to think over these problems a bit more.

[Question] As you said, the commission consists primarily of specialists. But is public opinion taken into consideration in developing the decisions involved?

[Answer] It certainly is. Please let me give you a characteristic example. S. Kelina, a doctor of juridical sciences and a member of our commission, wrote an article which was published in MOSKOVSKIYE VEDOMOSTI. Therein she laid the groundwork for the feasibility of abolishing capital punishment. A mass of responses from wrathful readers came pouring into the editors' offices; moreover, these were often insulting. In the commission itself opinions were also divided almost equally. The draft will soon be presented for discussion, and then any person will be able to state his or her suggestions.

[Question] Since we've already touched upon such a complex, constantly controversial topic as the abolition of capital punishment, could you please explain what changes may be expected with regard to this matter?

[Answer] Let me note right away that I personally favor its abolition. It has already been abolished three times in our country, and in the Foundations of the USSR Criminal Legislation even now it is written that capital punishment is a temporary measure. This punishment was likewise characterized in the first RSFSR Criminal Code, as published in 1922 and in the development of which V.I. Lenin participated.

In our draft the sphere of applying the highest measure of punishment has been limited to the following five items: for treason, a terrorist act, diversion, espionage, and premeditated murder with aggravating circumstances. This punishment will not be applied for economic crimes. Such a decision also evoked quite a few disputes. Many persons consider that there should be no place on earth for those who are guilty of major crimes such as those recently uncovered, for example, in Uzbekistan. But we were firm on this matter: money and a human life are values which are too incommensurate. The nature of the crime obviously does not correspond to the nature of the penalties in such cases.

Disputes are still ongoing about retaining capital punishment for the rape of minors. We have not yet arrived at a unified opinion with regard to this problem—the discussion will be all-decisive here.

[Question] Certain jurists consider that increasing the number of people's assessors could become one of the guarantees against judicial errors. What is your opinion on this matter?

[Answer] I think that, in trying cases involving particularly heinous crimes, for which very heavy penalties are provided, we need to increase the number of assessors. But for me the most important factor is not whether there are 3 or 12 of them, but rather the competence of the judges. We ought to select as people's assessors those persons who have proved themselves in public work—such as in a comrades' court or a detachment of people's volunteers. But it would be even better to accept former jurists who are now living on retirement pensions. Indeed, why not? There are so many of them, and they could talk with the judges on a professional level, rather than merely nodding their heads in assent, as is so often the case, unfortunately, at present.

[Question] It's no secret that imprisonment is frequently employed for people whose rehabilitation could be carried out without their being isolated from society. This applies, in particular, to minors....

[Answer] Liberalization of the legislation provides for a very useful approach to imprisonment. The commission is also working in this vein. In the draft the maximum of such punishment has been reduced to seven years, whereas for persons aged from 14 to 16, it has been lowered to five years. For adolescents who have committed petty crimes which the present legislation punishes by imprisonment of up to two years, we decided not to employ this measure at all.

[Question] Will defense attorneys be permitted to attend the initial phase of an investigation?

[Answer] The prevailing opinion is as follows: defense attorneys should participate in cases where crimes are allegedly committed by minors or persons with reduced amounts of responsibility and, in other cases,—from the time when the charges are presented.

[Question] The country's economy is now passing through a profound restructuring, cost accounting is being introduced at enterprises, and cooperatives are being created and strengthened. How do these processes influence the development of new legislation?

[Answer] They influence it very strongly, so much so that we sometimes simply lose our way and don't know how to extricate ourselves from a certain situation.

Here's a specific example. We always knew that buying up goods and then re-selling them in order to make a profit constitutes speculation, and such a point of view is confirmed in the existing legislation. But nowadays cooperatives have begun to appear, such as the well-known Ryazan Urozhay, which buy up fruits in the southern republics, haul them to their own places, and then sell them, of course, at higher prices.

At first we thought that there was no structure of speculation and that people were permitted to buy up items only in state stores. But neither is this a solution. What if someone suddenly creates a cooperative which acquires these same fruits directly in the localities for subsequent resale to other cooperatives?

Or what about the problem of a commercial, middleman type of operation? We've always considered this to be a crime. But nowadays it can no longer be spoken of as such because, after all, there are cooperatives which engage in the exchange of apartments, for example. And so there are heaps of such problems. But they must be solved; there's no place where we can escape from them.

Lithuania's State Administrative Apparatus Restructured

Ukase on Changes in State Administrative Organs
18000529 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
28 May 88 p 1

[Ukase of the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet On Changes in the System of the LiSSR State Administrative Organs, 27 May 88]

[Text] In order to improve the administration of this republic's national economy, the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet hereby decrees:

1. That the following shall be formed:

a republic-level LiSSR State Committee for Construction, after abolishing the LiSSR State Committee for Construction Affairs and the LiSSR Ministry of Construction;

a republic-level LiSSR State Committee for Fuel, after abolishing the LiSSR State Committee for Supplying Petroleum Products and the LiSSR State Committee for Gas Supply;

a republic-level LiSSR Ministry of Transport, after abolishing the LiSSR Ministry of Motor Transport and Highways;

a republic-level LiSSR Ministry of Labor and Social Security, after abolishing the LiSSR State Committee for Labor and the LiSSR Ministry of Social Security.

2. That the following shall be transformed:

the union-republic LiSSR Ministry of the Forestry and Timber Industry into the union-republic LiSSR Ministry of the Forestry Industry;

the union-republic LiSSR Ministry of the Furniture and Wood Processing Industry into the union-republic LiSSR Ministry of the Forestry Industry;

the union-republic LiSSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry into the republic-level LiSSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry.

3. That the following shall be abolished:

the LiSSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, LiSSR Ministry of Bakery Products, LiSSR State Committee for the Fishing Industry, after transferring their functions to the LiSSR State Agro-Industrial Committee;

the LiSSR State Committee for Cinematography, after transferring its functions to the LiSSR Ministry of Culture.

4. To introduce into Articles 24, 25, 26, and 27 of the LiSSR Law dated 12 December 1978 "On the LiSSR Council of Ministers" (VED, 1978, No 35-406; 1960, No 33-498; 1981, No 17-219, No 34-430; 1982, No 16-170; 1985, No 35-385; 1986, No 19-203, No 28-291; 1987, No 31-352; 1988, No 12-86) changes and additions, having set forth these articles in the following redaction:

"Article 24. Union-Republic LiSSR Ministries

The union-republic ministries of the LiSSR shall include the following:

Ministry of Internal Affairs,
Ministry of Health,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Ministry of Culture,
Ministry of Light Industry,
Ministry of the Forestry and Timber Industry,
Ministry of Public Education,
Ministry of Communications,
Ministry of Trade,
Ministry of Finance,
Ministry of Justice.

Article 25. Republic-Level LiSSR Ministries

The republic-level ministries of the LiSSR shall include the following:

Ministry of Consumer Services,
Ministry of Municipal Services,
Ministry of Local Industry,
Ministry of Labor and Social Security,
Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry,
Ministry of Transport.

Article 26. Union-Republic LiSSR State Committees

The union-republic state committees of the LiSSR shall include the following:

LiSSR State Planning Committee,
LiSSR State Agro-Industrial Committee,
LiSSR State Committee for the Protection of Nature,
LiSSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply,
LiSSR State Committee on Prices,
LiSSR State Committee for Statistics,
LiSSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting,
LiSSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade,
LiSSR Committee for State Security,
LiSSR State Committee for Supervision of Safe Working Practices in Industry and for Mine Supervision,
LiSSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports.

Article 27. Republic-Level LiSSR State Committees

The republic-level state committees of the LiSSR shall include the following:

LiSSR State Committee for Construction,
LiSSR State Committee for Fuel.

5. The LiSSR Council of Ministers shall be assigned the task of carrying out the necessary organizational measures stemming from the present Ukase.

New Appointments to State Administrative Organs
18000529 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
2 Jun 88 p 3 3 Jun 88 p 4

["Chronicle"]

[Text] In connection with the changes in the system of the LiSSR's state administrative organs, the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet has made the following appointments by means of ukases:

Morkunas, Vatslovas Antanovich—LiSSR minister of labor and social security;

Sheshlaukis, Bronislovas Aleksovich—chairman of the LiSSR State Committee for Construction.

Morkunas, Vatslovas Antanovich was born in 1933, Lithuanian, CPSU member, higher education—graduated from Lithuanian Agricultural Academy, Honored Cultural Figure of the LiSSR, member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, deputy to the LiSSR Supreme Soviet. Since 1973 he has worked as chairman of the LiSSR State Committee for Vocational Technical Education.

Sheshplaukas, Bronislovas Aleksovich was born in 1933, Lithuanian, CPSU member, higher education—graduated from Kaunas Polytechnic Institute imeni A. Snehkus, Honored Engineer of the LiSSR, candidate member of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, deputy to the LiSSR Supreme Soviet. Since 1978 he has worked as LiSSR minister of construction.

Lukashevichyus, Vitautas-Prantsishkus Vatslovich—LiSSR minister of forestry.

Minetas, Kazimeras Bolelavovich—minister of the LiSSR timber industry.

Lukashevichyus, Vitautas-Prantsishkus Vatslovich was born in 1932, Lithuanian, CPSU member, higher education—graduated from Lithuanian Agricultural Academy, Honored Forester of the LiSSR, member of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, deputy to the LiSSR Supreme Soviet. Since 1978 he has worked as LiSSR minister of the forestry and timber industry.

Kazimeras Boleslavovich was born in 1936, Lithuanian, CPSU member, higher education—graduated from Leningrad Forestry Academy imeni S. Kirov, member of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, deputy to the LiSSR Supreme Soviet. Since 1980 he has worked as LiSSR minister of the furniture and paper industry.

By decree of the LiSSR Council of Ministers. **Algimantas-Ionas, Natanovich Brazaytis** was appointed chief of the Main Administration for the Protection of State Secrets in the Press under the LiSSR Council of Ministers. **Mikolas Stasevich Slizyavichyus** has been relieved of these duties in connection with his retirement on a pension.

2384

Lithuania's Cardinal Sladkevicius Interviewed
18090002 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 15 Jul 88 p 2

[Interview with Cardinal Vincentas Sladkevicius by TIESA correspondent Mindaugas Barysas: "Lack of Love of One's Neighbor Is Most Harmful to Our Society"]

[Excerpts] **Vincentas Sladkevicius** was born on 20 August 1920 in **Kaisiadoris** rayon. He was the fifth child in a peasant family. He studied at the **Kaisiadoris** secondary school and at the **Kaunas** Jesuit high school from which he graduated in 1939, followed by studies at the **Kaunas Interdiocese Seminary**. He was ordained a priest 25 March 1944 and served in parishes at **Merkine, Aukstavaris, Kaisiadoris** and elsewhere. He taught at the **Kaunas Seminary**. He was a canon from 20 July 1956. He was consecrated a bishop on 25 December 1957. Since 26 April 1988 he has been head of the **Lithuanian Bishops' Conference**. He was designated cardinal on 26 May 1988 and invested into the College of Cardinals on 28 June.

[Question] First of all, we would like to congratulate you on the high esteem expressed by the Holy See for your work in its granting you the title of cardinal. Perhaps you could share with us some of your impressions of your visit to the Vatican for this occasion.

[Answer] The thing that makes me the happiest is that, in this instance, as never before, the focus was on the essence of the Lithuanian spirit. It was not my name as much as the name of Lithuania, which is so dear to us, that was honored. It was the first time that a Lithuanian prayer rang out right after the prayer in English in the Vatican's great hall, followed by prayers in German, French, Polish and other languages. It was gratifying that the name of Lithuania was mentioned in the press, and

not only in the Italian press. For example, the NEW YORK TIMES in its announcement noted that from 25 newly invested cardinals, two are Americans and one Lithuanian.

[Question] In our country the state is separate from the church. Though even in the earlier years, which were so difficult for all Soviet society, the clergy attempted to and knew how to comfort people and to engender spiritual strength. Now, the processes of restructuring having begun, new points of contact in church and state activities are appearing. What should be the focus here?

[Answer] Many painful wounds remain from the recent past. We all want them to be healed as quickly as possible.

Brother (the cardinal unexpectedly used this form of address), it was not long ago that the church was restricted in its activities. The sole exception was the propaganda movement of the peace supporters to which Catholic clergy were invited, as the saying goes, for show. Priests were even forbidden to advocate temperance. Charity work was not allowed, pity was moribund. The commemoration last year of the 600th anniversary of Lithuanian Christianity was used in many instances not for honoring the church's services to the nation or its culture, but frequently to strengthen anti-religious propaganda even more. Is this how the millenium of Russian Christianity was also recently commemorated?

It seems that the times are changing. But how are the losses to be retrieved? It is not always possible. That is why at present we all feel the lack of love of one's neighbor. For our society this lack is the most harmful. It is not very easy to overcome this. And it is particularly urgent today to foster love of one's neighbor, tolerance for the opinion of others, mutual understanding. These are the abc's of democracy.

In comparison to the recent past, changes are evident. New points of contact for joint undertakings will become clear later, when obstacles to the church's work are finally eliminated. We cherish such hopes.

[Question] More publications have recently been issued for religious community consumption. How should what has been done be evaluated, what causes you concern, what important work awaits in the near future?

[Answer] What has been done in the past are small crumbs. Rays of hope are appearing now. We hope for a truly bright new day.

We need religious books of a popular nature, we do not have any.

The matter of periodical publications is an urgent one for Catholics. Religion does not teach people evil. Today it is difficult not only to justify, but also to understand those people, particularly leaders, who used to look

askance at a practicing Catholic and even openly reproach him. It is time not only to declare, but also to put into practice everywhere in all aspects the equal rights of believers and non-believers.

[Question] The restructuring of society which we have begun encompasses a moral rebirth as well. What common fields of activity should there be here?

[Answer] Without a moral rebirth there can be no true restructuring of society. It is necessary to promote the moral education of people through combined efforts, so that life would be more uplifting and noble. The Lithuanian nation does not have to drown in alcohol, drunkenness was never her trait. There was, it seems, a serious effort to eliminate alcoholism. But how little has been done yet! Alcoholism has recently manifested itself in a most threatening form. This is because for a long time drunkards were indulged in every way, but what was the cost, not even considering the threat of our nation's degeneration, of using alcohol to fulfill the production plan. The tradesmen who sold more of it were not punished, as would be required by a sane mind, but given incentives, awarded bonuses.

Our common task, and one which can be postponed the least, is to raise people's morality, to bring up a good younger generation, our nation's future.

UD/mc

Soldiers, Students Help Restore Georgian Monument

18130421 Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian
27 Apr 88 p 1

[Article by Professor D. Khakhutaishvili, corresponding member of the Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences, director of the Batumi Niko Berdzenishvili Scientific-Research Institute: "Taking Account of Public Opinion and the Interests of the Public"; 1st paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The article "Sparkling Batumi," which we published in our newspaper on 11 February, probably made everybody think. This is confirmed by the letters to the editors coming in daily with more and more responses to this article.

This extremely interesting, essential, and well-argued essay is one more bit of evidence that our writers have their finger on the pulse of public opinion and are energetically responding to it.

Scientific collectives working in the autonomous republic fully share the viewpoint expressed in the article. They believe that the existence of the Batumi Petroleum Refinery, even after reconstruction, is totally unjustified ecologically, economically, and socially. Building the refinery was a grave mistake from the start. Why? If we make an in-depth study of the damage which this technically defective enterprise has inflicted upon the health

of the population and upon resort management in the 60 years of its existence; if we calculate the costs which the state has had to bear in treating people made sick by air and water pollution; if we draw up a list of the costs necessary to "clean up after" the refinery in the resort zone and restore ecological balance, then it becomes absurd, naive, and I venture even to say insolent to speak of any profit this enterprise has allegedly yielded!

As far as the refinery's management itself is concerned (and those who are in favor of reconstruction of the refinery in general), they appear to be prisoners of narrow departmentalism [vedomstvennost]; unfortunately, they can't seem to see past their own nose, as the saying goes.

Hence, as I have already said, the existence of a petroleum refinery in Batumi or anywhere else along the west Georgian seacoast is economically inefficient, ecologically criminal, and socially unjustified!

For this reason, Adjara's intelligentsia are very grateful for the decision taken by the conference of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, which testifies once more to the concern and understanding with which our republic's leadership deals with public opinion and the interests of the population.

06854

Georgian 'Political Prisoner' Rejects Dissident's Help

18130422 Tbilisi KOMUNISTI in Georgian
28 May 88 p 4

[KOMUNISTI interview with republic Procurator V. Razmadze under the rubric "Careful, It's Anti-Soviet!": "I Never Knew Him, I Don't Know Him, and I Don't Want To Know Him..."; subheading and first five paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] A Follow-Up

Readers will no doubt recall that our newspaper published an article titled "A Question For KOMUNISTI." It had to do with one Boris Kakubava, who along with six members of the staff of Tikhoretsk Sovkhoz was convicted of stealing state property in especially large amounts. The article focussed particularly on the fact that this man, who is serving time for economic crimes, has been declared a political prisoner by Z. Gamsakhurdia by the so-called "Georgian Committee for the Defense of Prisoners of Conscience" which he created.

This false information has been utilized by the foreign media, and here in our country certain interested persons have undertaken to defend him as a political prisoner and have published his appeal in one of the samizdat journals.

Some readers of this newspaper are interested in the essence of the case and have asked us for the necessary explanation.

In connection with this matter, our correspondent met with republic Procurator V. Razmadze, who made this statement:

As was noted in the 14 February 1987 issue of your newspaper, Boris Dzhotoyevich Kakubava, a veterinarian by training and a member of the CPSU until his arrest, used to work as a veterinary technician in the Sukhumi Meat Combine. Along with staff members of the meat combine and the Tikhoretsk Sovkhoz he was tried by the Abkhazian ASSR Supreme Court under Article 96(1) of the Georgian SSR Criminal Code for the theft of state property in especially large amounts.

B. Kakubava submitted an appeal and requested that we review his case, inasmuch as he considers that he did not take part in the theft of state property by the criminals and has been convicted unlawfully. Because of the emergence of new circumstances, the republic's Procuracy has deemed it necessary to make a detailed study of the criminal case against B. Kakubava, a study which is currently underway. As to whether B. Kakubava is a political prisoner and the author of the aforementioned "appeal," or whether he has any connection with his "defenders," you will get a better idea from excerpts taken from statements which he submitted to the republic Procuracy.

In one of them B. Kakubava writes: "I used to work as a veterinary technician in the Sukhumi Meat Combine. I consider my arrest to have been unlawful and the sentence handed down by the Abkhazian ASSR Supreme Court unjust. I appeal to you to review this unlawful sentence.

"...On 3 February 1988, while in prison, I found out that Zviad Gamsakhurdia intended to defend me. I wish to inform you that I have never met Zviad Gamsakhurdia, I have never heard his voice nor am I acquainted with him by correspondence [zaочно]. Neither I nor my associates have ever passed on any paper to him or any appeal connected with my case, nor have I asked him for help. All I know is that he is the son of a great Georgian writer, but I don't know him. I don't know what kind of 'public service' [deyatelnost] he is engaged in or what his views on life are. I do not wish to take any interest in him, because once I saw him on national television when he spoke and begged forgiveness for his errors. I might add that I got a very bad impression of this man; and, naturally, I don't need him to defend me...."

In a second statement, which is dated 19 April of this year, B. Kakubava notes: "I have acquainted myself with a collection of documents which includes 'An Appeal to the Georgian People,' allegedly written by myself. I repeat that I do not know Zviad Gamsakhurdia and have never met him. I have never passed on any paper to him, and I did not write the 'Appeal to the Georgian People....' I have not considered it necessary to seek support from any group or persons such as Gamsakhur

dia or other renegades who, without my knowledge or consent, have written some kind of appeal and are speculating on my name. I don't need their help and I don't want them to utter or use my name for the sake of their own ends. I repeat that I never knew them, don't know them, and I don't want to know them."

This, then, is B. Kakubava's attitude toward Z. Gamsakhurdia and other groups who are in fact trying to concoct

things in their own favor and utilize B. Kakubava's name.

As far as the review of B. Kakubava's case is concerned, we are currently making a detailed study of it as I mentioned above, and we will make a decision in accordance with the law.

06854