



# ***JPRS Report***

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

## **Soviet Union**

### ***Political Affairs***

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

19980812 117

10  
62  
A04

# Soviet Union

## Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-019

### CONTENTS

24 MAY 1988

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

#### PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

- Crimean Tatars Bring Requests to TaSSR CP CC Meeting  
[*TadzhikTA; KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, 24 Apr 88 p 1*] ..... 1
- TaSSR CP Central Committee Decree Responds to Politburo Criticism on Education  
[*KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, 31 Mar 88*] ..... 1

#### HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

- Philosophical Pluralism Contrasted With Dogmatism of Stalinist Era  
[*Yu. Furmanov; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 12 Mar 88*] ..... 5
- Georgian Academics Dispute Definition of 'New Historical Form of Society'  
[*V. Keshelava; KOMMUNIST GRUZII, Jan 88*] ..... 8
- Roundtable on Efforts to Eliminate Blank Spots in Soviet Estonian History  
[*A. Prisyazhnyy; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 25 Mar 88*] ..... 11

#### CULTURE

- Critic Blasts Literary Conservatives, Stalinists [N. Ivanova; *OGONEK, No 11, Mar 88*] ..... 15
- Writer Mikhalkov Describes Relationship With Stalin [F. Medvedyev; *OGONEK, No 12, 19-26 Mar 88*] . 22
- Prominent Author Describes Zoshchenko Stand Against Zhdanov, Writers Union  
[D. Granin; *OGONEK, No 6, 6-13 Feb 88*] ..... 28
- Estonian CC Secretary Defends National Culture [I. Toome; *SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 3 Apr 88*] ..... 36
- Latvian Cultural Restoration Goals Discussed  
[V. Daugmalis; *KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII, No 4, Apr 88*] ..... 41

#### SOCIAL ISSUES

- Estonian MVD Official Discusses New Visa Regulations  
[M. Pays; *SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 27 Mar 88*] ..... 43

#### REGIONAL ISSUES

- Armenian Komsomol Exhorted to 'Internationalist Brotherhood'  
[Editorial; *KOMSOMOLETS 29 Mar 88*] ..... 46
- Joint Armenian-Azerbaijani Komsomol Resolution on Increasing Interaction  
[Editorial; *KOMSOMOLETS 7 Apr 88*] ..... 47
- Appeal to Armenian Komsomol Members for Discipline, Public Order [KOMSOMOLETS; 24 Mar 88] . 48
- Official on Armenian Efforts To Provide Education for Azerbaijani Residents  
[I. Mamedov; *KOMMUNIST 24 Mar 88*] ..... 48
- Armenian Government Scores Failures, Lagging in Development of Cooperatives  
[Armenpress; *KOMMUNIST, 12 Feb 88*] ..... 50
- Officials on New Uzbek Water Resource Management Organization  
[N. Sadullayev; *PRAVDA, 11 Mar 88*] ..... 54
- Benefits of Using Urbanites in Uzbek Cotton Harvesting Questioned  
[V. Sokolov; *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 16 Mar 88*] ..... 55
- Dissemination of Unverified Ecological Disaster Data Decried [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 2 Apr 88] ..... 58
- Safety of Ignalina AES Operation Underscored ..... 58

**Crimean Tatars Bring Requests to TaSSR CP CC Meeting**

18300235 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA  
in Russian 24 Apr 88 p 1

[TadzhikTA report: "In the TaSSR CP Central Committee"]

[Text] On 21 April in the TaSSR CP Central Committee there was a meeting with a group of representatives of Crimean Tatars living in Tajikistan.

In the course of the discussion they expressed understanding for the measures being conducted in the republic toward satisfying the spiritual needs of citizens of Crimean Tatar nationality. It was observed that these measures in particular facilitate the level of informedness and also facilitate providing the Crimean Tatars with periodicals and literature in their native language, making it possible to meet their cultural demands. The group was created to systematize all the statements and proposals of the Crimean Tatars. Acting on this group's recommendations, local authorities will take measures in accordance with their statements and proposals. It was explained to the Crimean Tatars that the most important and difficult problems will be directed to a state commission.

It was observed that the working group has made significant efforts to meet with citizens of the Crimean nationality and to review their questions.

At the meeting a question was raised concerning the quality and the time of radio programs in the Crimean Tatar language and the shortage of newspapers in their native language. Until now editorial boards have not been staffed with qualified personnel. It was suggested that the Crimean Tatar activists assist Gostelradio and the addendum to the newspaper LENINABADSKAYA PRAVDA called YYLDYZ (ZVEZDA), which is in the process of being organized, in selecting specialists capable of guaranteeing high-quality publications and broadcasts. Despite improvements in the media's illumination of the work, life, and culture of the Crimean Tatars, all possibilities are not yet being exploited.

A question was raised at the meeting about improving the activity of the republic working group, strengthening its staff, fixing its permanent location in Dushanbe, and providing it with organizational technology and creating optimal working conditions. The need has arisen to create an independent artistic collective from among gifted Crimean Tatars and to organize cooperatives for preparing national cuisine. A question was asked on the possibility of an organized resettlement of the Crimean Tatars to Krym Oblast and the reestablishment of Crimean Tatar autonomy. It was explained that to accomplish this time, restraint, patience, balance, and responsibility are needed. The Crimean Tatar representatives were told that all questions must be solved taking into account the interests of all Soviet people. The state

commission is giving consideration to this in its work. The conviction was expressed that it is necessary to create everywhere the conditions for improved satisfaction of the population's needs, including those of the Crimean Tatars, and to solve efficiently the questions that arise, within the framework of the law. It was emphasized that the Crimean Tatars living in Tajikistan, together with all the republic's workers, are making a worthy contribution toward fulfilling the tasks of the 12th Five-Year Plan.

Participants in the meeting were: TaSSR Communist Party Central Committee Secretary A. D. Dadabayev, TaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Deputy Chairman I. F. Dedov, and TaSSR Communist Party Central Committee department chiefs Yu.Ye Sukhov and D.L. Latifov.

**TaSSR CP Central Committee Decree Responds to Politburo Criticism on Education**

18300218 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA  
in Russian 31 Mar 88 pp 1,3

[Decree of the Tajik CP Central Committee Ninth Plenum on the Course of the Reform in General-Educational, Vocational, and Higher Schools and the Tasks of the Republic's Party Organization Regarding Its Improvement, 26 Mar 88]

[Text] Having listened to and discussed the report by Comrade K.M. Makhkanov, first secretary of the Tajik CP Central Committee, entitled "On the Course of the Reform in General-Educational, Vocational, and Higher Schools and the Tasks of the Republic's Party Organization Regarding Its Improvement," the plenum of the Tajik CP Central Committee notes that party, soviet, and economic organs, as well as public organizations and public-education organs, have accomplished some specific work on carrying out the reform in general-educational and vocational schools, in restructuring higher and secondary specialized education in the republic. However, the depth and pace of the changes have lagged behind the society's needs in the new phase of perestroika. In such important trends as developing and implementing the concept of uninterrupted education in the republic, strengthening the instructional-and-material base, as well as improving the methodological, scientific, and personnel staff support of the instructional-and-educational process, progress has been insignificant. The level of party leadership in restructuring public education and in developing democratic processes in this field has obviously fallen short.

The TaSSR Ministries of Education, Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, the TaSSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, and their organs in the localities have manifested passivity and sluggishness in solving the urgent problems of educational development. Aid to schoolteachers and instructors all too often boils down to general purposes and petty regulation. Pupil and student self-government is

not being introduced in a satisfactory manner, nor do the links between schools, families, and the society in general measure up to the requirements of the reform. Many educational institutions fail to provide for merging instructional and extracurricular educational work.

The TaSSR Council of Ministers has been unable to combine the effects of this republic's Gosplan, Gosagroprom, ministries and departments, as well as the Academy of Sciences, for the purpose of comprehensively solving the problems of restructuring secondary and higher education.

The Plenum of the Tajik CP Central Committee hereby decrees the following:

1. The decrees of the February (1988) Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, entitled "On the Speech by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev at the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee" and "On Progress in Restructuring Secondary and Higher Schools and the Party's Tasks with Regard to Implementing It," shall be adopted as the unwavering, guiding principle and shall constitute the foundation for the activities of all this republic's party, soviet, and economic organs, as well as those of public organizations and labor collectives.

2. In light of the decisions made by the February (1988) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the positions stemming from the speech which Comrade M.S. Gorbachev delivered there, and the criticism which Comrade Ye.K. Ligachev in his report at the Plenum leveled at our republic, it shall be required that the appropriate conclusions be drawn and additional measures be adopted without delay for the purpose of eliminating the shortcomings and omissions which exist in public education.

It must be considered that the following factors comprise the fundamentally important conditions for accelerating perestroika in public education: a change of attitude toward the role and work of the schoolteacher, delivering him from a petty stewardship, freeing him from duties which are irrelevant to the work of teaching, applying all measures of support for a creative, innovative quest, freeing up the maximum amount of time for the process of teaching and educating pupils.

3. The organs of public education, public organizations, and pedagogical collectives shall concentrate their efforts on further improving the forms and methods of the communist education of the student youth, molding the latter's consciousness in the spirit of perestroika, enhancing the prestige of the principal work of pupils and students—their studies. During their school hours students and pupils should not be involved in projects which are unconnected with the process of studying. Such young people should be taught and prepared to live

under the conditions of more thoroughgoing democracy. We must adopt effective forms for the moral, legal, patriotic, internationalistic, and atheistic education of young people.

There shall be a coordinated development of Tajik-Russian bilingualism and multilingualism, as well as a radical improvement in teaching the humanities, including the history of Tajikistan.

4. The leading organs of public education shall develop collegial, democratic forms for administering VUZ's and tekhnikums. The leading officials of educational institutions and their main subdivisions shall consistently embody the principle of electivity and accountability. By the beginning of the school year public-education councils shall be created under the city and rayon Soviets of People's Deputies. Administration of school and vocational-technical education in oblasts will be combined.

In order to ensure a balance between the amounts of training received by specialists at VUZ's, tekhnikums, and vocational-technical schools, on the one hand, and the genuine needs for them by the republic's national economy, on the other hand, the TaSSR Gosplan, the State Committee for Labor, the State Committee for Statistics, and the TaSSR Academy of Sciences, as well as this republic's organs of public education, working together with the local Soviets of People's Deputies, shall be assigned the task of elaborating a system for administering manpower resources.

5. TaSSR CP obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms shall be obligated to channel the activity of primary party organizations of educational institutions into increasing the effectiveness of teaching personnel and the quality of the instructional-educational process, into developing democracy in schools. They must make a timely and deeply penetrating investigation into the contents of the work being done by the educational institutions, and they must solve the problems which come up in a competent, businesslike manner. Taking into account the small number of party organizations in schools, colleges, and tekhnikums, rayon and city party committees must ensure the growth of party influence in the life of their collectives not only by the efforts of schoolteachers who are party members but also by Communist parents, as well as party organizations of base enterprises and staff members of party raykoms and gorkoms.

Maximum use should be made of the possibilities for organizations of war and labor veterans, republic-level Societies for Knowledge, book-lovers, efficiency experts and inventors, DOSAAF, the republic-level cultural fund, the Children's Fund imeni V.I. Lenin, and women's councils in educating the rising generation in preschool institutions, schools, vocational-technical schools, tekhnikums, and VUZ's near their places of residence. We must intensify our concern for forming

strong, morally healthy, spiritually rich families, and for women who become mothers. We must also deepen the mutual cooperation between the family, the school, and labor collectives .

6. In order to strengthen the aesthetic education of children, young fellows, and girls, to imbue them with a long-lasting immunity against tastelessness and the influence of bourgeois "pop culture," the Tajik Trade Unions Council and the Tajik Komsomol Central Committee, working in conjunction with the TaSSR Ministry of Culture, Goskino, the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and the creative unions, shall acquaint them systematically and intelligibly with the best achievements of worldwide, domestic, and national culture, take all measures to develop artistic creativity, skillfully and persistently propagandize genuine folk art.

The TaSSR State Committee for Physical Education and Sports, along with the public-education organs engaged in work to develop physical education and sports, shall fully utilize the existing base of educational institutions, sports societies, and enterprises, regardless of their departmental jurisdiction, and shall enhance the quality of training physical-education personnel.

7. The TaSSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, public-education organs, and the TaSSR Academy of Sciences shall radically improve the matter of preparing and publishing textbooks, sets of instructional materials, instructional-methods and visual aids, including those to be utilized with the help of technical means of instruction, and likewise pedagogical literature taking bilingualism into account. We must fully supply the needs of pupils, teachers, and even parents for these materials; and we must organize an additional output of textbooks for sale to the general public.

The TaSSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply shall exercise special monitoring controls over the delivery of the necessary furniture and equipment to all educational institutions, including schools. In order to accomplish this task, the ispolkoms of the local soviets must utilize the possibilities of the industrial enterprises which are situated on their territory.

8. During the current year the TaSSR Council of Ministers shall complete working out the program for uninterrupted education in this republic for the years 1990-2005, taking into account the requirements of the decree passed by the February (1988) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, and shall introduce it for consideration by the Tajik CP Central Committee Buro. Provision shall be made in this program for implementing measures to strengthen the material and technical base of public education, its technical renovation, and the development, especially in rural localities, of a network of children's preschool institutions, outfitted in accordance with present-day requirements.

We must gradually increase the funds expended on public education in order to strengthen the material base of higher, secondary specialized, and vocational schools, to carry out their construction in accordance with up-to-date plans and with a high degree of quality. We must create the possibilities for improving the social-everyday conditions for instructors, students, and pupils, as well as the medical services available to them.

We must utilize the experience of the Pendzhikentskiy Rayon with regard to drawing upon the funds of the population for building socio-cultural types of facilities.

9. In conjunction with the leading public-education organs, the TaSSR Gosplan, Tajik Trade Unions Council, and Gosagroprom shall introduce to the TaSSR Council of Ministers during the first half of 1988 a proposal to improve the conditions of work, everyday life, and rest for pedagogues, having in mind planning and helping to construct individual houses, sanatoriums, and rest homes, along with boarding-houses, preventive-medicine clinics, and teachers' homes, at the expense of the state budget, as well as to be paid for from other sources.

Specific deadlines for solving these problems shall be set for each oblast, city , and rayon.

The TaSSR Ministry of Trade and Union of Consumers' Societies, along with the public-education organs, shall be obligated to radically improve public dining in children's preschool institutions, schools, vocational-technical schools, as well as secondary and higher educational institutions. Beginning with the current year, the Ministries of Light and Local Industries must provide for the complete needs of pupils for good-quality school uniforms. In developing new, contemporary designs for such uniforms, it is considered feasible to approach the problem in a differentiated manner, creatively taking climatic features and national traditions into account.

10. The editors of the republic-level and local newspapers and journals, as well as the TaSSR Gostelradio, shall competently and universally elucidate school life, the complex process of education and upbringing, reveal more profoundly the positive changes and difficulties in restructuring education, enhance the prestige of the pedagogical profession, and a teacher's hard, honorable work. We must root out conservatism and dogmatism in the organization and administration of the educational field, disseminate more widely the experience of the best pedagogical collectives, teachers, and educators, along with the work of base enterprises.

\*\*\*

The Plenum of the TaSSR CP Central Committee emphasizes that the sphere of educating and bringing up the rising generation is a matter of party-wide and nation-wide importance. And it expresses firm confidence that party committees, soviet organs, ministries

and departments, public formations, pedagogical collectives, and their primary party organizations will do everything to ensure the unconditional implementation of the decisions made by the 27th CPSU Congress, the

February (1988) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, and the points contained in the speech which Comrade M.S. Gorbachev made there, and that they will raise this republic's public-education system to a qualitatively new level.

### Philosophical Pluralism Contrasted With Dogmatism of Stalinist Era

18000224a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in  
Russian 12 Mar 88 p 8

[Article by Yu. Furmanov, candidate of philosophical sciences, assistant professor at Moscow State Institute of Historical Archives, under rubric "More Democracy, More Socialism": "Lessons Derived From One Discussion"]

[Text] The wave of criticism and self-criticism in the social sciences that has encompassed broad segments of the intelligentsia recently, it would seem, is capable once again, as occurred after the 20th Party Congress, of turning into a genuine "ninth wave." On the pages of newspapers and magazines and in scientific and educational institutions, heated discussions deal with the reasons for the phenomena of stagnation and even of crisis in the social sciences. Once again, as in the 1960's, the "Stalinist times" are being subjected to sharp criticism.

Well, this is correct, since, without criticism of the ideological past, it is impossible for the ideological restructuring of the present to arise and proceed at full speed. Nevertheless, one is alarmed by the fact that the participants in the discussions once again have leaned toward locating in the "Stalinist times" individual seeds of dogmatism, instead of revealing with "scientific mercilessness" the roots of those phenomena. There is something else that is disturbing. Will the criticism of the state of the social sciences not result in something that has already occurred — will that criticism not develop into the attempt to fence itself off from the historical past, or, even worse, will it become a screen behind which newer, more refined forms of scientific adaptability will follow?

We shall not understand the reasons for the phenomena of stagnation in the social sciences until we become completely aware of the fact that dogmatism is not simply a type of mental process that is socially unmotivated, but is a completely defined social institution. Dogmatism arose when the Marxist critical method was turned into an organized method of criticizing every heterodoxy, when a phenomenon that became widespread was the bureaucratic parasitizing of the works of the classic authors of Marxism-Leninism for protective purposes, and when the methods of scientific, philosophical discussion among the Marxist schools in our countries that occurred in the 1920's were reduced to forms of the political struggle.

Everyone knows the course taken by Stalin and those who shared his views, the course aimed at creating in the country the desired "moral-political unity" under the flag of "Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism." In I. V. Stalin's article "Against the Vulgarization of the Slogan of Self-Criticism," which was published in 1928, under the guise of "Bolshevik self-criticism," the goal already

being pursued was the eradication of every heterodoxy: "It is necessary to make a strict differentiation between this destructive, anti-Bolshevik 'self-criticism' that is alien to us, and our Bolshevik self-criticism, which has as its goal the implanting of party spirit, the consolidation of Soviet authority, the improvement of our construction, the strengthening of our economic cadres, and the arming of the working class."

Dogmatism as systematic and organized orthodoxy under the conditions of the ideological struggle was introduced into the awareness of the intelligentsia by various methods. The struggle against the real enemies of Marxism and socialism gradually began taking on ugly doctrinaire forms of a struggle against all kinds of heterodoxy. As the claims that Stalin and those who shared his views had on the possession of the true interpretation of Marxism-Leninism intensified, the intolerance of heterodoxy took on increasingly authoritarian forms. The "erring" intellectuals were "corrected," and soon they either "joined the formation," or disappeared physically or ideologically and spiritually.

The struggle against heterodoxy in the social sciences most frequently took the forms of the struggle against academicism and objectivism. In a number of instances it was justified, inasmuch as, among the scientists, there was a striving to fence themselves off from the problems of the party's ideological work, to retreat from the problems of the struggle being waged by the working class into "pure" theory and classical problem areas. However, the accusations of academicism were frequently constructed on the foundation that, in various works of a theoretical and methodological nature, it was impossible in a completely unambiguous way to espouse their identity with the "true" interpretation of Marxism-Leninism.

The accusations of objectivism were much more serious. Here too, against a background of the struggle against true uncritical objectivism, which opened up for itself a path to the cognition of social reality, one began to observe the application of labels which, as everyone knows, led to a hail of unjustified repressions. Suffice it to recall the so-called "errors of Pokrovskiy," whose historical works simply had a ban placed upon them.

Dogmatism in the social sciences took on considerably more dangerous forms when the implanting of orthodoxy began to be carried out in pseudodemocratic organizations for various scientific discussions. After the war, a large-scale discussion was held on G. F. Aleksandrov's textbook "History of Western European Philosophy," a discussion which BOLSHEVIK magazine would subsequently call "a remarkable model of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism." This "model" set the tone for extending similar discussions in the other sciences.

Soon after that discussion, in February 1948, at the All-Union Conference on Darwinism, a campaign was begun — which campaign was "successfully" completed

at the notorious session of VASKHNIL — to defeat the “reactionary theory of Weissmanism-Morganism.” Many major Soviet geneticists became victims of that campaign. The reader can judge the negative consequences of the phenomenon of Lysenkoism by referring to the numerous items published in recent times. In 1951 a new wide-scale discussion was organized around the mockup of a textbook on political economics, the course of which discussion was closely followed by Stalin. A year later, in his pamphlet “Economic Problems of Building Socialism in the USSR”, he would sum up the conference results, and his comments would form the basis of the first textbook on political economics.

The discussion that developed 40 years ago around G. F. Aleksandrov's book on the history of philosophy was, in a certain sense, a landmark one that officially and irreversibly confirmed the dogmatism in the social sciences. It is also remarkable in that it set the model for discussions in which the force of argument was replaced by the argument of force.

The 1947 discussion was organized with the aim of reinforcing the situation on the philosophical front and on the ideological front as a whole. What was there that Stalin did not like about that situation? After all, it would have seemed that an end had been put, once and for all, to the opposition, to the heterodoxy, and that his authority in the question of philosophy, as incidentally in all the other questions, was indisputable. It would seem, however, that the crux of the matter lay in the following.

Under conditions when the focus of the class struggle was shifting into the area of international relations, Stalin obviously was seriously concerned that the victory of the troops in the anti-Hitler coalition might sow among the intelligentsia an illusion concerning the weakening of the class struggle, or might evoke among the intellectuals deviations in the direction of bourgeois liberalism and the uncritical perception of bourgeois culture and philosophy. It must be said that such fears were not groundless, either at that time or subsequently. Stalin, however, attached an overly exaggerated importance to them. That occurred not only by virtue of the personal traits in his character, his tendency to suspect that everything small contained something large, but chiefly because he had long since ceased to make the distinction between democratization and liberalization and in every instance of free-thinking he saw a possible threat to his own ideas concerning the “purity” of socialism and its ideology.

While propagandizing in his works the idea of the “invincibility of the new” that allegedly evolved directly from the law of the negation of negation, he simultaneously felt that that law did not guarantee the “purity” of socialism and its ideology and that it was “only in the struggle against bourgeois prejudices in theory that one can achieve the reinforcement of the positions of Marxism-Leninism.” In this pronouncement itself there is

nothing non-Marxist. The question, however, lies in the fact that the reinforcement of the positions of Marxism-Leninism was being carried out in practice not by way of the internal development of that theory, but only by methods that frequently were remote from the ideological struggle. Having not too much trust in the intelligentsia, upon which, to no small degree, the success of that struggle depended, he began after the war, by making use of his authority, to conduct organized campaigns to check the scientific and cultural figures for their “purity” with respect to their having resisted bourgeois influences.

And yet, the reader might ask, was it necessary at that time to devote such careful attention to a discussion concerning a textbook on the history of philosophy? It would seem that the desired effect could have been obtained from a discussion on historical and dialectical materialism. The fact of the matter is that this was not the first textbook that had been subjected to discussion. Suffice it to recall the well-known 1934-1936 decrees concerning the teaching of history. In April 1947, on the eve of a repeated discussion of F. G. Aleksandrov's textbook, a discussion was held dealing with S. L. Rubinshteyn's textbook “Principles of General Psychology”, in which the author of the textbook was reproached for not having limited the subject of psychological science to the psychology of Soviet man. Secondly — and this is the chief consideration — after the publication of Stalin's work “The Dialectical in Historical Materialism”, there was no need to undertake any extensive campaign dealing with these areas of philosophical knowledge, since no one could have any doubt about the degree of completion of the structure of Marxist-Leninist philosophical thought that had been “brilliantly executed” in that work. At the same time the ideologists in the Stalinist leadership were well aware that the apparent remoteness of the history of philosophy from the demands of the immediate ideological struggle created for it a certain field for free-thinking that was capable of undermining the immutable principle concerning the absolute opposition of all Marxism-Leninism to all thought that preceded it.

It was precisely that immutable principle that had been violated by F. G. Aleksandrov in his textbook, for which — such is the irony of fate — he had been given a Stalin Prize in 1946. We shall not venture to guess how that mistake occurred, but it remains a fact that the author was accused of “objectivism,” of having been excessively “infatuated” with depicting the evolutionary history of the arising of Marxism to the detriment of its revolutionary essence, and thus having allegedly ignored the principle of adherence to party spirit. The concept of the “purity” of socialism and its ideology, at the basis of which lay the equating of philosophy, ideology, and policy, not only put a ban on any possible borrowings from the bourgeois science of the present, but also put a maximum limitation on the influence exerted on Marxism-Leninism by pre-Marxist bourgeois philosophy. According to that concept, the arising of Marxism was



spasmodic, and therefore, in its very genesis, there had been a rupturing of the umbilical cord that linked it, in particular, with German classical bourgeois philosophy. The formula "'pure' genesis, 'pure' Marxism-Leninism, 'pure socialism,' 'pure' Stalinist ideology" was supposed to become an invincible bulwark against the penetration into the ideological system of any elements alien to it.

Despite the fact that this formula was not only extremely erroneous, but also a harmful one that contradicted the open nature of Marxism-Leninism and its dialectical theory, it was rapturously accepted by many participants in the discussion. Nevertheless the task that they faced was no easy one: it was necessary, in essence, to carry out the denial of German classical philosophy as the theoretical source of Marxism under conditions when every student knew V. I. Lenin's work "Three Sources and Three Components of Marxism", in which, in addition to criticism, it was stated that Marxism is the "lawful successor of all the best that was created by mankind in the nineteenth century in the person of German classical philosophy, English political economy, and French socialism."

We do not set as our goal the retelling of the course taken by the discussion. If one wishes, one can become acquainted with the stenographic report on that discussion, which was published in issue No. 1, 1947 of VOPROSY FILOSOFII. We do not follow the goal of making any participant in the discussion more or less responsible for his personal contribution to reinforcing the positions of orthodoxy and dogmatism not only during the discussion, but also after it. Those who are still alive include persons who worked quite a bit in that area, and certain of them, as V. S. Semenov recently said in VOPROSY FILOSOFII, "once again the 'first' are already appealing to us to show boldness and are marching 'up ahead' of the processes of glasnost and perestroika. And all this time there has been not a single word of self-criticism. It is as though nothing happened." The most beneficial thing that can be drawn from this discussion that occurred 40 years ago is the reminding of people of the distortions in the sphere of education and culture that can result from the atmosphere of oppressive intolerance of heterodoxy, from the orthodoxy and dogmatism that fear bold creative thought. Among the lessons of the discussion there are none that would be unknown. However, according to Hegel's apt expression, "The well-known, from the fact that it is well-known, is not yet known." Soviet philosophical thought and social studies as a whole currently need, more than they ever have, discussions that are free of dogmatism, need organized discussions without any authoritarian pressure. "Today's processes should not be adjusted to fit old formulas... The search for truth must proceed by way of the comparison of various points of view, discussion, the breaking of previous stereotypes," M. S. Gorbachev said at the All-Union Conference of Social-Science Department Heads.

We shall attempt, however, to sum up the results of that very significant 1947 discussion.

The wide spread of dogmatism in the social sciences in the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's was the reflection of crisis phenomena in the practice of the building of socialism, a practice that contradicted the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. That dogmatism grew and became stronger under conditions of the ignoring or underevaluation of the personal factor in socialist building, the absolutization of the bureaucratic-centrist and administrative-command methods of managing public life, deviations from the principles of democracy and social justice, and the ignoring of the relative independence of the superstructure with respect to the social base. That dogmatism fulfilled the function of "substantiating" the theory of the "moral-political unity of the Soviet nation" at the price of slurring over the real contradictions that arose in the development of our society, which society was capable allegedly by the "evolutionary method" of arriving at the "bright future."

The discussion of the 1940's indicated that, when philosophy too closely, too realistically proves to be linked with current policy, that inflicts harm both to philosophy itself and to policy. By acquiring protective functions, it takes the path of self-elimination, self-removal from social practice.

Wherever authoritarian evaluations of individual persons prevail, there is no free conscience and there can be none, and wherever there is no free conscience, there is no free creative thought and there can be none.

Hiding under the umbrella of the "most holy" authoritarian opinion, almost everyone feels that he is fearless and without sin in the face of the strong persons in this world and from the positions of his irreproachability and invulnerability he experiences the persistent desire to locate "dark spots" on his opponent's suit. And, once again returning to the discussion in past years, I might note that it is possible to cite dozens of examples of reciprocal stupefaction, the tacking on of labels, the ascribing to one's opponents of words that he has never said, of blows below the belt, and even of almost unconcealed appeals to higher administrative echelons to achieve the "brainwashing" of one's opponents. The methods are still viable, and albeit more and more infrequently, they continue to be used today.

The discussion of those years showed that the methods of criticism and self-criticism, in and of themselves, do not serve as a panacea against dogmatism, objectivism, and subjectivism. Wherever they are used to serve as a monitor over thought, as a means of censuring it, criticism and self-criticism as substantial factors in cognitive reflection and self-reflection are turned into defensive mechanisms of attack or repentance, using at such time all the power of the demagoguery and rationalization of the "best" models represented in it. Being external to thought, they can serve as forms that are convenient for sociopolitical mimicry and phraseological self-flagellation, for various kinds of speculations that are wrapped in the toga of scientific ethics.

The restructuring in philosophy, as in all other areas, requires not only the sober and fearless awareness of crisis phenomena, but also, and more importantly, the search for ways to eliminate them. That search has already begun.

The search that is perhaps the most difficult but at the same time the most vitally important one is the search for modern approaches to the interrelations among philosophy, ideology, and policy. It would seem that for such a search it is insufficient simply to criticize the "Stalinist times" or even to present bold plans for reorganizing the philosophical institutes and institutions. We need discussions on Marxist theory as a whole, keeping in mind the fact that Marxism develops in the process of replacing definite historical forms of it. Incidentally, such discussions have taken place in the place, but they did not yield any visible effect, since there had been no true diversity of positions. And it could not have been otherwise, since wherever there is no competitiveness among schools or positions dealing with the real problem of theory and practice, rather than around the "decreed truth," wherever the discussion occurs according to some previously assigned scenario and is under the strict view of the director, what dominates is not the logic of the matter, but the matter of the logic.

We continue to be enslaved by the delusion that the pluralism of positions in the theoretical-cognitive sense mandatorily presupposes or is influenced by political pluralism. Theoretical-cognitive pluralism, like criticism and change, is not a bourgeois, but a Marxist concept.

Criticism and self-criticism is a form of development of Marxism from unity to diversity and from diversity to unity. The principle of monism in Marxist-Leninist philosophy does not have anything in common with dogmatic monothought, which leads to the depersonalization of philosophical creativity. Marxist-Leninist philosophy does not deny and even presupposes the pluralism of true positions. It acts only as the opponent of undisciplined, anarchical thought that has been freed from the necessity to prove its claims on truth and humanitarianism.

5075

### **Georgian Academics Dispute Definition of 'New Historical Form of Society'**

*18300203 Tbilisi KOMMUNIST GRUZII in Russian  
No 1, Jan 88 pp 33-43*

[Report of a round table discussion led by V. Keshelava, editor-in-chief of KOMMUNIST GRUZII, with L. Toidze, doctor of historical sciences, senior research associate at the Institute of Party History of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee; Professor G. Chkhaidze, doctor of historical sciences, head of the scientific communism department at the Kutaisi State Pedagogical Institute imeni A. Tsulukidze; Professor L. Dzhakhaya, doctor of philosophical sciences, head of the philosophy department at the Georgian Institute of Subtropical Management; N. Kikvadze, candidate of historical sciences, director of the Center for Information Science in the Social Sciences of the Georgian SSR

Academy of Sciences; B. Bagateliya, candidate of historical sciences, docent at Abkhaz State University; Professor V. Chaniya, doctor of historical sciences, head of the scientific communism department at Abkhaz State University; Professor A. Mudzhiri, doctor of historical sciences, leading scientific associate at the Institute of History, Archeology, and Ethnography; L. Antonova, candidate of philosophical sciences, docent in the historical materialism department of Tbilisi State University; Professor I. Bogomolov, doctor of philosophical sciences, department chief at the GSSR Academy of Sciences Museum of the Friendship of Peoples; O. Demenia, candidate of philosophical sciences, docent and pro-rector at Abkhaz State University: "Taking Account of the Multi-Nationality Factor"; first two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Excerpts]

"Nationality relations in our country are a vital question of a vital life." M.S. Gorbachev

Questions of how to improve inter-nationality relations and inter-nationality education in multi-nationality labor collectives were raised during a meeting organized by the editorial board of KOMMUNIST GRUZII for scholars from various cities in the republic and representatives of the Tbilisi Elektroapparat Production Association. Material from this meeting was published in the No 9, 1987 issue of the magazine. A continuation of this conversation was held in the Boris Dzeladze Komsomol complex; from this conversation we offer our readers a discussion by specialist scholars.

V. Keshelava, editor-in-chief of the journal KOMMUNIST GRUZII:

The subject of today's meeting is how to improve inter-nationality relations. And this is no accident. At every level of our public consciousness, whether in literature or criticism, journalism or historical-philosophical-sociological research (not to mention political theory), these questions firmly occupy one of the most central places. While it carries out radical transformations in all spheres of the life of society, the party also sets the task of significantly improving inter-nationality relations. The essence of the problem, as M.S. Gorbachev noted at the January (1987) plenum, is that "there is not a single question of principle which we could solve, either in the past or the present, without taking account of the fact that we live in a multi-nationality country."

In addition, attention should be paid to another circumstance related to changes in the social structure of Soviet society. As class differences are erased, inter-nationality differences attract ever increasing interest because they have the property of persisting for much longer than class ones.

And finally, one must not underestimate the fact that the population of the union republics is ceasing to be homogeneous in terms of its nationality composition. This leads to changes in the nature of inter-nationality contacts: while previously they took place, as a rule, at the macro-level, taking the form of relations between large ethnic groups, now their individual aspect, their micro-level, must be taken into account as well. The significant growth in the number of multi-nationality regions, cities, settlements and labor collectives, as well as families in which the spouses are representatives of different nationalities and ethnic groups, leaves its imprint on inter-nationality relations.

I do not think that there is any need to emphasize that these problems are especially important for us in Georgia, which has a population whose multi-nationality composition is well known to everyone. I would only like to note that the republic and its party organization have experience in resolving many questions related to the economic, social and cultural development of autonomous units (the Abkhaz and Adzhar ASSR's and the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast). This experience (both its positive and negative aspects) awaits thorough scientific analysis and generalization. While using that experience as a foundation, our social scientists must draw conclusions and make their own recommendations to those engaged in practice.

In its preparations for this meeting, the editorial board used as its starting point a feeling of dissatisfaction with those materials on the nationality question which were sent to it by individual authors—a very small proportion of them has appeared on the pages of our magazine. The dissatisfaction arose from the extremely abstract nature of the arguments and their distance from reality.

It was precisely this feeling of dissatisfaction which gave rise to the desire to organize a "round table," at which the participants would move away from general phrases and would raise concrete questions based on actual experience.

Professor L. Dzhakhaya, doctor of philosophical sciences, head of the philosophy department at the Georgian Institute of Subtropical Management:

V.I. Lenin made a well-known statement that with the enormous diversity of social life, one can always cite any number of examples to support any position. And on the nationality question, clearly, our task consists of drawing conclusions and generalizations on the basis of a large mass of facts from which a pattern emerges.

In my view, the social and economic questions should be separated from the nationality ones, because the national development of peoples takes place parallel to socio-economic progress. We recognize the extreme importance of the nationality question for our multi-nationality state; however, it does not have such significance

for one-nationality countries. There are many multi-nationality states. We could name China, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland and Canada. These are also multi-lingual countries. For example, I would place great emphasis on the fact that the USSR is not only a multi-nationality but primarily a union state. The union form of organization for a socialist state substantially changes the nature of the resolution of the nationality question. For example, China is a multi-nationality state but not a union one, while Yugoslavia is both a multi-nationality and a union state. For this reason it is necessary to distinguish between the concepts of a union and a multi-nationality state. The Leninist idea of forming a union, soviet state had and has enormous political significance; we have not yet fully discovered all of the political potential contained in the idea of a voluntary union of fraternal peoples of the Soviet state.

Instead of this, when some people today talk about inter-nationality relations, they attempt to outstrip events, presenting the desired as the real and putting forward the thesis that the Soviet people is now a ready, developed "new historical community of people." Scholars in the social sciences have taken up this thesis; dissertations have been defended, and monographs have been written proving that this community has already been formed, that it exists. In reality, however, as the 27th CPSU Congress noted and the new edition of the CPSU Program has recorded, "a new social and inter-nationality community of people—the Soviet people—has been formed" in our country. But this is not the same thing as a "new historical community," similar to such historical forms of community as the clan, the tribe, the ethnic group or the nationality. In this regard it is useful to return once again to the original Leninist concept of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; this concept has not become obsolete; on the contrary, it has now become bigger than ever before, it is becoming the most suitable one for the nationality relations which have developed in the USSR. I do not by any means call for the complete retraction of this thesis about the "new historical form of a community of people" but it seems to me that it must be formulated as a process in which this form of a community of people will take shape in the future as a definite tendency toward it has already emerged. But what we have today as an actual community requires concentrated attention and careful analysis. Above all, if this community exists only in the USSR, if there is nothing else like it in the world and it cannot be compared with anything, then is it right to draw a conclusion from a single example?

N. Kikvadze, director of the Center for Information Science in the Social Sciences of the Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences, candidate of historical sciences:

In its time socialism in our country was also a singular phenomenon, a single example in world history; however, by drawing support from objective tendencies we correctly confirmed that this was a new socio-political system. I agree that in the social sciences there are now

many problems requiring re-interpretation and further refinement. This clearly includes such concepts as "nation" and "community." But, given all this, one must not ignore methodology or forget that in order to understand the mechanism behind the formation of a "community" as well as a "nation," it is essential to take into account their history, their developmental and formational process. I cite V.I. Lenin, who pointed out that one must not ignore that which contains the very essence and the living soul of Marxism—the requirement for concrete analysis of a concrete situation.

In this regard I would like to emphasize the correctness of the thesis concerning the formation—at a certain historical level and in a concrete situation—of such a community as the Soviet people.

B. Bagateliya, docent at the Abkhaz State University, candidate of historical sciences:

For my part I must acknowledge that I do not understand why the formulation concerning the Soviet people as a "new historical form of community of people" arouses objection. In my opinion this concept clearly expresses that unity—economic, political, ideological, etc.—which is characteristic of the peoples in our country, and which arose as a result of the commonality of their historical fate, especially since 1917.

L. Dzhakhaya: I am not asserting absolute truths; I am simply trying to clarify something. For example, how does the thesis about the "Soviet people as a new historical community of people" fit with the right of any union republic to leave the Union of SSR's, which is stipulated in the USSR Constitution? If objectively this community has been formed already, does not the very formulation of the question concerning the right of nationalities to self-determination and the right of any given Soviet republic to leave the USSR cease to make sense? One can leave a union state but not leave a "historical community of people."

In my view, it is perfectly correct to assert that the Soviet people, as a multi-nationality community, was formed within the framework of the union state, that it is a social and inter-nationality community, which is constantly being developed and possibly will develop into an "historical form of community" in the future.

L. Toidze: If I understood correctly, it is your opinion that to talk today about a new historical community—the Soviet people—is to jump ahead a bit. You think, it would seem, that this concept gained political and scientific currency after someone got the ball rolling? To me, however, this kind of attempt to find fundamental differences between the two definitions seems to be completely artificial.

Professor V. Chaniya, head of the department of scientific communism of Abkhaz State University, doctor of historical sciences:

In continuation of what has just been said, I want to note that previously, when there was talk about the Soviet people as a new historical community, it was viewed as nothing other than a social-inter-nationality community. Thus, the thesis about the social-inter-nationality community of Soviet persons is not something new, if we keep in mind the content of the concept of the Soviet people. Maybe this was not always emphasized with sufficient force and for this reason the main content of the concept was pushed into the background and was hidden by the formula about the new historical community.

L. Dzhakhaya: In clarifying my viewpoint, I would like to say that we are justified in talking and writing about the "Soviet people" in approximately the same way that we use in a collective sense the concept of the "Czechoslovak people," or the "Yugoslav people." In the opposite case, if we invest this term with something more and insist that we have before us a "new historical form of a community of people," we—as I understand it—lessen the meaning and belittle the role and timeliness of the friendship between Soviet peoples because with the achievement of this level of community, it is not so important whether the peoples forming the "new historical form of community" are friendly or hostile to each other. (For comparison: a nationality remains a nationality, even if it is torn apart by class contradictions). That is why it is necessary to clarify that the "Soviet people" is a time-tested national-political term, which instills a feeling of Soviet patriotism and internationalism, but when it is put forward as something more than the fraternal unity of free peoples, who have voluntarily joined together in a union, multi-nationality state, then things do not come out the way they should.

V. Chaniya: I have not so much a question as a lack of understanding with regard to the argument put forward here. I emphasize once again that it constitutes a serious misunderstanding to attempt to find serious variant readings between the definition of the Soviet people as a "new historical community" and its definition as a "social-inter-nationality community." It is one and the same.

Academician Kim has written that the Soviet people in the form of a new historical community of people was formed essentially in the mid-30's and that this was related mainly to the building of socialism. In addition, there is another opinion to the effect that the formation of the Soviet people should be linked directly with the 50–60 years of the building of socialism. I understand the position taken in the new edition of the CPSU Program on this question in the following way: a new historical community—the Soviet people—has already been formed. In my opinion, the concept of the Soviet people is correctly understood to include the decisive fact that our multi-nationality state is based on a common economy, political system, ideology, etc. This is not an ethnic community, but rather a social and inter-nationality one, as specified in the party documents.

Professor A. Mudzhiri, leading scientific associate of the Institute of History, Archeology and Ethnography of the Georgian SSR Academy of Sciences, doctor of historical sciences:

Today's meeting proves once again that the theory of nationality relations lags substantially behind the needs and development of practice, as was noted at the January (1987) CPSU Central Committee plenum. For this reason, it is clear, one needs to talk more boldly about those negative sides of the practice of nationality relations which we have had in order to extract lessons from them and draw correct theoretical conclusions. Recently there has been a lot of talk about the Alma-Ata events. They could have taken place in any multi-nationality republic where the nationality policy was being incorrectly implemented, and where inter-nationality education was being carried out badly. There is a completely reasonable need to analyze the roots, causes and consequences of such omissions and take them into account for the future.

It is well known that one aspect of the Alma-Ata events and their causes was an incorrect nationality policy on the personnel question. With regard to promotions, personnel policy must first of all take into account directly the political, vocational, business, and moral qualities of workers, as well as the nationality structure of society. It is obvious that in multi-nationality regions and republics all factors in the personnel policy, and of course the nationality factor, must be weighed optimally, in an especially careful manner.

I want to touch on one more question and that is the relation between assimilation and the amalgamation of nationalities. Unfortunately, in the literature these two concepts are frequently viewed as the same. Do we in the USSR today have the amalgamation of nationalities and ethnic groups? No, we do not. Amalgamation means the loss of national features and properties in general. Assimilation, however, is a completely different process, which implies the loss of particular national qualities and the acquisition of features of another nationality. This is probably a natural process. Today there are many people who by background belong to one nationality but who present themselves quite consciously as representatives of another nationality. For example, in a number (and a relatively large number) of cases it is difficult to draw the line between Abkhazis and Georgians because many Georgians (that is, people who are of Georgian origin) consider themselves to be Abkhazis and, vice versa, there are many Abkhazis who consider themselves Georgians.

8543

**Roundtable on Efforts to Eliminate Blank Spots in Soviet Estonian History**

18300211 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in  
*Russian* 25 Mar 88 pp 2-3

[Roundtable discussion with members of a working group under the Estonian CP Central Committee established to coordinate republic historical research, conducted by ETA special correspondent A. Prisyazhnyy: "Revealing the 'Blank Spots' of History: An ETA Roundtable Discussion]

[Text] Glasnost and democratization in the life of our society has naturally led to increased interest in problems of history within our republic as well as throughout the Soviet Union. We have dealt with many stages of our history until now dryly and schematically, simply ignoring a number of issues for the most part. Current interest is in the real lives of historical figures, depicted not in terms of black and white, but in all the complexity and contradictions of human nature in a particular historical situation.

The study of history is not easy. It requires coordination of activity. To consolidate efforts, a working group was established under the CPE Central Committee. What this working group has done and is engaged in doing was the topic of discussion at the most recent roundtable discussion sponsored by the Estonian Telegraph Agency (ETA). At the invitation of the ETA, the following participating members were present: N. Yuganson, member of the CPE Central Committee Buro and chairman of the Party Control Commission; Yu. Kakhk, academic secretary, Department of Social Sciences, ESSR Academy of Sciences; R. Pullat, director, Institute of History, ESSR Academy of Sciences; E. Kaup, Institute of Party History, Estonian CP Central Committee; and Yu. Roots, first deputy procurator, Estonian SSR.

[Correspondent] Who else is a member of the working group?

[N. Yuganson] Under the delegation of responsibilities among the members of the Estonian CP Central Committee Buro, I am charged with undertaking an in-depth study of historical problems. Within this working group, A. Aben, head of the Estonian CP Central Committee's Department of Science and Teaching Institutions, and A. Keyerna, vice president of the ESSR Academy of Sciences, are also members of the Estonian CP Central Committee. No special commission for the study of blank spots in history has previously been created, despite occasional rumors and even press reports to the contrary.

I want to emphasize also that the study of history on the professional level is a task for professional historians. In our republic these people are concentrated in the Academy of Sciences Institute of History, in the Party History Institute of the Estonian CP Central Committee, and on the faculties of the social sciences at Tallinn State University as well as at other higher educational institutions. Creditable work in the teaching and popularization of history is now going on at many museums by regional experts and the aktiv of the Society for the Preservation of Antiquities in the ESSR. The work of republic historians is given unity and coherence by the Council for Coordinating Historical Research in the Department of Social Sciences of the ESSR Academy of Sciences, headed by academician Yu. Kakhk. A meeting was held at the end of last year, attended by leading

historians in the Estonian CP Central Committee, at which the present situation and plans for developing historical studies were discussed.

[Correspondent] On 22 March, a meeting of the Estonian CP Central Committee was held, attended by institute directors R. Pullat and E. Kaup, and by V. Rayangu, minister of higher and mid-level specialized education, to discuss expediting research in little-studied periods of the history of the republic and its party organization. What decisions were reached there?

[N. Yuganson] The history institutes were commissioned to extend their investigations of inadequately studied periods in the history of the republic, to increase publication of controversial materials in journals, and to prepare for publication works of basic research into the history of Estonia and the republic Communist Party for the 50th Anniversary of the Establishment of Soviet Power in Estonia. Further, additional efforts were to be made to study other periods, as required, to satisfy the growing interest of the people in their own history.

[Correspondent] Addressing the February 1988 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, General Secretary M. S. Gorbachev emphasized the vital role and major responsibility of historians at the current stage of the restructuring process. "The Marxist-Leninist approach to historical analysis of society," he said, "presupposes a critical, strenuous, and stubborn intellectual effort; this, in turn, requires time, talent, and a sense of responsibility. One may understand the impatience of the public in its desire to glimpse as soon as possible closed pages of our past. Nevertheless, this desire cannot justify rash or any kind of hasty judgments, which might lead to nothing more than superficial conclusions, failing to reflect the full complexity of emerging processes. It is intolerable that, instead of true scientific research, makeshift improvisations should be turned out for broad public consumption, which darken rather than cast light upon the truth."

[Yu. Kakhk] These words of M. S. Gorbachev guide us in the effort to work out scientifically the problems that pertain to the history of the ESSR and the Communist Party of Estonia. It has now become possible, under conditions of glasnost and democracy, to deal more comprehensively with many key problems of current import, including matters that were in general not known about or that had been represented in a distorted way.

We have consulted with leading historians and directed attention to the rather uncritical approach taken with respect to sources in publishing certain allegations and to some little-contested articles with a flair for sensationalism. We have also had talks with journalists on these matters.

[Correspondent] What topics are now considered by historians to be important above all others?

[E. Kaup] The working group, together with scholars from the research institutes and the staffs of the higher educational institutions, have drawn up a specific plan for dealing with matters that have not been thoroughly researched or are relatively new to history. This plan was recently approved by the Estonian CP Central Committee Buro. It specifies the 11 most significant problems in the history of the Estonian SSR and the Estonian Communist Party. Scholars of the Party History Institute of the Estonian CP Central Committee, for example, along with vuz teachers, confront the task of studying the activities of Estonian communists in the Soviet Union during the period 1920-1930; issues surrounding the socialist revolution of 1940; and the role of K. Sorer, first secretary of the Estonian CP Central Committee during that period. They are also to prepare and publish, in the form of individual works of research, biographies of I. Vares-Barbarus, N. Karotamm, A. Beymer, and others.

One of the most difficult and crucial tasks facing party historians at the moment is an objective study of the eighth plenum of the Estonian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) Central Committee in March 1950.

Conferences have already been held in the Party History Institute of the Estonian CP Central Committee at which supplementary materials were drawn upon in considering the socialist revolution of 1940, as well as inadequately or little studied aspects of the Estonian people's participation in the Great War for the Fatherland. Much valuable material was made available by the conference, which discussed matters pertaining to the history of the CPSU during the years of stagnation. This series of conferences was conducted at our institute in November 1987. Present, in addition to republic party historians, were scholars from the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee and its affiliates in Moscow, the BSSR, MoSSR, LiSSR, and LaSSR.

[Correspondent] Readers often ask this question: What published works written in keeping with the new approach can be found at this time at the book counters?

[E. Kaup] In the past two years our institute has published 15 works; that is, in addition to translations of the Marxist-Leninist classics and collected "CPSU Resolutions." These include a collection of scholarly studies entitled "Great October and Estonia"; a popularized account by candidate of science A. Vakhemetsa entitled "Autumn 1917 in Tallinn"; reminiscences of party veteran G. Gustavson, entitled "Landmarks on Our Way," dedicated to the 70th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution; a monograph, published in both Estonian and Russian, by D. Rudnev entitled "The Life of Viktor Kingisepp"; a collection of recollections by Komsomol members during the period 1940-1945 (25 authors in all), describing the underground revolutionary struggle in Estonia during the Great War for the Fatherland; and other works.

[R. Pullat] The history of the October Revolution, the civil war, and the bourgeois Estonian republic are covered in a book published in the latter part of 1987 by Kh. Arumyzas well as in collections of documents and a series of articles in which the so-called "war with the Landesver," the emergence of the bourgeois republic, and the Peace of Tartu are depicted from an up-to-date perspective. The activities of the then-existing leadership of the Estonian Communist Party in preparing for the collectivization of agriculture was interpreted in a radically new way in a series of articles published in the second half of 1987.

Basic historical research is planned for the period of the bourgeois Estonian revolution (1920-1940) and the Great War for the Fatherland.

[Correspondent] Among the unresolved questions of history, special attention has been given by readers to events surrounding collectivization, the struggle with the kulaks, banditry, and the exile of a part of the population of Estonia in the 1940's and 1950's. A good deal has been published on this subject. Certain of these publications, unfortunately, contain erroneous figures and inaccurate versions of the facts. It must be acknowledged that even the ETA article entitled "The Class Struggle in Estonia in 1940-1950," which came out in the Sunday newspapers, was not free from errors.

[E. Kaup] Land reform and collectivization were achieved in Estonia under difficult circumstances. Take, for example, the disposition of economic forces in the country on the eve of the establishment of Soviet power in Estonia. According to the agricultural census of 1939, published in a 1940 supplement to the "Estonian Encyclopedia" in Tallinn, there were approximately 140,000 private farms in Estonia.

Land holdings were distributed as follows:

Size in Hectares	Private Farms
1-5	21,987
6-10	28,823
11-20	40,249
21-30	25,438
31-50	21,720
51-100	6,322
Over 100	452

In the course of land reform the part taken from major land owners, having more than 30 hectares, was transferred to 55,700 small landowners and new landowners; of these, 24,800 peasants received land for the first time.

[Correspondent] On 27 September 1987 in a Voice of America broadcast Professor Taagepera stated that 60,000 persons were deported from Estonia in 1949, and that less than half of them returned. Could you comment on this?

[E. Kaup] Our newspapers have carried statistical information on this subject on several occasions, but unfortunately the figures have appeared piecemeal. First the number of those deported in 1941 were not accounted for, then the number of heads of families who were sentenced and later sent to their families in special settlements. Meticulous readers have therefore raised the question: How could the number of those who returned have exceeded the number deported? According to more precise data from the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers and organs of the Ministry of Justice, the record is set straight as follows. There were 5,978 people deported in 1941; 20,660 were deported in 1949. In addition, 3,178 of those sentenced earlier as kulaks and bandits and subsequently deported by order of the USSR Supreme Soviet, dated 11 March 1952, were sent back to their families in special settlements, as has also been reported in the press. (See the article by candidate of historical sciences A. Ruusman, entitled "The Class Struggle After the War in the Estonian Countryside," in issue No. 5 of the journal AYA PULSS.) During the 1954-1960 period, 27,835 persons were released from special settlements and returned to the republic.

[Correspondent] As is acknowledged now, despite the sharp class struggle, including armed conflict, nevertheless, it is impossible to justify the deportation of families, deviationist excesses, and other violations of socialist law. Statistics have been cited in the press on the number of persons who have been rehabilitated: 1,256 deported without proper grounds in 1949 and 373 persons out of those deported in 1941. Are these the final figures? May people who believe themselves to have been wrongfully subjected to repressive measures reinstate their good name? And how do they go about it?

[Yu. Roots] Excesses and errors, and very serious ones, were indeed committed. Many innocent persons suffered under conditions of lawlessness during the cult of personality of Stalin.

In accordance with the law therefore, people who believe they were subjected to illegally repressive treatment have the following recourse. Persons who believe that they were illegally deported and sent to special settlements as heads of kulak families may appeal to the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers. A final decision to remove them from the rolls of kulaks is made in a decree by the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers. The correctness of the decision by the ESSR NKVD to deport a person from the Estonian SSR in 1941 is checked with respect to the complaints and claims of those deported by the office of the Estonian SSR Public Prosecutor.

Finally, the complaints and declarations of persons who served sentences by decisions of former boards of the OGPU, the NKVD and its Special Conference, together with the USSR Ministry of State Security and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, are reviewed by the office of the Estonian SSR Public Prosecutor. An objection in

JPRS-UPA-88-019  
24 May 1988

14

## HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

these matters by the Estonian SSR public prosecutor is in turn reviewed by the Supreme court of the republic, which has final jurisdiction. 12889



**Critic Blasts Literary Conservatives, Stalinists**

18000286 Moscow *OGONEK* in Russian No 11, Mar 88  
pp 25-28

[Article by Natalya Ivanova: "What Does Brake Fluid Smell Like?" (First paragraph is source supplied author information. Second paragraph is source introduction)]

[Text] Natalya Ivanova, a well-known literary critic, has been published since 1972. Her articles have been published in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and in the journals DRUZHBA NARODOV, ZNAMYA, VOPROSY LITERATURY, LITERATURNOYE OBOZRENIYE, and LITERATURNAYA GRUZIYA. In 1984 the "Sovetskiy Pisatel" publishing house printed the book by N. Ivanova entitled "The Prose of Yuriy Trifonov". Today this same publishing house is preparing to issue her new work, which is devoted to prose in recent years and entitled "Point of View".

At the turning points of our country's history, our literature has given rise to lofty examples of civic courage and bravery of thought. But along with the tormenting questions and the answers obtained through suffering, a murky wave was gathering, threatening at times to drown the most radiant endeavors. An immortal parody of the fuss made over literature was given by Dostoyevskiy in "The Possessed"—the "quadrille of literature". What kind of a dance is this? A few masks symbolizing various directions. In a raspy voice an elderly gentleman in a tuxedo characterized one of the well-known newspapers. "Dancing, he shuffled in one place with an important look on his face, often taking little mince-steps and almost never moving from his place". "Honest Russian thought" has arisen in the guise of this gentleman in real shackles, around whom two shorn nihilists mince-stepped. And across from them danced a gentleman with a heavy stick in his hand, personifying the terrible publisher. "I'll give you a whack—and you'll be a wet spot". "It was difficult to imagine a sadder, more banal, more ungifted and boring allegory", notes the narrator. Certain phenomena in our literary life have forced me to unwittingly remember these masks, dancing before the honorable public.

There is today in society a sincere desire to find out what has happened in the situation which has arisen. There is also demagoguery which cleverly uses the words "glasnost", "democracy", and "perestroyka". Social mimicry, as always, dresses in the most fashionable clothing. In my opinion, it is much more dangerous than one who stubbornly insists on his conservatism. It is a more complex matter to determine the true face of the "seeming reorganizers", who in reality want to "slow down", if not to "apply the brakes". And combatting them is also more complex. One can at least talk with the "conservators"—at least their position is open.

Let us look at our literary arguments from this point of view. It would seem, after all, that behind the narrow departmental discussions there are problems of reality.

**The Real Matter of "Real Criticism"**

At the very beginning of the year, I had occasion to become acquainted with two opposing views of criticism.

Question: What is your attitude toward literary criticism?

Answer: I don't notice it. I just can't understand how one can make a profession out of one's own dissatisfaction. ...For each writer (today—N.I.) there are ten critics (V. Pikul, KNIZHNOYE OBOZRENIYE, 1988, No 1).

But here is an entirely different point of view expressed in the letter written by reader G. V. Kuznetsov from the city of Almet'yevsk in the Tatar ASSR: "Everyone is saying that this year is the year of the journals. But it is also the year of criticism! It is a year when criticism for the first time in many years has seriously announced its pretensions to an equal place in the ranks of the literary aspects and genres. In any case, this was felt for the first time by a common reader such as myself."

"Every time one receives the long-awaited issue of any 'thick' journal, one goes first not to the prose or poetry, but to the criticism and publicistics, and the criticism first of all, since it is more up-to-date and closest of all to the meaning of the word "journal"—a diary of contemporary life. And our best, "critical", criticism this year (...) is working toward reorganization, embodying democratization and openness not as ossified concepts, but as a living and developing process. This is why it is interesting to read critic's articles and why one has the desire to respond to them."

"It seems the period of complaints about drab literature, which evoked so much mockery, is ending, and a real, positive struggle against the specific vehicles of this drab literature is beginning. The reader is waiting for the gaps to be filled not only in narrative literature, but in criticism as well. More precisely, he is waiting for the presentation of a real critical picture of the state of affairs in our literature today and in the past two decades."

The social order has been clearly formulated. Let us see what is changing in our literary life, and how. And is it indeed changing?

For decades there was only one demand on literature—that it be true to life. For decades this same demand was placed on criticism (plus that of being true to literature). The words are the same. One thing was said, but something else was implied.

Under L. I. Brezhnev, most of all was said about the development of socialist democracy...

The most urgent problem today is to return to the words their true, real meaning, to cleanse them of the many years of demagogic stratifications.

The prosaic was told: "Emulate life!"

The disobedient critics were told: "Emulate literature and life!"

But amidst all this, neither the critic nor the prosaic even dared to think of the real—the difficult, hard, dramatic—reality. A sort of social plot arose: the call was for reflection of some unknown, fabricated "make-believe" life, with "make-believe" conflicts and nonexistent "positive" heroes. After all, it was quite recently—only 3 years ago—that the discussion about the "positive" hero took place on the pages of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. They wore out their pens... But as it turned out, true literature was thinking about something else entirely.

Criticism today must rid itself of "make-believe", of the second plane, of "one we write, two we keep in mind".

#### Halloo, Belinskiy!

"Where could the genius Vissarion Belinskiy publish his 'Literary Dreams' today?" This rhetorical question was presented in the article by V. Bondarenko entitled "Outlines of Literary Mores" (MOSKVA, 1987, No 12).

The answer, evidently, is implied—in the journal MOSKVA...

But all jokes aside, the question of "where to be published" is also important. However, even more important is the question which precedes it: what to publish?

Articles have appeared which testify to the rebirth of the traditions of Dobrolyubov's "real" criticism. This is criticism which takes a step toward getting to know society "in the interests of its development and transformation". (That is how Yu. Burtin defined the tasks of "real criticism" in his article published in the June issue of NOVYY MIR for 1987). "The field lies unplowed," bitterly notes Burtin. "We have all kinds of criticism, this and that, but real criticism, i.e., that which judges literature in the context of a serious and continuous discussion about society, such criticism we have not seen for a long time in our homeland".

But not even a few months had passed since the publication of the NOVYY MIR article, and readers could be convinced that this conclusion was outdated. I am referring to the emergence in print of the social pamphlet by Yu. Karyakin, "Should we Step on the Rake? An Incognito Answer" (ZNAMYA, 1987, No 9) and "To You, From Another Generation..." by Yu. Burtin himself (OKTYABR, 1987, No 8). The letters from readers published in issue No 12 of OKTYABR also served as

proof of the "incorrectness" of Yu. Burtin's pessimism. The article, devoted not only to Tvardovskiy's poem and its difficult fate, but on the whole to the political life of society in the 60's, received strong public reaction.

Burtin in his OKTYABR article does not touch upon the question of the artistic style of Tvardovskiy's poem. As one reader correctly notes, the article is about "past decades, about truth and lies, about you and me". The readers of Burtin's article, we might add, were also divided into two viewpoints: those who support "the rebuff to the pillars of the past" ("If we give them a chance to rise again, they will not leave a stone standing from glasnost!"), and those who believe criticism of Stalinism to be "blackening" of our entire history ("The people did not want to have Stalin's name besmirched to satisfy the aesthetic snobs"). That is how differently 20-year olds think today.

The struggle between the forces of forgetfulness and the forces of memory is still going on today. But it is taking on different forms.

Sometimes these forms are sufficiently clear. Here is the desire to retain the stable appearance of the "leader" at the price of any historical distortions necessary. Here too is the much more subtle desire to sacrifice this gloomy figure (having proclaimed it almost paranoic, as does D. Volkogonov in his article "The Phenomenon of Stalin"—LG, 1987, 9 December) and to affirm that we nevertheless went exclusively from one achievement to the next. They stubbornly persist in reviving the thesis of "extremes". Thereby they reanimate the "weighed" logic of the swing—"one one hand", "on the other hand", "despite the fact that", "however"... And now they are clearly trying to imply the thought that we had no alternative after the revolution, that history developed in the only true direction, that the attempt of the dramatist to formulate the question in a different way is subjectivism—and this leaves only one small step to the thought of justifying this means.

We might ask, why do writers today, including critics and publicists, concentrate on Stalin? Don't we have any other more current problems?

In analyzing the mail received in regard to this article, Yu. Burtin correctly writes that "there is Stalinism, we might say, of the administrative-bureaucratic type, and then there is mass, 'base' Stalinism". This mass Stalinism is our most serious problem, whose solution vitally determines the future of reorganization, since the future is formulated today by that direction which we give it.

To proceed from life, or to proceed from the "obligatory", normative conceptions about it—that is the choice today. It would seem that we long ago buried "Yermilovism", with its dogmatic instructions for literature (and society) telling where and how it must develop. Empiricism passes, but the "methodology", it

seems, is still flourishing, conveniently placed, for example, in the article by V. Bondarenko. No, it is not for Belinskiy that the heart of today's descendents of Yermilov yearns. It is not concerned about where the new Belinskiys and Dobrolyubovs are to be published! It is concerned about that same normative nature, urging literature on to "strong characters". But today, the watchful author warns, prose is "staking its wage on the weak person".

"We will leave it to the conscience of the author". V. Bondarenko likes this "Aesop's" stylistic phrase, which testifies to something entirely different: to the lack of conscience by the subject of the conversation. Extending this measure to the author, we will leave on his conscience the affirmation that in the period of "stagnation", "only NASH SOVREMENNİK was able to publish independent articles". (We will remember that these articles for the most part bore a pogrom character— and NASH SOVREMENNİK attacked not the worst writers—from Trifonov to Paustovskiy). Getting back to our day, V. Bondarenko announces at the outset that today "we are shown with satisfaction the backside of the Soviet 70th anniversary", that everywhere only "stagnation, violence, and camp barracks" are selected as subjects for print. Yet even in the "camp barracks the heroic generation was in no hurry to 'reorganize' (!—N. I.) by accelerated methods, and remained a generation of strong people with firm convictions. They went voluntarily from the camps to the penalty battalions to defend their Homeland". This, it turns out, is what V. Bondarenko is pleased about. And you come in with your "sacrifices" and "suffering"!

The logic in such compositions is truly unpredictable. Here is what V. Bondarenko writes in MOLODAYA GVARDIYA about the article by V. Gorbachev. "...Much seems unconvincing to me in this article. There is a one-sidedness in the selection of writer's names, there are unfounded accusations addressed at all publications except one's own". And on the same page the article by V. Gorbachev is characterized as "a non-standard, extremely sharp publicistic article, appropriate in tone", which "as a catalyst for action is very beneficial for the broad manifestation of the overall picture of the literary process". So, is it "unconvincing", "foundless in its accusations", i.e., simply speaking, mendacious, or is it "appropriate in tone" and "beneficial"?

The author discusses the young guard article in a fully benevolent, understanding tone, and speaks in exalted tones about the criticism of NASH SOVREMENNİK. But as soon as his pen touches upon other journals, other names, insulting definitions follow: "a wave of progressive obscurantism", "organs of quick reaction", today almost everything has turned out in the hands of the advocates of "negative culture", "hysterics", "clannishness of the worst gossip", and "exaggeration of many reputations"... But where does the Devil make his nest? The most frightening thing, according to Bondarenko, are progressively thinking people. "Trembling lovers of

progress" (that is how he scornfully characterizes them), "a little more, and they will demand imprisonment for the 'non-liberal minded'." We are speaking here of method. "It is easier to compromise your opponent than to substantiate your own convictions", justly noted critic Yu. Bogomolov in No 1 of ISSKUSTVO KINO. "However, this operation is more effective particularly in that case where it can be given a political shading".

It is best of all to respond to this "proposal" in the words of Bondarenko himself. "The subject here, as you understand, is already not that of criticism and polemics, even the most acute".

### How To Cross Balsac with Avvakum?

Extremes always come together.

From compliments to insinuations—the distance is no more than a step. This concerns, for example, the question of the position of critic S. Chuprinin. Naturally, there can be different evaluations of his works. But here is the ideological pillar to which A. Baygushev pins him: "In practice, S. Chuprinin has spoken out against the basic principle of the Leninist conception of national culture" (MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, 1987, No 12).

But here A. Baygushev switches to another genre. In the article entitled "Chronicle of a Generation" (NASH SOVREMENNİK, 1988, No 1), he discusses the prose of P. Proskurin. The vocabulary here is entirely different. "The scope of the narrative is great", "an Avvakum-like burning sense of morality", "a work which probably can fully equal such large-scale works as Balsac's series of novels, 'The Human Comedy'". In the 70's the writer, it turns out, worked only "on the stubbornness of the taiga dweller—in spite of the indifference of the journals and the stubborn lordly silence" of criticism.

Why is it that the "elite criticism" (one more label) exhibits "indifference" to P. Proskurin? A subtle hint is given regarding the "reptilian nature of the elite": because Proskurin "did not occupy any posts". But the main root of the reason was the dislike of the critics for the "Russian novel". That is the way it was. If you, a critic, don't like this author or are indifferent to him, you, it turns out, are against the "Russian novel" in principle.

Let changes be as they may, and reorganization remain reorganization, but the signature, it seems, is the same—yesterday's.

How would you have us understand the comparison of Proskurin with Avvakum? Avvakum went to be burned at the stake for the sake of an idea. Avvakum is the symbol of a lack of compromise, which has been purchased at the cost of one's own real, human life. After all, it is not right somehow to equate the current anniversary celebrant with Avvakum, wouldn't you think? We must consider also the incredible (and in the "stagnant" time

at that) number of publications and re-publications, the millions of circulation copies, the film adaptations and the endless television serials based on Proskurin's books. It is not very reminiscent of Avvakum.

But what does Balzac have to do with this? "The Human Comedy" is a series of novels in which the writer continually exposes bourgeois society, the society of the "new people". Proskurin writes, mildly speaking, about something slightly different, and on a different level. But we again make the comparison lightly, without stopping to think about its true content. Again the cursed heritage of past ages triumphs—"make-believe", "it seems". Our "make-believe" Balzac is "something like" Avvakum... The approximation of the thought immediately displaces and disrupts the system of true values. And when this system is shifted, the entire edifice turns out to be built on sand. This is the gift of the critic to the prosaic.

Let us stop to think, for example, about this new term—the "Russian novel". Is it the novel of Turgenev? Or Dostoyevskiy? Pushkin or Tolstoy? Goncharov or A. Belyy? Is it polyphonic or monologic? Bless the Lord, there are a multitude of phenomena, and true literary science studies them seriously and in-depth. Yet there is no general concept of the "Russian novel". Again we are playing a game of semantics. We are trying to substitute the real sum of knowledge about society and about literature with a phrase behind which we must guess an entirely different ("Aesop's") meaning. And the meaning is this: Proskurin is a true patriot, since he writes the "Russian novel" unlike the novelists who work in a different stylistic manner, if we may say so.

If a critic is concerned with problems of his national culture and wants to define its place among the other cultures—that is wonderful. But if you delineate ahead of time with a hierarchical caste line—as an exception—the qualities of your culture, it would not be a bad idea to first look at the problem from the other, neighboring national point of view. Particularly since we all live in a multi-national society. It is sad that sometimes we have to remind one of this.

How many times, for example, have I, a Russian, read in articles about "true Russian good-heartedness". But are Belorussians or Abzakhs devoid of it? Or about "true Russian" hospitality, "wonderful chastity of Russian women"... But aren't Georgians and Armenians hospitable? Aren't Azerbaijani women chaste?

Or we write (again quoting A. Baygushev): "The poetic sense of the world is organic to the Russian writer, since it emanates from his very nature, from the highest meaning of human existence on earth..." Excuse us, but wasn't it "organic" in the Latvian Oyar Vatsiyetis? Didn't it stem "from his very nature"? Or doesn't it stem "from the highest sense of human existence on earth" in the Estonian Uri Tuulik?

Distortions, historical botches, and illiteracy have always been the other side of toadiness. In speaking about time, for example, A. Baygushev writes: "It was the eve of 1953. It was a time, as they say today, of change, of 'thaw', and of the first gasping exercise in reorganization". But if Proskurin is today proclaimed a "martyr", then why would the "eve of 1953", i.e., the time of "the case of doctors" and the "struggle against cosmopolites" not be proclaimed a "thaw" and an "exercise in reorganization"? Historical accuracy is of little concern to the critic. The main thing for him is to use the word "reorganization" as often as possible.

The main thing for some others today is to apply the brakes to the process of liberating literature. The means here differ with each passing day.

Here is one of the latest means: to pretend that nothing noteworthy appeared in the journals for 1987. A. Prokhanov, for example, answers the question regarding the most significant publications for 1987 and cites only the novel by V. Lichutin, "Lyubostay". V. Lichutin is a really good writer. But let us be frank: is his work really the event of the year? Or V. Gusev, who condescendingly speaks about "The Tale of the Unextinguished Moon" by B. Pilnyak, and peevishly notes its low artistic level: "That is not how prose is written". Well, evidently V. Gusev is more clear on how prose should be written than B. Pilnyak. I will not argue the point. I will only recall that when V. Gusev wrote about the prose of A. Prokhanov, he fervently greeted specifically the "new" artistic nature.

#### An Attempt at Reanimation

The past literary year was unprecedented in terms of publications. Prose, poetry, short stories, novels and articles which awaited the reader for 50 years or more saw the light of day. The rehabilitation of their authors is continuing.

However, as yet the voices from the republics are faintly heard in the work on rehabilitation of major artists and their works. The overwhelming majority of literary events still takes place in Moscow. In Uzbekistan they have just begun to publish the works of the poets Chulpan and Fitrat who died tragically in the 30's. Any information about them breaks through with difficulty onto the pages of the press. In Kazakhstan they are stubbornly silent about the poet Magzhan Zhumabayev, who was branded a nationalist in those days, twice repressed (in 1930 and 1937), and long ago rehabilitated. But although the document on rehabilitation is there, nevertheless the works themselves still await rehabilitation. In the Ukraine the works of Khvylevoy—a 20th Century master of prose and one of the founders of modern Ukrainian literature—have not been published for a long time. Khvylevoy committed suicide in 1933 at the age of 40, hounded by official criticism. Only in the December book "Bitchizny" for 1987 did one of his stories appear. Khvylevoy has not been translated into

Russian, and is unknown to the all-union reader. American publishers have issued a 5-volume collection of his works which they found—piecemeal—in our publications of the 20's. Are we again going to dawdle at the tail end of the situation? Are we going to say that since they are interested in it across the ocean, we don't need to be?

The republics are still very timidly, if not shyly, dealing with the problems which have arisen. In Moscow they are publishing the "Requiem" and "By Right of Memory". The novels of B. Pasternak and V. Grossman are reaching the reader, while the newspaper SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIA condescendingly refers to those who try to rend from forgetfulness the names of the innocent victims as "home-grown rehabilitators". On 29 December 1987, V. Pepelyayev says that such words referring to Stalinism as "destruction of the best", "victims of bureaucracy", "genocide against one's own people"—are, supposedly, an exaggeration. He issues a strict reprimand to those who today deal with the most serious questions: why, for example, were the losses in the Great Patriotic War so catastrophically great? Trying to slow down the activity of youth and society abroad, V. Pepelyayev believes that if among those repressed in the years of terror there are those who deserved to suffer, the viable thought of "enemies of the people" is not so bad.

Today, says V. Pepelyayev, "in the spirit of reorganization and openness", "we must not seek out some negative aspects, but rather help rid ourselves of them (how to do this without disclosing them—this is a secret that evidently only V. Pepelyayev knows), we must support useful initiative and avoid unnecessary (?—N.I.) stratification".

"The most active part of society, its youth," V. Bykov responds to A. Maysen and V. Pepelyayev (SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 9 January 1988), "does not cease to ask questions such as: how could such a blatant violation of Socialist law and order happen, as a result of which thousands of innocent people perished? Thousands, and maybe even millions?" The newly presented statistics "are strangely silent about the number of those repressed during the years of Stalin's personality cult, as if these figures do not deserve serious attention of the Soviet people," writes V. Bykov. "But the people, including also the youth, are seeking clear answers to the cardinal questions of that time, most important of which, undoubtedly, is the question of executioners and victims. ...Having acknowledged the undoubted illegality of the repressions of the 30's," continues the writer, "we cannot escape the inevitable question: who is at fault?"

And here again we find those same two positions of which I spoke at the beginning of my article.

The first: why set boundaries? Let us unite—under the sign of new forgetfulness! Everyone is at fault—no one is at fault! A. Maysen, for example, warns "...[there is] a

demand to publicly name not only those who suffered in the years of the repression, but all those who...committed 'crimes'". After all, many of them, he says, were sincere in their delusion...

The names of those who ruined N. Vavilov have already become known. The country knows the name of the interrogator Khvat who tortured him. MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI dated 3 January reported the names of those who in 1939 inspired the repressions against the group of Moscow girls sentenced for "counterrevolutionary activity". But what about Belorussia? asks V. Bykov. Where are the names of the people who in their "sincere delusion" ruined the writers Tishko Gartnyy, Platon Golovach, Maksim Garetskiy, Mikhasiy Zaretskiy, and Vladislav Golubok?

"It is strange to see in a current newspaper," says V. Bykov, "this flow of touching kind-heartedness toward those who ruined or helped in the ruin of thousands, and at the same time to encounter everywhere in the article an irreconcilability which is difficult to explain toward those who dared to express their views, even though they were incorrect."

As soon as a person ceases to automatically repeat after others, as soon as he begins to think for himself (even if sometimes he is wrong, which V. Bykov points out), then he is immediately tagged with political, I stress, labels, and efforts are made to compromise his social position and to strongly hint at his moral deficiency.

For the critic Yu. Idashkin, for example, there is no middle ground. As soon as he stops handing out unctuous compliments to the customary addressees, he goes immediately to a political pogrom. From his article entitled "Different Faces of Confession" (LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, 1988, No 2) I learned the following about myself (the accusations were directed toward my "moral-political position", as Yu. Idashkin calls it): "an aggressive desire toward moral, and then also organizational alienation of those who think differently", "a triumphant aggressiveness", "extremism", "avant-gardism", which "is the back side of conservatism", and even a thirst to "become the Joan of Arc of literary renovation", who wants to "light" "a small but very hot" bonfire... Yu. Idashkin has an education in jurisprudence, but from his school lessons he could have extracted some useful knowledge about the fact that it was Joan herself who was burned in the bonfire.

This is my only commentary on weighty political labels. We may easily give more examples.

Such are the current morals. Such is the "literary quadrille".

But let us return to a more burning question raised by V. Bykov.

This question, as evidenced by the press, also has different answers. Yu. Idashkin, for example, today tells us a Christmas tale about how friendly and tender the relations of a former prisoner with his camp commander are, if the latter simply fulfilled his assigned duty, not going beyond the framework of the "directives" of the Beria regime. "We chatted for a long time in the editorial office, then we went to a cafe and sat there until closing time" (they just didn't want to leave each other—the writer, the prisoner, and the "commander"). Here is what the commander said: "This is what I proceeded from in my actions: a person has committed a crime and has been punished. It is my duty to see that after he serves his time he returns to society and becomes a useful member of it. Of course, I could not create any special conditions. However, I tried to see that the already difficult fate of the people was not made worse".

Well, what is wrong with the legend? They say the "directives" in the Stalinist camps were really not that bad. The main thing was not to go beyond "the boundaries". And those who even today strive to refute the outdated laws and directives based on the "demands of life" are manifesting, it turns out, "legal avant-gardism". The brand has again been placed on them. This time a political-legal one. The methods have been worked out.

#### Revenge Writer-Style

"...Will we be able to fully and deeply assimilate the aesthetic heritage willed to us by the ages, to clarify the moral lessons of the past?", rhetorically asks the young critic A. Kazintsev. And here he answers in the negative. "The publications of recent months, unfortunately, do not allow us to give an encouraging answer to this question" (NASH SOVREMENNİK, 1987, No 11).

A. Kazintsev believes that in recent months it is not history which has gradually begun to emerge from the dark and the forgetfulness, but that "a hunt has begun in its sanctuary" (it is quite a "sanctuary", especially if we clearly imagine the 30's and 40's). A. Kazintsev severely divides writers who turn to history into two ranks: "continuers" and "consumers". Heading up Kazintsev's list of "consumers" is Yu. Trifonov, who even in the most difficult times knew how to speak the truth about the time. Let us remember, for example the "House on the Sea-Front", "The Old Man", and "Time and Place". An in-depth analysis of the 30's, a non-illusory study of the "springs" of terror and the historical blindness of those who lived in the house on the sea-front and the objective guilt of those who stood at the beginnings (this is directly and unambiguously evidenced by Trifonov's historical conception on the whole, the entire "string" which he tried to pull out of the well of history), the penetration into the sources of current-day conformism—all this is present in the recently published novel by Yu. Trifonov, "Disappearance". But by means of juggling the facts and frank overexposures, A. Kazintsev wants to convince the reader of the opposite. The conclusion that follows is: "It is not a confession, but rather

a justification" of the House and its residents (all together, both the victims and the executioners!)—"that is the main idea of the novel".

Whom does A. Kazintsev want us to pity, with whom does he sympathize?

It is the one who conducts the search in the apartment of the arrested victim. Yes, yes. It is specifically for him, believes Kazintsev, that the writer did not have enough "compassion", although there is quite enough "understanding" on the part of the critic. Does this make you indignant? It isn't convincing to you? That's alright—we'll distort it once again at the end, this time a bit tighter. And now the "writer's memory" of Trifonov is likened to a camp convoy in which the poor executor is currently led along the pages of the journals. A. Kazintsev easily grants amnesty to the "simple man", who washes his hands after a dirty deed. And he calls Yu. Trifonov an "eloquent protector" of those who carried out the orders about arrests and executions.

Well, Trifonov during his life had occasion also to encounter lack of understanding of his ideas, as well as deliberate distortion and falsification of his literary and social position. But what about today?

Evidently, this is one of the negative aspects of our time, when people who defend group ambitions shout loudest of all about an equal partnership in discussions, using the fact that this initial period of democratization in which we currently find ourselves has not yet worked out any legal standards for protecting the individual against slander.

"Glory to our labor, we have lived to see our bright days," delights Vasilii Roslyakov (LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, 28 August 1987). But the deeper one delves into the spacious composition under the ambiguous title of "Revenge?", the clearer it becomes that this little phrase is full of thoughtful irony. What is the writer ironizing? As it turns out, it is the word "happiness" as applied to the occurring events. Since, as it follows from the text of V. Roslyakov, the events which are occurring do not please him in the slightest. "...In our time of astounding openness and full freedom," V. Roslyakov forces ironic modulations, noting with open sarcasm that there has been a "bright celebration of a return to the Homeland for the Russian talents who have been offended by fate". In speaking of the return of the national heritage, V. Roslyakov constantly uses the word "we". "We" have waited, the flow of nostalgic poems has washed over us, "they have returned to us", "we are rejoicing", "how could we ever dream...". However, let us read on to the end: "...dream of such things even yesterday, when [our writers] were totally excluded from this Union..." (USSR Union of Writers—N. I.). And here for some reason the convenient little word "we" has for some reason been shamefully omitted. We might even substitute the word "they".

A bit later, it is true, the hidden meaning of the stubborn use of the first person plural and the inclusion in the almighty "we" becomes apparent. "...We turned out to be right," the writer is no longer being ironic. "...Soviet rule turned out to be right..." And although the stylistics of the composition do not allow us to refute without vascillation the thought that this phrase is also ironic, we nevertheless recall the words of A. Platonov. "Don't get yourself confused with mankind!" With a single stroke of the pen, our suddenly serious brother takes on too serious and mighty of an ally!

According to the logic of V. Roslyakov, if the currently returned national values were created by people who did not return to Russia or by people who do not share "our" convictions, then, it seems, "we" do not need them. Anna Pavlova's wig, brought to the Homeland by I. Odoyevtseva, evokes particular sarcasm on the part of the author of "Revenge?" What do "we" need it for in our "revolutionary reorganization", ironizes V. Roslyakov.

Pursuing the thoughts of V. Roslyakov, we may again talk ourselves into the situation where even I. Bunin is unsuitable for "us", and once again recall how in the unforgettable 30's-50's they spoke of the "religious obscurantism" of Fedor Dostoyevskiy. Under the symbol of this same logic, watchful literary critics of the 30's wrote about the flourishing of B. Pasternak's lyrics: "these are lyrics 'in general'—the same social-historical 'in general' which in the best case makes art morally and artistically indefinite".

Fellow literary critic V. Roslyakov notes with a puzzling satisfaction, we must say, the fact...of the death of the Russian writer V. Nabokov. To quote his lines: "But the muses without kith or kin have been our ruin, and now it is time for us to leave the world". The most ironic humanist announces with an undoubted sense of relief: "Well, Vladimir Vladimirovich this way will be closer to the truth". And then, mocking the old, sick man, he continued: "But then the muses without kith or kin have not ruined everyone. For example, Irina Vladimirovna Odoyevtseva even (!—N.I.) returned home..."

Yes, the muse without kin did not "ruin" everyone. Many were ruined by the return. Let us recall the tragic fate of Marina Tsvetayeva and her family. There is a bitter memory of thousands of others who had seen the light, returned, and went directly from the railroad station to the place from which there was no return...

V. Roslyakov does not like the fact that extensive selections of the poems of Nikolay Stepanovich Gumilev, for example, have been published. (I don't know why V. Roslyakov calls him Semenovich, maybe to be funny). "They are rushing headlong with the publications". Finally the novels of A. Bek and B. Pasternak are emerging. These novels had a tragic fate and their authors died without living long enough to see justice done," V. Roslyakov is again skeptical. The vocabulary

speaks for itself in referring to those who, "glory be to labor", lived long enough to see their publication. "The novels of Anatoliy Rybakov and Vladimir Dudintsev, and even Anatoliy Pristavkin, written in good time and clearly unacceptable for those days, are being laid out on the literary counter." I have already noted V. Roslyakov's ability to give a second life to certain words. So it is here—such clever little words, "even" and "in good time"! One can just visualize the malicious writers who spent long years on writing novels in good time, in advance, so that they could later emerge with them and surprise the public.

Yet why are "we" so nervous? Is it because in the light of the works returned to the national culture and the publications written "in good time" the compositions of those who tried to represent this culture and to identify it with themselves have faded in comparison?

The question of whether we should rejoice today in returning V. Nabokov to the journal pages is a question of tactics ("who is displacing whom", etc.). And yet, if we think about it seriously, this problem is of an entirely different nature. It is a problem of the full-fledged existence of our culture, as a huge historical expanse. The very approach of "printing in the journals and printing in books" bears a shading of market calculation. This is a narrow utilitarian approach which does not facilitate anything.

Questions of culture are strategic, not tactical. And "we" simply cannot get used to this idea.

We must note that the evaluations of that which comes to the reader today are quite varied. Someone whose taste has been formulated by V. Pikul cannot get through Platonov's "The Pit". Admirers of V. Sidorov's poetry, for example, may not be interested in N. Gumilev. Well, as they say, there can be no arguments about taste. But the matter is not one of taste.

In prerevolutionary Russia, the slogans "don't allow!" and "prohibit!", as we know from the immortal compositions of M. Saltykov-Shchedrin, were the watchwords for the censorship clerks. Could a classical writer imagine that his brother the literary critic was capable of preaching this "prohibitive" ideology?

Prohibitive ideology necessarily formulates the image of the enemy. The method is well-known—the ideological label. Let us say, for example, that we divide writer's thought into "healthy" and "impaired...somewhere along difficult historical turns". The logic is such: if you and those close to you (and there are millions of these in the country, as we know) have suffered in any way from the repression, then your thinking now and forever is "impaired". (How can we forget the matters of the repressed with the vengeful stamp "to cherish forever"? Here too the writer was not without irony). "Maybe you



became impaired during the dispossession of the kulaks. Maybe your social and historical thought had been impaired over the entire period of the cult of personality."

Let us say, for example, that V. Roslyakov did not like the article by S. Zalygin, "The Turn", published in NOVYY MIR. It is a normal thing—he likes it—he doesn't like it, he agrees—he disagrees. But V. Roslyakov looks into the depth of the matter. "...I even began to suspect, or more accurately, guessed that the author of 'The Turn' also suffered from impaired historical and social thinking. I can't say exactly where and how this thinking became impaired, because I don't know the life's path of this leading writer". That is a strange oversight for a person who uses the methods of suspicion and guessing!

V. Roslyakov criticizes S. Zalygin for his clear and firm rejection of the idea of industrialization and collectivization "at any cost". Zalygin does not accept "any cost", paid by the suffering and blood of his people. And what does V. Roslyakov counterpose to this? Having distorted the thought of the writer, he again "guesses": "It turns out that Sergey Pavlovich would have begun to price and barter: at what price, how much must be paid for industrialization, how much for collectivization?" Mildly speaking, V. Roslyakov belittles not so much the position of the writer, as the sacrifices of the people, and then haughtily instructs S. Zalygin in his short course in the rudiments of political knowledge. "After all, at that time in the country the question of who was to get whom was most acute. Either we would get them, or they would get us. There was no choice".

It was the very time to take a breather from the onslaught of old fear! But having taken this breath, we think—was it in the late 20's that "there was no choice"? And who were "they"? Peasant families sent off by the millions to a hungry and cold death, women, little children, old man—in cattle cars? Or was it Chayanov and his associates, whose names only today, several months ago, have been cleansed of dirt? Or was it F. Raskolnikov, who did not voluntarily take a sacrificial pose and did not let them slay him like a lamb? Or was it all those "enemies of the people" who were tortured and sent to camps and to exile? Truly, what kind of a soul must one have to write with one's own hand—today!—the sentence: "Only one answer suited us...at any price". "At any price..."

S. Zalygin, in the words of his opponent, "seems to be reaching out his hand, seems to be paving the way for those who suffered from these 'actions' and 'deviations', and who today believe that the day has come when they can in artistic form, or even in the form of bare publicists, say the full truth of those years to our face, when they can settle up for all those wrongs. Well, we'll have to be patient". So that's how it is! There is no one to "settle up" for "all those wrongs"—they were eliminated "at any cost". But "to tell the full truth of those years" is the

responsibility of those who have a living conscience, compassion, and an inexhaustible thirst for justice and truth. But how should we understand the words "we'll have to be patient"? Do they mean we'll wait awhile, and all this will end?...

If you are a person of this national culture and you know that another person has come to his homeland to die, you will never be able to gloat over his misfortune. If you are polemicizing with one of the most respected writers in the country, you shouldn't pull him by the hair with such undue familiarity, or hit him below the belt. And if you have brought up the topic of millions of victims, you cannot ironize.

To make light of the topic of collectivization means to have no respect at all for the past of one's people. What are they dancing the literary "quadrille" on? On bones?

V. Roslyakov tries to conclude his "Revenge?" with an ambiguous artistic image. Drawing an analogy with the automobile, he warns: they have run up the car's speed, isn't it time to apply the brakes? And he recalls how in his younger years he was taught to determine the presence of brake fluid—by its smell.

The odor is there, but is it the right one? It does not indicate a loss of control of the automobile, but clearly evidences the effort to slow it down.

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

12322

### Writer Mikhalkov Describes Relationship With Stalin

18000301 Moscow OGONEK in Russian

No 12, 19-26 Mar 88 pp 6-8, 28-29

[Interview by OGONEK Special Correspondent Feliks Medvedyev with Sergey Vladimirovich Mikhalkov: "Sluices or Floodvalves?": "Features of the Times and Fate"; date and place not given]

[Excerpts] A father, a son, a man of his times, he is full to overflowing with memories and paradox. Wittingly or unwittingly he has also paved the way for the current changes—if only by means of his FITIL, one of the oases of perestroika before there was a perestroika, its litmus test.

He has erred, and today finds the courage not to hide it. Yes, he has erred; or more precisely, he has had his doubts over whether he had behaved properly in this or that instance. But he takes comfort in the fact that if he had behaved differently, they simply would not have understood him. Naive? Yes. But honest. He does not hide it. In the shameful days of the shameful bacchanalia around Boris Pasternak he sided with the majority. He



gave his approval and cast his vote. And he has long since understood that he did not have to act that way. This is honest, for many have not understood to this day.

My questions for Sergey Mikhalkov were the most elementary ones: "When?" "With whom?" "Where?" "For what reason?" "Why?" "Did you know?" "Did you take part?" "Did you have any doubts?" "Did you believe?" I was interested in the answers, and will leave commentaries and questions about his responses to the readers. Let them think it over.

"Once at a press conference in Italy I was asked: 'How is it that you, a man known to Stalin, survived? David Kugultinov was arrested, but you were not.' And I answered, 'Even the cleverest poachers cannot shoot all the birds.'

"In contrast to the fate of other literary figures, my life has truly turned out well, although each of us was balanced on the point of a knife. And now we know that there could be no untouchables in the times of the personality cult. Many outstanding military leaders, government and party figures, major economic leaders, and prominent masters of culture innocently suffered in prisons and camps.

"But who knows how my fate might have turned out if my father had been alive? Could he—with his national origins, his knowledge of foreign languages, his scholarly work entitled 'Why Hens Lay Well in America,' and with his friendly connections—have escaped being an 'enemy of the people'? It's very unlikely. And that means, I would not have become a writer either, and would hardly have been giving you an interview. Moreover, even as a beginning writer I was on friendly terms with Mikhail Gerasimov, Boris Kornilov, Pavel Vasilev and Yaroslav Smelyakov, who suffered a hard fate. Obviously I was lucky."

[Question] What do you mean, "lucky?" Were you saved by events?

[Answer] "To a great extent. Well, here's just one example. I was totally smitten by a certain young woman. She was studying with me at the Literary Institute imeni Gorkiy—from which I, unfortunately, did not graduate owing to my family situation—I had to support my family. At that time I was working in the Letters to the Editor Department at IZVESTIYA and was already being published. You see, my poem 'Kolybelnaya' was being carried in IZVESTIYA; it is still being published today. I met my girlfriend at the writers' club, and jokingly said, 'If you want, I'll write a poem for you today, and tomorrow you'll read it in IZVESTIYA.' Svetlana, which was my friend's name, only smiled in reply. And so I ran to the editorial office and changed the name of my poem to 'Svetlana.' Well, I thought, now I'll win Svetlana's heart for sure.

"But as it turned out, I 'won the heart' of a different person altogether. The next day I was summoned to the TsK VKP(b), and an official named S. Dinamov told me, 'Comrade Stalin likes your poetry, young man. He wants to know how you are getting along. Is there anything that you need?'

"And I told him about the unsettled way I was living.

"Thus, owing to happenstance, including the fact that Stalin's daughter was named Svetlana, my life was changed. But the light-brown maiden for whose sake 'Kolybelnaya' was renamed 'Svetlana' continued to ignore me...

"They began to pay attention to me, and my poems, which had been published in OGONEK, were reprinted in PRAVDA.

"What did we, as young writers, live on in those years? On our lips were the words: Abyssinia, the Chelyuskins, Spain, German Fascism, Chkalov, Papanin, Gromov... And in our works we spoke out on these very themes, and we spoke out sincerely. Stalin was, for us, a Man with a capital letter. Of course we were alarmed that people were disappearing; that so-and-so was expelled from the party; that people were being arrested and exiled; but we thought that it was probably for cause. Should we really not have trusted the official information? And at the very same time after every one of these alarming reports we all felt truly defenseless.

"In 1938 Aleksandr Fadeyev wrote an article about me in PRAVDA. At that time I had already written 'Dyadya Stepa' and on the advice of Fadeyev, Marshak and Chukovskiy I was writing mostly for children.

"In 1939 a remarkable event in literary life took place—the first award to a large group of writers. Along with Marshak, Sholokhov and Katayev I was awarded an Order of Lenin. At that time I was 26. As it seemed to me, I was standing on firm ground, and the award of the Stalin Prize in 1941 for children's books perhaps once again became a kind of 'safe-conduct pass' for me."

[Question] And how were you lucky enough to become an author of the State Hymn of the Soviet Union?

[Answer] "Yes, I was lucky. And here's how it happened.

"Once during the summer of 1943 I learned completely by coincidence that the government had made the decision to adopt a new USSR Hymn. That same day I spoke of this to El-Registan. Next morning my friend appears before me and says, 'I dreamed that we became the authors of the text of the Hymn, and I actually wrote down some of the words.' And he shows me a hotel bill, on which some words were written. And that's how my participation in creating the State Hymn of the USSR began. A commission headed by Voroshilov and Shcherbakov read and listened to dozens of texts and variations

of the music. Then Voroshilov invites Registan and me to the Kremlin and says, 'Your text has come to the attention of Comrade Stalin; we shall be working with you...' Somehow Stalin called me at home at one AM, apologized for the late call, and said that they had listened to the Hymn but their impression was that it was too short; there was too little text and it needed another couplet. I asked, 'About what?' 'About our army.' 'We have raised up our Army in battle;' thus was born the third couplet. While we were working we frequently met with Stalin. And we introduced amendments upon his suggestions until finally the text and the music were completely satisfactory. On the night of 1 January 1944 the new Hymn of the Soviet Union was first heard on All-Union Radio.

"I must tell you that the last hearing of the Hymn was held in the Bolshoy Theater, where the hymns of all the countries of the world were played. After the hearing we were invited to the government lodge, and to a laden table. Stalin greeted us and said that in accordance with Russian custom, we must 'wet down' the hymn. We were seated next to him. The members of the Politburo were also here: Kalinin, Molotov, Voroshilov, Beria, Mikoyan, and Khrushchev who had arrived from the Ukraine, and other comrades. We stayed at the lodge until five AM. El-Registan, myself and Stalin did most of the talking. The rest were silent. When something funny was said, everyone laughed. Stalin asked me to read my poetry. I read 'Dyadya Stepa,' and other jolly children's poems. Stalin laughed until he cried: the tears were falling onto his mustache. During our conversation Stalin quoted Chekhov, and one phrase which I recall was, 'We do not like timid people, but we don't like firebrands either.' Comrade Shcherbakov and I were proposing toasts. But Stalin turned to us and remarked, 'Why are you draining your goblets? You will not be interesting to talk to.' He asked me whether I was a party member. I said that I was not. He replied, 'Well, that doesn't matter, I was not a party member either.' Evidently Stalin was not interested in our biographies. He asked Registan with irony, 'Why are you El-Registan? Whom do you bow to? To the Catholicos or to the muftis?'

"What could we say about Stalin then, at that time? For us, Stalin was—Stalin... And we were a Russian and an Armenian, Mikhalkov and El-Registan; two non-party officers in the Red Army—and the authors of the State Hymn of the USSR. And it was only later on that we learned that at that very same time our friend, a co-worker on the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, Colonel Nikolay Nikolayevich Kruzhkov, was being interrogated by KGB General Abakumov: 'Your pals Mikhalkov and Registan already admitted everything to us long ago.'

"Kruzhkov himself told us about this later, by which time he had been completely rehabilitated and was working at OGONEK. But no one touched us. Apparently it was not quite so easy to compromise in Stalin's

eyes those who had been fated to become the authors of the words of the just-approved State Hymn of the USSR. And thus, this work also turned out to be another 'safe-conduct pass' for me.

"Just one more small detail: one time when Registan and I were leaving Stalin's office, Beria followed us out. 'And what if we don't let you out of here?' he 'joked' darkly.

"Under other circumstances this 'joke' would have cost us dearly."

[Question] Are you simply a fatalist, Sergey Vladimirovich? It appears that in everything you put your trust in fate.

[Answer] "No I'm not a fatalist. But my life is truly a chain of circumstances, a trick of fate. In general I think that, except for Fascist captivity, I wasn't afraid of anything."

[Question] Not even Stalin? Tell us about this man, in general. What did you think of him then and what do you think about the "Greatest of the Great and the Wisest of the Wise" now, in our days?

[Answer] "One time when I was at the Stalin Museum in Gori I was asked to leave a note in the visitors' book. I wrote, 'I believed in him, and he trusted me.' Was that naive? Perhaps. Well, what else could I have written? You see, that's the way it was! It is only now that history is opening our eyes, and we are seeing that Stalin was directly responsible for many evil deeds.

"The figure of Stalin is a very contradictory one: he was a tyrant, a butcher... But it is hard to understand why he supported good writers, directors and actors. When at the very same time no-less-talented people were sitting in the camps, or were exterminated.

"I agree with the formulation of Volkogonov in his article on Stalin published in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA: that the life of Stalin is a triumph and a tragedy. How can one comprehend, for example, the following episode? One time I was sought out with great difficulty at the Front, and was summoned to Kurochkin, the commanding general, who says: 'Call Comrade Voroshilov right away; he was interested in what had become of you.' When I reached Voroshilov, I hear from the receiver, 'Comrade Stalin has asked me to find out from you whether it's all right to change a punctuation mark in such-and-such a line.'

"What on earth?! Thousands of people are suffering, and we talk about a punctuation mark."

[Question] For which works did you receive a Stalin Prize?

[Answer] "The first was for poems for children. The second was for the screen-play for the motion picture 'Frontovyye podrugy' [Frontline Lovers]. And the third, for the plays, 'Ya khochu domoy' [I Want to Go Home] and 'Ilya Golovin.' I was also nominated for a fourth, for my fables. But when Malenkov was reading the list of candidates for a prize during discussion at the Politburo, Beria grinned and asked, 'What's this for? For 'Lisa and Bobr' [The Fox and the Beaver]?' And silence reigned. Everyone was waiting for the reaction of Stalin, who was pacing up and down the room. After a long pause Stalin pronounced: 'Mikhalkov—is a children's author.'

"And so my name did not appear on the awards list. N.S. Tikhonov, who witnessed this discussion, described it to me."

[Question] What was your attitude toward Zhdanov, of whom so much is now being said and written?

[Answer] "I did not know Zhdanov well personally. I did not associate with him. But his reprisal against Akhmatova and Zoshchenko stunned me. I could not make sense of his actions. I cannot say any more about him, for I saw him up close only once, when he was playing the piano and Stalin was singing ancient chastushki. That was on 22 May 1941, when Stalin invited a small group of the first laureates of the Stalin Prize and showed us the film, 'Esli zavtra voyna' [If There Is War Tomorrow]. It began in exactly four months..."

[Question] And what do you think about Khrushchev today?

[Answer] "Khrushchev, unquestionably, did a great deal in his time to change the situation in the country: he began rehabilitating those convicted innocently during the time of the cult, and he was the first to begin talking about universal disarmament. He was a unique personality, and had a sharp peasant mind! I recall that at one of the writers' congresses, Khrushchev delivered a report—a long, long report. It was quite interesting to hear. He spoke of many things, if not of all things. And as it happened he did not speak of everything. After the report I was approached by some of our literary functionaries, who had unambiguously noted that, they said, my cause was lost: 'Khrushchev had said nothing about satire. He spoke not a word. Thus, is it necessary now?' Such were the times... The functionaries merely adhered to every word spoken; if it was not stated, that means it is unnecessary.

"I understood that I had to correct the situation: Khrushchev must say at least a few words about satire. And so at the reception in Georgiyevskiy Hall, I walked up to Khrushchev and began to talk about satire. 'What on earth?' said Khrushchev with surprise. 'And why should I have to say anything more?!' 'Because,' said I, 'they will start to quote every word you've spoken, and study them. And if you have said nothing about satire, it means, Nikita Sergeyevich, that you don't care for this genre,

and that will have fateful consequences, and not only for literature...' 'And where should I say this?' asks Khrushchev. 'Well right now, say it right into this microphone.' Khrushchev walked up to the microphone and called for attention: 'Comrade Mikhalkov here says that I did not say anything about satire. We need satire; it helps us a lot!' And turning to me, says 'There, I've said it.' And once again I appealed to him: 'It is necessary, Nikita Sergeyevich, that your words be inserted into the printed text of your report.' Khrushchev summoned the editor of PRAVDA, P.A. Satukov, and gave the order: 'Put what I've just said about satire into the report.' This episode, one more time, takes us back to the times when the opinion of the leadership, whether competent or incompetent, could willy-nilly decide a great deal.

"One of the Central Committee plenums comes to mind, at which there were many guests. And you see, prior to the start of the next regular Central Committee Plenum, I was approached by certain comrades who were fighting for preservation of ancient monuments—that is, for that which is now approved and supported with such success by the government. They asked me to give Khrushchev a letter, in which they proposed creating a society for preserving cultural monuments. And I spoke of this myself from the rostrum. I hand the letter to Khrushchev, but he does not take it. 'I won't take it,' says he. But I insist. 'Nikita Sergeyevich, I beg you to take it; the people have asked for it, and I myself am wholeheartedly behind this cause.' But once again, 'I won't take it!' I am in a ridiculous situation: in front of the entire Plenum we are exchanging retorts. Finally Khrushchev gave in and took the letter with an angry look. And here I am, waiting for one of the speakers to support me. But not a single person supported me! Not one. In his concluding remarks Nikita Sergeyevich said: 'Mikhaylov and Paustovskiy here are protecting the relics of the past,' and he spoke out against the content of the letter I'd handed him. And right there, on the rostrum, something spoiled it. I don't know what exactly, whether it was the text of the letter, or something I'd said myself. And rumors crept throughout Moscow, saying that Mikhalkov had to crawl and that he took a drubbing. Malicious tongues can always be found. But eventually a society for preserving the monuments of history and culture was created, and today it serves the Fatherland with honor.

"True, I also remember a happier episode from the very same Plenum. Two kraykom first secretaries, serious people, were sitting there and guffawing. From the presidium, Khrushchev says to them, 'What's with you, do you think you're at a concert? What are you laughing about there?!' One of them replies, 'Forgive me, we are reading Mikhalkov's fables here.' They bought one of my little books in a kiosk. That's the way it always is: the serious and the funny exist side by side. And it's been that way in my life too."

[Question] But how did Brezhnev feel about satire and criticism?

[Answer] "Once I asked Brezhnev, 'Leonid Ilich, what is your opinion of FITIL?' He says, 'I don't like to look at it.' 'I managed to ask Mazurov, 'Kirill Trofimovich, do you look at FITIL?' 'I do.' 'Well, how do you like it?' 'I don't sleep for three nights afterward.' 'Well, what should we do then, cover it up?' I joke. 'No, no. We need it.'

"And speaking later in Baku, Brezhnev supported FITIL, when I reported to him that a critical dramatic subject which touched upon the honor of the uniform of the Azerbaijanian leadership was not being released to the public.

"Such paradoxes! On the one hand, stagnation; and on the other, support for FITIL!"

[Question] Sergey Vladimirovich, in John Barron's rather widely-known book, you and your spouse are named as "agents of the KGB." I understand that the question is a delicate one, is it not, and not from Barron's point of view?

[Answer] "About my wife, I don't know. But here's what I remember.

"Death came to Brezhnev while I was in Spain. Demanding comments from me, as a Deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on the events which had taken place in the Soviet Union, the journalists would not allow me to pass. Everyone was asking the same thing: 'How do you view the fact that the KGB Chief Yuriy Andropov would now be the head of the country?' When one of the more obnoxious reporters roused me to fury, a Spaniard who had taken part in the talks came to my rescue. 'Why are you pestering him?' he hurled himself at his countryman. 'What has the Committee for State Security to do with us here? After all, in the USSR the majority of the people think about the security of the state!'

"I had frequent occasion to meet with Brezhnev. He impressed me as a well-meaning and warm person. But Brezhnev lost contact with reality with inexplicable rapidity. Probably because by nature he was a sybarite. As they say, 'There's nothing wrong with living well.' But when such a personality is given unchecked power, all the conditions are set for satisfying one's every demand. And it was as if the servility and complete license of those around him stimulated a sense of impunity in those strata of society in which personal well-being is paramount. Violations of socialist legality—cooking the books, misuse of state property and corruption; ostentatiousness, and total bureaucratization in the years of stagnation, along with the permissiveness in the highest hierarchy in the state apparatus—corroded our society and halted its development. And the healthy forces had practically no power to withstand this utter lack of principles on the part of functionaries and administrators. The wheel of history turned away from us. And distrust was born both in the words uttered from the rostrum and in the mass information media. And then

Yu.V. Andropov became party general secretary. This most honest and modest communist could see everything from his post as Chairman of the Committee for State Security. But in conditions in which democracy and glasnost had fallen into in total oblivion, he had no opportunity to bring about fundamental changes in the situation in the country. For everything, the appropriate conditions are required..."

[Question] It seems as if we are talking about the role of personalities in history?

[Answer] "When I am asked about Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev abroad, I say that life itself promoted him to the post of General Secretary. The time for new thinking had come.

"Let us remember, that under Stalin a person could be slandered, snatched from the streets, arrested, exterminated... Under Khrushchev one could fall into disgrace as did poet Andrey Voznesenskiy, film director Marlen Khutsiyev, sculptor Ernst Neizvestnyy, and certain others. The wrath of the party leader was unjust, and poets ceased to be published and artistic works were not shown. Devastating articles in the press led to ostracism of a person's name. I think first of all of Boris Pasternak. In the situation of moral terror which grew up around the name of Pasternak, many writers—myself included—could not find any civic courage in themselves and went along with the decision to exclude him from the Writers' Union. And we welcomed this decision. Today it is bitter to reflect on this. But time puts everything in its place. Under Brezhnev, many, very many people were afraid of where the gap between words and deeds would lead, and general instability was threatening. It was only under Yuri Vladimirovich Andropov that the atmosphere of social life began to heal. But fate had given him such little time..."

"Just what does perestroyka mean to me? It is a completely different attitude toward life. I for example, to be honest about it, have at times made a pretext of going along with everyone else. Not alone, but together with everyone else. However, when Vladimir Dudintsev was excoriated for his magnificent novel, 'Ne khlebom ediny'm' [Not By Bread Alone], I spoke out sharply in his support. This was in Dubovyy Hall at the Central House of Writers.

"For a long time I have been struggling to restore the good name of producer-artist K, who had been slandered, arrested, accused and put in jail, after concocting a criminal case against him. In the end he was not only rehabilitated, he was also given an apology.

"In the given case the matter is not for me alone, and I am not wrapping a blanket around myself. I simply know that both during the personality cult and during the stagnation one could always find honest, courageous people—both communists and non-party members, who could not help trying to do what must be done in the

name of justice. When it was not possible to prove anything to Rashidov, Shchelokov, Churbanov or Medunov; when it was hard to punch through to the truth; then one had to wait until the proper moment for some kind of intercession, for protection.

"The hero of my fable, 'In Our House,' medical technician Stepan says: 'Should not this entire system be replaced?' Not to change the regime, but the system of control, the system of management, the system of a don't-give-a-damn attitude toward human concerns."

[Question] The human concern shown in "In Our House" was until recently considered a "celebration of disobedience" on the part of the functionaries clinging to power. This celebration placed limits on their freedom of action, to put it mildly.

But what do you think about the conception of limits to democracy and glasnost?

[Answer] "No type of freedom is in conflict with order. Only while strolling in the woods, but without an axe in one's hand, can a person experience relatively complete freedom. Complete freedom in any society leads to anarchy. I wrote of this in the children's story, 'Prazdnik Neposlushaniya' [Holiday for Disobedience].

"Complete freedom, I suppose, is enjoyed only by true Yogas: they just sit there; they don't touch anyone and they don't bother anyone; they dwell in Nirvana. And this, as specialists affirm, is freedom of the spirit. But what if you foist your spirit on another?

"Did not those writers who wrote works that were critical, topical and bold, and who got them printed more often than not with great difficulty, actually prepare the way for perestroyka? I have in mind Abramov, Dumbadze, Gonchar, Bykov, Trifonov, Bondarev, V. Grossman, Bek, and Troepolskiy. Does not the fact that Sholokhov was silent for a long time prove that he is for perestroyka. He did not perceive any kind of phenomena in our life; therefore, he was silent. The fate of Ovechkin, Dorosh and Radov was complex. And Dvoretzkiy, Volodin and Roshchin were ahead of their times.

"But for me, perestroyka has opened new opportunities for satirical articles and for public figures. It has become easier to stand up against injustice.

"I greeted the October Revolution at the age of four. Today I am 75. I was educated in Soviet schools and in the Soviet way of life. I am a son of my times and went through the Great Patriotic War; perhaps in my time there was a great deal that I didn't understand, or indeed simply did not know, just like millions of Soviet people. And it was only after the 20th, and then after the 27th CPSU Congress that we matured.

"I cannot trample the past into the dirt and join in with those who attempt to speculate on the tragic periods in the life of my Motherland. In spite of what we have lived through, in 70 years my Motherland has become a Great Power. The nation suffered, it fought, it won, it toiled, it believed, and it had patience—and the nation endured.

"Today there also people joining up with perestroyka for whom the socialist system is anathema and who are only waiting for an excuse to maliciously whisper, 'The experiment was a flop!' And of course they do not talk about this directly and not very openly. This is that 'human factor,' the ballast that wants to cast us back into the past.

"One time, it was in 1962, I was invited to the party Central Committee, to the Agitation and Propaganda Department. Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev spoke with me. They proposed that I organize a satirical film magazine. When they asked me what I needed for this, I answered: only one thing—trust me! And if I am unworthy of your trust, then give this film magazine to someone else. And you see our FITIL has been coming out every month for 26 years now. And when problems with censorship arose, we fought, we defended our positions, and we gave proof. And we were supported. As a rule, comrades were found 'up above,' who would say, 'Get on with your business! The people are fond of FITIL.' And in truth, during the years of stagnation (and this is especially evident now) FITIL was among the social forces which were preparing for the democratization of our society.

"In recent times the general tone of a lot of public commentary arouses a great deal of suspicion in me. Why, for example, on the eve of the artists' congress, at the very time for discussing the problems of the fine arts in the pages of its own press organ, the newspaper MOSKOVSKIY KHUDOZHNIK, did the Moscow Department of the RSFSR Artists Union publish such a monstrously ignorant and incoherent article against Vladimir Mayakovsky?! Who needs this? After all, everything here is attributed to Stalin! Must all the literature of the 1930's bear the stigma of Stalin's name, thus striving to compromise many literary figures? For what? So that Gorkiy and Aleksey Tolstoy and Vsevolod Vishnevskiy and Aleksandr Fadeyev should be called to account on why, let's say, they were not arrested; why they received awards from the government; why were they delivered at the time when others were sitting in prisons and in Stalin's camps? This is an emigrant view on the literature of the times which we have come to call the epoch of the cult of personality."

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

09006

**Prominent Author Describes Zoshchenko Stand  
Against Zhdanov, Writers Union**

18000264 Moscow, OGONEK in Russian  
No 6, 6-13 Feb 88 pp 9-11, 29

[Article by Daniil Granin: "A Fleeting Phenomenon"]

[Text] I met him at a time when almost no one was talking to him. He lived in Leningrad and occasionally visited the Writers Building, that is, he would drop in, but somehow stealthily, avoiding people. They would greet him and hurry on past with concerned looks, as if they felt themselves to be guilty. Some avoided him just to be safe. Everyone had his own fears. I too experienced a feeling of guilt. Later, when we became acquainted, he tried with his characteristic tact to help me overcome this feeling. But it remained all the same. I still have it to this day among the other sins and remorse that have accumulated during the years of our confused life.

It may have been because of that guilty feeling that I continued to look for the shorthand copy of a certain speech by Zoshchenko, and now, many years later when I have found it, I can write about that meeting in 1954.

I was already a member of the Writers Union, but it was my first general writers meeting. It had some title, to greet some holiday or prepare for something. It is impossible to remember that, although the meeting on that hot June night seemed to imprint itself in my memory in the finest detail, like a print in concrete.

The report and the discussion and everything else were only a prologue to the business at hand, and that business was to vilify Zoshchenko for his statement at a meeting with English students. Everyone knew that this was why K. Simonov and A. Perventsev had come from Moscow to this meeting. Zoshchenko's behavior in front of foreigners—sons of the bourgeoisie—had already been stigmatized in the press; they berated him without mercy. They expelled him, threatened him, and tried to outdo the definitions of him that Zhdanov had used in his report.

So, it was June 1954. Just over a year earlier Stalin had died. The terminology was unchanged, monuments to the Leader stood immovable, and many thousands of people who had been expelled from life continued to serve time in the camps. His words continued to be sacred. He rested in the Mausoleum alongside Lenin, fully preserved for eternity. History was just preparing to leap forward. Something was moving, certainly, gathering itself; the air was thawing, water was running secretly somewhere, and melted spots appeared. I do not know how but Ehrenburg's "The Thaw" had just been published; but it was immediately attacked by the guardians of permafrost.

The main hall of the Union was overflowing. The invitees to the execution packed in—journalists, newspapermen, and the public of the literary suburbs, exited, in sweet anticipation. I squeezed myself into a passage with difficulty and stood there against the wall until the end.

The report was presented by V. Druzin, who droned on about how Soviet literature becomes more and more mighty with every year, how the percentage of good works increases.

In tune with him the hall buzzed in a monotone, people conversing. They only fell silent when Druzin started passing out the snipes and carping, above all about "The Thaw." This had to be done as a ritual, then came the local offenders. He warned Vera Panova because she had "gone the wrong way" with her novel "Seasons". He threatened Olga Berggolts for her love poems. He lectured and slapped wrists and was confident of his right to do so. After all, he was the editor-in-chief of ZVEZDA, which had already been punished, cleaned up, and now stood as one of the model journals after the famous 1946 decree on the journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD.

I remember reading that decree at a newspaper stall on Liteyny. I was standing in a rain-soaked tankman's jacket, barely able to make out the print on the dark, wet page. Out of military habit I thought that if they had decreed it, that meant it was necessary, they wouldn't do it otherwise. But their malice and rage did seem excessive: "unprincipled, conscience-less hooligan"—that was about Zoshchenko, and there was stronger language, while on Akhmatova it was practically uncensored, as if at the very last minute they had changed to the milder term "whore." I would even have accepted that, if it had not been Zhdanov. Since the days of the Leningrad Front nothing associated with him seemed right. At that time I still remembered what he appealed for, demanded, and criticized, but never once in the months of the blockade did he visit the front line, and even in the second echelon we in the army did not see him.

They blamed Olga Berggolts, Vladimir Orlov, and Yuri German because they "bloomed" the prestige of Zoshchenko and Akhmatova and "propagandized" their writing. It appeared that this was exactly what had been done by the best Leningrad writers, the most talented ones, that Zoshchenko had been supported by Yevgeniy Shvarts, Mikhail Slonimskiy, and Mikhail Dudin.

Seven years passed, and then came this ill-fated meeting with the English students. I now suffered for Mikhail Mikhaylovich, pulled for him, but why in the world did he stick his neck out. It meant nothing to him, and he had been through plenty, he had been tortured and brutalized so much. But no, for some reason he was caught up in this business. Many of the writers I knew were annoyed in about this way. He should have waited, been more careful. 1954 was a year of waiting. We waited for changes, but pleasant ones this time. N. S.

Khrushchev became first secretary. Something was happening, some kind of thaw could be felt. And suddenly here was a new campaign against Zoshchenko. It frightened all of us, put us on guard. Was it really going to start up again, were they calling to battle again? Some people panicked—why in the hell had he shown himself, he shouldn't have provoked trouble, it only played into the hands of the Stalinists.

I remembered how it was with us at the front, near Leningrad in October 1941. We would fire a few rounds at the Germans and would catch it from the leaders: why are you stirring up the enemy, look what kind of fire he gave in return, and we are short of shells. Sit quiet and don't provoke trouble.

The essential point, as I understood it from Druzin's report, was that one month earlier, in May, at a meeting with English students they had asked Akhmatova and Zoshchenko their attitude toward the criticism in Zhdanov's report. To this Zoshchenko answered that he did not agree with the criticism in the report. This went off like an explosion, spread, and crackled. His answer resounded throughout the Western press, which, of course, "served the class enemy." As Druzin said, Zoshchenko's behavior in general had become a "class struggle in open form."

It is true that what stung him more than the class struggle was that the foreign students photographed Zoshchenko, but they did not take pictures of any other participants at the meeting.

"And they did not applaud anyone else!" he declared in an accusing tone.

Zoshchenko "did not agree." This, of course, had a stunning effect on us—how could you say that you did not agree with the opinion of a secretary of the Central Committee!

If I remember Druzin's report, it is only because of what happened to Zoshchenko at this meeting. And I remember that because it was new to me. No matter whom I asked later, no one remembered that report. They do not even remember Druzin himself at that meeting; they only remember Zoshchenko, and his speech. But I also remembered Druzin because he seemed a mysterious figure to me. Large, flabby, greasy, he gave the impression of a significant figure. No one could say what he had written, what works he was known for. I could not understand then, why in such a case he was the head of ZVEZDA, why he corrected and instructed others, and with such grandiose confidence. Why did people listen to him?

At the appropriate places the audience applauded, and at the appropriate places they were indignant. Everything was moving ahead smoothly. The loyal subjects tried to show themselves, and the liberals tried to calm the leaders, let them see that the organization was "healthy"

and "making correct assessments." To prevent things from getting worse. It would be a good idea for the meeting "to give a rebuff." Important for the leaders who were present. And in turn, to the leaders it was important for Moscow, for their leaders. It was as if everyone was striving to please some invisible person. Not long before this invisible person had had a name and existed; now you could not figure out who he was, but the ritual was observed in every point.

Several writers whom I did not know followed Druzin, and spoke and condemned Zoshchenko. Among the things they said were: "an accomplice of our enemies," "like the bourgeois hacks," "bootlicking behavior on demand," and "has lost the dignity of a Soviet man." I knew that Zoshchenko was in the hall. Somewhere in the front rows. I could not imagine how such things could be said to a person's face, in front of others. If it had been done in a rage that would have been one thing, but this was done calmly, read from paper, with a kind of cold cruelty.

A few unexpected hands were raised. V.A. Kochetov, first secretary of the Leningrad writers organization, was conducting the meeting. He consulted with K. Simonov and proposed that, since the issue had been clarified, all that was left was to hear Comrade M. Zoshchenko.

Zoshchenko went up on stage. There was movement in the hall, people adjusted their seats, pressed forward, and got ready.

It was the first time I had seen Zoshchenko. Short, in a dark suit, a brownish shirt with a black tie, very prim, "correct," as our master sergeant called it, and tense. His narrow, swarthy face was attractive for its old-time masculine good looks. His appearance combined delicacy and firmness, grief and self-containment. I do not know how he had looked earlier, before all these events, before the war and even before, during the years of the Serapion Brothers. I do not know whether this cool reserve was always a part of him.

Alongside Simonov, the heavy, flabby Druzin, the bulky, mustachioed Sayanov, all those who were sitting in the presidium, he looked weak and fragile. The podium concealed his puny little figure. He took out his papers, arranged them, and took hold of the edges of the podium. The audience watched in a complete silence that held more hostility than sympathy. The audience had been adequately prepared, a repudiating mood created.

Zoshchenko looked over the faces of people whom he had known for years, for decades; they were staring at him expectantly.

"It is very difficult to speak in my situation," his voice came out thin and broken.

It was clear that no matter what he said it would not be right: "insincere repentance," "forced to confess," "exposed for double-crossing"—it would certainly be worded some way.

"I do not know how to speak formally. And what use would my formal admission of errors be to you?"

But this was exactly what was demanded of him. Nothing more. That is why "Simonov himself" and Perventsev had come. Let it be formal, but the case had to be closed. Even if his confession were considered inadequate, no matter: steps would have been taken, and a report could be made.

"I am going to talk like I think. That is the only way it is possible to fully understand what a person is like."

That he was agitated was correct and could please the meeting, but his frankness and sincerity put them on guard. This could go too far. To say what you think—that was never demanded. You should say what you are supposed to say.

"I will begin with the recent events. The newspaper said that I had concealed my true attitude toward the Central Committee decree and had not drawn any conclusions from the party's instructions. I did not conceal my attitude. I wrote to Comrade Stalin in 1946 that I could not agree with the criticism of all my works. They are not all like that."

He was now reading smoothly and calmly, without any expression, in a colorless voice. His hair was combed in a perfect part. His propriety and coolness could have been taken for arrogance.

"In my application to be restored to the Union I wrote that I had been wrong in many things, had made mistakes. But I did not agree that I am not a Soviet writer and have never been one. That was the main accusation in the report, precisely that I was not a Soviet writer," and once again he repeated clearly and distinctly: "I cannot agree."

"Why emphasize the disagreement?" someone nearby whispered, "It's not worth it."

"For the last seven years I have been in a depressed state and have worked mainly on translation from Finnish. Several books have been published, and in addition I finished a book begun before the decree, about the Leningrad partisans."

He listed his stories and humorous columns and mentioned that in the past year he had begun to work for magazines. He was returning, slowly, with difficulty recovering from that blow.

"It seemed to me that I was stronger and more healthy, but after 7 years when my nerves were weak I became sick for several months and experienced extreme physical difficulty."

Kochetov smiled thinly and exchanged glances with Perventsev. I remembered this because it continued later.

"And yet some of my stories and columns were not bad. As you know, the procedure for selling vodka was changed on the basis of one of my stories. So my work was not so removed from life. I considered and adopted everything that the party said literature should be."

Portraits of Stalin still hung in every office, his name was on plants, kolkhozes, streets, and boulevards, and marchers in the Mayday celebration carried pictures of Lenin and Stalin. It never even occurred to anyone that you could take a swipe at the decree, nor even at Zhdanov's report, because he was a Comrade-in-Arms, his report had been approved, it was the basis...and so on.

"Yes, I wrote many things in the past that were apolitical and non-ideological. That is true. In part this was in step with a long-ago day, the 1920's. After all, I began work in 1921. My story "The Aristocrat" was published in 1923, more than 30 years ago! The sin of a certain apolitical quality, which unquestionably is present to some degree, is significant. But that, I repeat, is not true today. It was also stated that I concealed my attitude toward the decree. At that ill-fated meeting with the English which we are talking about not a word was said about the decree. The only subject was Zhdanov's report. That was what the English students asked: 'Your personal attitude toward Zhdanov's report?' I was prepared to answer any question jokingly. But that report, which said that I was scum, a hooligan, that I was not a Soviet writer, that since the 1920's I had been making fun of Soviet people—I could not answer that question with a joke. I answered seriously, the way I really thought."

His voice grew stronger and rose. The last words had a frightening ring. The silence was resounding, as if everyone had caught their breath.

Zoshchenko took a sheet of paper and clearly and distinctly read his answer to the English students, noting that the accuracy could be checked against the shorthand copy.

"I did not agree with the report because I did not agree with the criticism of my works written in the 1920's and 1930's. I was not writing about Soviet society then, it was just emerging. I was writing about the petty bourgeoisie engendered by our past life. My satirical pictures were not of Soviet people, but of the petty bourgeoisie, which had been shaped for centuries by our whole former way of life."



In front of everyone he was reaffirming his open disagreement. A direct challenge. The first open disagreement with higher authorities that I had heard in my life.

"I ended my answer like this: satire is a complex business. It seemed to me that I was writing correctly, but maybe I was wrong. But one way or the other, I give all my literary talent in full to the Soviet State, to the Soviet people. I understand that I should have expressed myself with greater political clarity. I probably should have distinguished the ideological content of the report as a whole from the attitude toward criticism of my work. I did not see any lack of patriotism, anything reprehensible in my answer. What could I have answered? What could I have said? Anna Andreyevna Akhmatova said, 'I agree.' She faced different accusations. In her place I probably would have answered the same way. But what could I answer when I was asked whether I agreed that I was not a Soviet writer, that I was scum?"

I was pleased at how tactfully he justified Anna Andreyevna. She was always juxtaposed to him. People would say that she had conducted herself with dignity, like a patriot, she had not played up to those wretches. The decree linked them together, two remarkable writers, the best there were in Leningrad at that time. They were always mentioned together. But at this point their paths diverged. Zoshchenko was left alone, all the guns now trained on him alone.

"What could I have answered?"

Suddenly this question rose up unavoidably before me. And before the others. Before each one of us. What could he have answered? You have to agree: what kind of discussion could there be? After all, it was not just anybody's opinion, it was said by Zhdanov, a secretary of the Central Committee. You should not think of yourself, of your own honor, but of groveling before the class enemy, of disgracing us in front of foreigners. In others Zoshchenko's question brought out a torturous disharmony. It was only then that I understood what an unbearable position Zoshchenko was in, what kind of line he could not step over at that moment. And he could not now either, it is beyond him.

He tried. Because it was terrifying to remain on the other side of that line, against everyone, to be condemned again, to go through the circles of hell again. But he did not have the strength. He asked himself, and us: was this question possibly a provocation, a deliberate action?

He was trying to draw us into the search for a way out.

"It was not until I got home that I realized what I should have answered, that they were a different audience, that they were just 20 years old, that the report had been 7 years earlier, and what could they remember? Which one of your older colleagues put you up to asking this tactless question? That is what I should have answered!"

"No, that is no answer!" someone shouted immediately, triumphant, catching him out, and even standing up so he would be noticed from the presidium. I only saw his fat, pink, shaved neck. A buzzing broke out, loudest among those who thought that Zoshchenko was trying to weasel out of it and had been caught. They did not even need his repentance; they were engulfed by the thrill of the chase, the capture, seize him just when he wanted to slip away, accuse, expose! The ruthless hunting spirit of the pursuing, surrounding crowd reigned supreme in the hall.

He did not seem to understand any of this and continued speaking from the podium in the language of trust. He hoped that he would be able to bypass all the rules of this civic execution. Now, when both Zhdanov and Stalin were gone, it seemed to him that it would be possible to achieve understanding among his comrades, his colleagues, if only he could find the words, tell everything like it was, and open up his own intimate feelings—they would have to understand him.

"Only several days later did the correct answer occur to me. I should have, with political accuracy, distinguished the ideological content of the report from its harsh criticism of me. But I did not find the words. Maybe that is because I do not know how to think politically. I am not illiterate in politics. No, I have read a great deal, practically everything written by Comrade Lenin. I have read twelve volumes of Comrade Stalin."

While rereading the shorthand record I recalled my feeling of annoyance at him. He should not have tried to justify himself, those 12 volumes would not help, they would have no impact. He was only making it worse. Possibly he should have taken a different tone with this audience, spoken in the language of those high-handed loudmouths who were pressing in upon him.

"There is some kind of defect in my writer's brain. I am not able to think in political formulas! I have difficulty understanding them."

But what kind of defect is that when it is a feature, a distinguishing trait of the real artist; is it a virtue that we are able to, that we have been taught to, think in political formulas, that we have been drilled in these endless meetings, interviews, seminars, newspapers, and radio broadcasts? Too often when at work I feel this as an illness, a heavy burden of the times.

"Yes, that was my mistake, that I did not immediately figure out the question and did not answer quite correctly. I am ready to receive my punishment. I believe that I am guilty of that."

"Is that all?" Druts shot out in acid tones.

I knew that it was Druts because earlier he had spoken against Vera Fedorovna Panova and supported V. Kochetov's article. What kind of writer he was I did not

know; I had never heard of a single book by him, but he spoke in a poisonous rage, and was followed by Neruchev, equally unknown to me but an aggressive, clever speaker. Most of those who appeared on the stage were well-known, experienced, and resounding speakers; it is true that they were not so well-known as writers, but that did not bother them. They were equal members of the Union, whether Panova, Druts, or Neruchev.

"I know what the article means when it defames me with words such as 'concealed his true convictions.' I know about complicated relations with publishing houses and arrogant looks from editors," here Zoshchenko departed from his papers, raised his head, looked into the seats, and everyone saw him. He was the same person who for many years had kept the whole country laughing, whose words had been repeated and quoted. In the hardest times, during the most unfortunate years, he gave people a chance to catch their breath; he gave them a little cheer. Zoshchenko was performed on every stage, and people laughed until they fell. While laughing at the stupidity of others, they learned to laugh at themselves. They saw themselves from outside, but not in a way that hurt, because the author was generally sympathetic to them and grieved with them and they, that is we, recognized the banality that Zoshchenko was able to show better than anyone else. The little man on the podium looked at us with such sadness, in such misery. God, could he really have been the source of laughter for all those years. Were all those sitting there, including Druzin and Druts, the ones he made laugh, did they all owe him those many hours of happiness?

He looked over all these people, and his voice tensed:

"But nonetheless. In my complex life, no matter how hard it is for me, even in this situation I cannot agree with the fact that I was called those things in the report."

It seemed that he felt relief, and so did the audience—both those who were against him and those who did not know how to act but secretly were suffering for him.

"For eight years now it has been hard, almost unbearable to live with the names which they hung on me, which so deeply insulted my dignity."

Then he went point by point through the accusations made in Zhdanov's report and refuted them. As I understood, this was his first opportunity to respond publicly. Indeed, everything that had happened since the 1946 decree had gone unanswered, all kinds of slander and falsehood had been made against him and he had not had a chance to justify himself. He had been called names and not permitted to object. So it appeared to people that he was keeping silent.

"I never tried to slip onto an editorial board, as the report claims. I did not want to climb into the leadership. It was the other way around. Who dares to tell me that

this is not true? I ran from every official position like the devil from holy water. I pleaded not to be included on the editorial board of ZVEZDA."

Concerning the story "The Monkey," which was supposedly what all the fuss had been about, he explained something that I, for example, had never imagined. In any case, it was completely new to us, the young people.

"That story was printed in 1945 in MURZILKA, for preschoolers. It was printed before the bad harvest year, when there could not have been any thought of a lampoon. Then this story was reprinted without my knowledge. I learned of this much later. Things took shape in an almost fatal way. Of course, I would never have taken this story from the series of other stories and given it to a thick journal. And it would have looked strange in a thick journal. I myself would have thought, what is this author trying to say? But it was really written for preschoolers and I swear that there was no underlying text in it."

On the subject of the charge that during the war he holed up in Alma-Ata, that he was a coward, and did not want to help the Soviet State in the war, he said:

"I fought at the front twice, won five combat decorations in war against the Germans, and was a volunteer in the Red Army. How could I admit that I was a coward?"

Mikhail Leonidovich Slonimskiy told me how bravely M. M. Zoshchenko commanded a platoon during World War I, was awarded two St. George's Crosses, reached the rank of staff-captain, was wounded, commanded a battalion, received two more orders, and after the revolution commanded a machine gun squad in the Red Army.

"Who here can say that I fled from Leningrad? My comrades know. I was working on a radio committee and for a newspaper. With Yevgeniy Shvarts I began the antifascist review POD LIPAMI BERLINA, which was broadcast during the blockade. They are here today, in Leningrad, alive: Akimov, who put on shows, Shvarts, with whom I wrote. This was in August and September 1941. The whole city was plastered with posters and caricatures of Hitler. I did not want to leave Leningrad, but it was suggested to me..."

Concerning reproaches for leaving Leningrad, much later, in the late 1970's when I and Adamovich were working on "The Blockade Book", we were shown with documents and figures how important it was to carry out the mass evacuation of Leningraders on time, even before September 1941. It was not done. That is why so many city-dwellers remained in Leningrad during the blockade, and why so many perished. Those who left on time should be thanked, not reproached. But a situation was created in which it was considered shameful to leave the city. This deadly pseudopatriotic idea persisted even long after the war. The 1 million Leningraders who

perished from hunger and gunfire apparently did not convince anyone. And so to accuse Zoshchenko Zhdanov used the same old device—he fled from Leningrad! He used it, attempting in this indirect way to once again justify his own obvious guilt for the fact that they did not really begin organizing the evacuation until the State Defense Committee insisted, when the circle of the blockade had closed, not until the end of January 1942, when death by hunger was in full sway.

"I was never an antipatriot of my country. I cannot agree with that. I cannot! You here, my comrades, my life as a writer has passed before your eyes. You all know me, have known for many years how I lived and worked. What do you want from me? That I confess that I am a coward? Do you demand that? Do you think that I should admit that I am a vulgar petty bourgeois, that I have a mean little soul? That I am a conscience-less hooligan?"

Something had changed in the atmosphere of the hall. The podium rose up, hung high above the seats. It suddenly seemed that Zoshchenko was not defending himself, not asking indulgence; he was attacking. One man against the entire organization with its secretaries of the board, sections, and editors-in-chief. Against the Kochetovs and Druzins, who were not important in themselves, but represented the authorities, the invisible forces of the apparat, the press, and radio. He had been invited to the stage in order to hang his head in public and repent. It did not occur to anyone that he would dare to rebel. Especially not then, beaten down, trampled, seemingly exhausted and completely destroyed. He was not supposed to have any strength left, neither strength nor spirit.

"Is that what you demand? You!" his shout hung in the air and then stopped abruptly.

His gaze bore in on me, and on everyone. It was a grim moment. I do not know how long it lasted. No one moved, stood up, or shouted, "No, we do not demand that!" This painful silence deepened the feeling of shame. Both general shame and personal. No one dared to raise his head. We sat frozen. Zoshchenko waited with some kind of desperate, mindless hope, then he said in a breaking voice:

"I can tell you that if that is the situation then my literary life and fate are ended. I have no choice. A satirist must be morally clean, and I have been humiliated like the lowest son of a bitch. I thought that it would be forgotten. It has not been forgotten. And in a few years I will hear the same old question. Not just enemies. Readers too. So that is how it will be, it wasn't forgotten."

He slowly gathered up his papers, and put them in his pocket. Once more with a long parting glance he looked over this hall with its rich molding, plump gypsum cupids frolicking, and enormous crystal chandelier shining gaily.

"I have nothing further," he said coldly and evenly. "Nothing. I do not intend to ask for anything. I do not need your indulgence," he looked at the presidium, "nor your Druzins, nor your abuse and shouting. I am more than tired. I will accept whatever fate brings me."

He left the wooden maw of the stage. He seemed to become even smaller in size. His pale yellow face was tightly shut, but it seemed that an incomprehensible light was breaking through the closed shutters.

He came down as if he was leaving us and going into oblivion. Not depressed, far from it. He had said what he wanted to say. From then on his words would live.

It turned out that all those years of harsh criticism, anathema, and repudiation had not been able to do anything to him, and as soon as he was allowed to talk he defended his honor. It was the first time someone had dared to speak out against one of the Loyal Students of the Successor. The 20th congress had not taken place yet, and their words were not subject to question!

It was a victory. It was clear that it had cost him dearly. But he did not care about the price. Nothing could stop him any more; you had the impression that he was floating off somewhere, light, weightless, all the ties and clamps had broken, and there was nothing to stop him. Those who had just a little earlier been threatening him with expulsion looked after him with a still unclear sense of a great loss.

Applause rang out. Two people in different parts of the hall were clapping. Applause was really inappropriate, you could say absurd, but everyone understood that it represented support, sympathy, a kind of protest.

I saw one of the people who was applauding. It was the writer Metter.

Kochetov rose and looked intently into the audience—who is it taking such liberties—shaking his head in warning. Then he whispered something with Simonov. They had to erase the impression left by Zoshchenko's speech. Druzins sat showing a kind of self-important smile, as if he was amused by Zoshchenko's attack, even flattered that, so it seemed, he, V. P. Druzins, had been the chief opponent, the chief exposé. In fact he was for Zoshchenko the symbol of a mediocre, not to say talentless leader.

So many of these self-important, high and mighty Druzins worked their way into editorial and publishing positions: they managed, ordered, promulgated the line, and taught us. We no longer remember their names, but those names were once imposing, menacing.

Incidentally, Druzins, that sad, orthodox persecutor of any "uprising," literally any one that was pointed out to him, whatever one they said to go after, this Druzins had his own secret. This secret was revealed to me by chance.

A year after the meeting with Zoshchenko I happened to be traveling to Karelia for a writers congress. I got a ticket in the same compartment with V.M. Sayanov and V.P. Druzin. Sayanov, a sociable man, brought some liquor with him, dug up some snacks, and after a few rounds he began to recite poetry, at first his own, and then others'. Sayanov had an exceptional memory. He read with good taste, but the most surprising thing was how he got Druzin reciting too, and well. Where did his nasal voice go?—he recited in a ringing, artistic style. A contest developed between them. They recited Mikhail Kuzmin, Benedikt Livshits, Vyacheslav Ivanov, Tsvetaeva, Gippius, Nadson, and Belyy—poets who were rejected, forbidden at that time, and completely unknown to me. They recited with intoxication, tirelessly. I crawled into my berth and fell asleep, exhausted. And the next day in Petrozavodsk, at the writers congress, this same V.P. Druzin spoke and cheerlessly destroyed the young poet Marat T. for formalism, modernism, and other sins.

The phrase "I don't need your Druzin" made a strong impression. Decades later I tried to survey writers who witnessed that long-ago summer meeting. As usual, no one made any notes. Their recollections were dim. It was impossible to recreate the text of M.M. Zoshchenko's speech through them. But it is odd that they all repeated the line, "I don't need your Druzin!" This concluding phrase they remembered exactly.

The first to speak was Kochetov. He also tried to smile.

"We are not going to exaggerate the significance of the speech that you heard from Comrade Zoshchenko. We are not going to exaggerate this whole story; this kind of thing takes place in church entryways. It was just hysteria, and I am surprised at the applause. What kind of people are they?"

The "church entryway" and "hysteria" were crude, but nonetheless they had no impact. People were slowly recovering from what they had been through and were not listening to Kochetov. They started to breathe again, and began moving around and whispering.

"It was a shrewd speech," Kochetov persisted. "Almost the entire Writers Union was indignant after Zoshchenko's statement to the students. Most saw this as a terrifying antipatriotic action!"

He spoke with conviction. He did not understand why the hall was not responding to his words. PRAVDA had just published his devastating article about Vera Panova's novel "Vremeni goda." He should have been feared. His tone took on a metallic ring; it was a shield, and at the same time a cutting sword. People really did fear him, but this is what started the gap between him and the writers community which ended with him being voted out in elections to the board. He was sure that they took up arms against him because of his ideological

implacability, because he was fighting against the "decadent intelligentsia." But he did not lose much. The opinion of the masses held little interest for him, and in the eyes of the leaders he was a victim and suffered in the defense of fundamental principles.

His conviction always puzzled me. At least you could not call him a hypocrite. And what he said further was also his sincere belief. Why are you all attaching such importance to Zoshchenko's speech and to Zoshchenko himself? Who is Zoshchenko? Why are we wasting our time on him? This was the gist of his words. But they went right past the audience, arousing no anger or even indignation; people were still under the powerful impression from Zoshchenko's speech and were not aware of this other agitation. He tried over and over to break through the indifference of the audience, could not, and then he snapped bitterly:

"Zoshchenko is just one person, a fleeting phenomenon."

"Yes, he was a writer who composed funny little stories for the philistines during NEP. Why worry about him? Don't we have enough people who are marching in step? It is only our enemies who are inflating him into a real figure."

But this did not work either. People did not come back to attention until Konstantin Simonov was announced. The representative from the capital was supposed to speak at the end, conclude whom should be corrected, and bring everything into line with objectives that were known to him alone. People had been waiting for Simonov. It had not been simply one of the secretaries of the Union who had come; it was K.M. Simonov, who was capable of independent actions, who could block what had been said by the Druzin and all the others. The opinions of the local officials could be crushed by his disagreement. Ranks of decorations shone on one side of his jacket, and on the other were laureate's insignia. It was customary to wear them then. The favorite of marshals and generals, our brother from the front. I looked at him with hope. It was all clear with Kochetov, but Simonov was a real writer, the favorite poet of our trench life during the war. He was handsome, dashing, with a small black Caucasian mustache. His fate had been entirely different from Zoshchenko's, but they were unified by their talent. At that time I believed deeply in the brotherhood of talented people. There are so few of them, and it is so hard for them alone—how could they not defend one another?

He held himself in a simple, soft manner and chided us indulgently—what have you poor Leningraders done this time? Like it or not, things will have to be put in order.

"A Soviet writer, readmitted into the Writers Union, who says that he has understood his mistakes, and then he up and complains to these bourgeois puppies. And gets applause from them."

I thought that this was just an introduction, an obligatory lead-in, so to speak—you can't escape that—but then, after this he would come out for justice, which had finally become clear.

"There is no reason, certainly, to make a big thing of this," he said, seeming to support Kochetov, and here he raised his finger.

And he frowned.

Then he sternly tapped the podium, warning us of the immutable significance of the decree on ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD. It is in effect, there will be no changes, nor any debate on this subject. As for the question raised by Comrade Zoshchenko, why not respond, why bypass a critical issue. If you want to erase the idea that you are literary scum, you have to do it with work, work is the only way to clear yourself.

"We recently published his partisan stories in NOVYY MIR. We trusted Comrade Zoshchenko and printed them. So why make yourself out to be a victim of Soviet power? You should be ashamed."

The German poet Stefan Hermlin later told me, "It was while Stalin was still alive, in his last year I think, that Simonov and I were talking about Zoshchenko. And Simonov told me with determination, 'As long as I am editor of NOVYY MIR I will publish Zoshchenko. I will not let him be insulted.' I remember how I was struck by the courage of his statement."

That is how Simonov was: he would hold out, hold out, and then at the last minute give in, unable to withstand the pressure. And there was, of course, enormous pressure on him.

You do not forget your first love, or your first disillusionment. I met Simonov numerous times later and learned that he had many more noble and respectable qualities than he had weaknesses. But for a long time afterward our dealings were shadowed by my inward-boring, deeply hidden memory of that meeting. I did not have the moral strength to ask him directly. And indeed, what could he have answered? It is easy for those who sat on the sidelines and had no responsibilities to judge, home-bound types with clean hands and pure heart who did not stand for anything, did not participate, were not elected, did not speak out. In those years activity prevented you from observing spiritual hygiene.

Once in my presence some students from the Leningrad Pedagogical Institute asked him to speak to them. He refused. His refusal was somehow too angry. They were surprised—what was this? He explained that it had nothing to do with them. He did not want to speak at all. "I do not want to lie," he said haltingly, "but I cannot say what I think. That's why." This admission to some

extent revealed the bitter workings of his conscience, and I understood a little, by no means everything, but at least I understood why I forgive him for many things.

It seemed to me that I, a newly elected member, was the only one who suffered so much at that meeting and had such a deep memory of it. After all, there had been many bitter showdowns in past years in that same hall. They destroyed the formalists, the cosmopolitans, and the followers of Marr, Veselovskiy, and several other figures, and expelled and reviled people for admiration of and connections with the "Leningrad case," and so on. But that meeting with Zoshchenko shocked even experienced Leningrad writers who had seen a great deal.

On the stage was a large portrait of M.M. Zoshchenko, with a vase of flowers beneath it. I was opening the ceremonial meeting dedicated to his anniversary. But my speech did not come off, my memory got in the way. The speakers that evening, Valentin Katayev, Sergey Antonov, and Leonid Rakhmanov, told of the youthful escapades of the Serapion Brothers so long ago, happy and touching things. It was in the same hall of the Leningrad Writers Building. Overhead, under the ceiling, the gypsum cupids frolicked, just as plump, curly-haired, and ageless. The hall was packed, with people standing along the walls and crowded in the doorways.

None of those who conducted that other meeting were now among the living. Why does it happen, I thought, that when the time comes there is no longer anyone to bring to shame, to hold responsible?

It appeared from the speeches that those infamous events of 1946 drove M.M. Zoshchenko to the limit, and in his last years he was broken and crushed. I tried to show that this was not exactly right. I tried to quote from his speech. And that is when I found that the text which I thought was fixed in my memory forever had disappeared, melted away, and only an impression remained.

After the anniversary I turned to the archives, first one and then another. There was no shorthand copy of Zoshchenko's speech anywhere. It had been confiscated. No one knew when and by whom. Obviously someone found the document so disgraceful or dangerous that it should not be kept, even in the archives. I was unable to find a copy anywhere either. No matter how many writers I asked, as usual they had made no notes. They knew that something exceptional, historical had happened and they did not write it down out of our Russian carefreeness.

One time, and I do not know why myself, I told a woman stenographer I knew that I had searched for years for a certain shorthand copy with no luck. My friend shrugged her shoulders: unlikely, you are not supposed to keep a copy for yourself, and in those years this was watched especially closely. Our conversation ended there. Two months later she telephoned me and asked me to come over. When I arrived she held out a packet of typewritten

pages, with no explanation. This was the shorthand copy of the speech by Mikhail Mikhaylovich. Where was it from? How was it gotten? It was from the stenographer who was working at that meeting. She had been able to find it. Stenographers know each other very well.

A note was appended to the copy: "I am sorry that the copy is unclear in some places. I was very upset at the time, and my tears got in the way." There was no signature. And my friend would not say anything more, nor did I try to find out. I tried to picture this unknown—to me—woman, who was on the stage over to the side at that time, working at her small desk, unable to get away, to look at Zoshchenko and the audience, to join what was happening. But all the same, she understood better than many of us that Zoshchenko was not a fleeting phenomenon, and that his speech should not disappear. She took a copy for herself, and kept it all these years.

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

12424

**Estonian CC Secretary Defends National Culture**  
*18000291a Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in*  
*Russian 3 Apr 88 pp 1-2*

[Speech by I. Toome, ESSR CP Central Committee secretary, before a joint plenum of ESSR creative unions: "Restructuring, the Task of All and of Each Individual"]

[Excerpts] Comrades! Today is most definitely a notable day. Our creative elite is gathered here at Toompea Castle, in the auditorium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet. Many of you have sat at these same tables before as participants in the work of joint plenums; however, today we have not come here to listen to ceremonial speeches, but instead to discuss in a serious manner issues pertaining to the lives of our people, to culture and restructuring.

One of the most serious effects of stagnation, and one of the most difficult to overcome, is the devaluation of moral values in our society and a tendency toward amorality on the part of individuals and in relations between people.

From the recent past we have inherited a society with a lessened sense of such ennobling morality qualities common to all humanity as honesty, a sense of duty and responsibility, respect for other people, love for one's native land and a low level of social empathy with regard to things occurring domestically and throughout the world.

The consequences of these things have been massive instances of petty theft and public tolerance of dishonesty. Their manifestations have been the concealment and juggling of statistical data and so forth. They have been manifested in abuses of power for the sake of

personal gain, a low level of labor discipline, negligence and an indifferent attitude toward the job; as a result of this we have an inefficient economy and a whole series of large and small disasters. Alcoholism, crime, drug addiction, prostitution and other things have managed to take root in this soil.

Ignoring moral values also results in deformation of relations between people, interethnic tension, a breakdown in the family, a devaluation of the ethical foundations which are so important in the upbringing of young people, and a decline in the prestige of education and culture.

Comrades! Glasnost and democratization in spiritual life have brought to our lives that which they were supposed to: the expression of and conflict between divergent views, approaches and perceptions. Restructuring prompts us to think in different ways and seek new paths of development. What we are talking about is pluralism of views in the search to find truth and make correct decisions.

At a meeting with journalists and the creative intelligentsia M. S. Gorbachev repeatedly stressed that we should not fear socialist pluralism. Both a radical rejection of former viewpoints and diversity of opinion on issues pertaining to restructuring have become a standard manifestation of glasnost in Estonian-language journalism. One could say that our journalism already more or less reflects the sentiments of the people and of various social groups. Thus, in newspapers and magazines and in television and radio broadcasts one can sense an upsurge in the people's interest and activism, a feeling of involvement and a proprietary attitude toward the things which people see occurring around them. One can also sense rapid growth in the people's political awareness.

Articles about our work in which problems are examined from a highly critical stance and often from a completely new point of view provoke special interest and a lively reaction from the public. As a rule, the social coefficient of useful action by such articles is high, even if the situations described in them are to a certain extent overly dramatized.

However, as a secretary of the ESSR CP Central Committee I am concerned by the maliciousness and tendentiousness which have appeared in some critical articles; they are directed not so much against our shortcomings and errors as against the socialist social order per se. By deepening the tendency toward mistrust of public opinion we are also sowing social pessimism which, objectively speaking, is a dangerous braking mechanism affecting the restructuring process.

We will not, as has heretofore been the custom, pin any political labels on anyone or regard people expressing their opinions as enemies. But let us all together give thought to acceleration of healthy social processes, to

unity of our creative strength, to democratization in our lives, to realization of the humanistic principles which have made the ideas of socialism attractive to hundreds of millions of people.

We are still in the process of learning how to determine public opinion and take it into account. Under conditions of restructuring public opinion is becoming a real political force. We realized this when we were dealing with the issue of phosphates, in the political actions of recent months, and also in discussion surrounding the transition of our republic economy to cost-accounting. We are convinced that political success and solutions to major social problems are impossible without the support of public opinion. We need to be able not only to study public opinion, know it and take it into account, but also to mold it effectively. Unfortunately, we are still not able to do this properly.

At the present time both throughout our country and in our republic there are plans to adopt quite specific measures concerning the organizational basis of the study of public opinion. Recently a public opinion center was established under the AUCCTU and the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, with a branch in Tallinn.

It is essential that we assess the capabilities of our sociologists and set up a corresponding system in our republic in the near future.

In this connection we would like to stress once again that the mission of our journalists is not merely to be a mirror reflecting the mood of the people and of individual social groups, but also propagandists of the party policy who shape public opinion, and organizers of social movements.

An increase in the value of democratic principles in the people's consciousness should be accompanied by genuine democratization of social relations and of public and state institutions.

Deserving of special attention is the initiative by our creative intelligentsia which resulted in today's joint plenum and in the work of the Council on Culture. Restructuring requires more active support by other segments of the population as well. Recently changes have taken place in public affairs; various new leagues and societies have come into being, and this is to be applauded.

The appearance of democratically structured private groups quite naturally encourages the democratization of state organs as well. There is probably no one who doubts the fact that the newly established public cultural groups have already had the proper effect on the work of

our cultural organs, forcing them to become more competent. We would hope that an important role in improving the system for administration of culture in our republic will be played precisely by the creative intelligentsia and its democratic public institutions.

In the situation which now exists party and state organs also face the task of reinterpreting their roles. Democratization should affect both the people's way of thinking and the forms and methods of their work.

The process of democratization in our country is being developed at the initiative of the Communist Party. And although at times one may encounter the fear or, on the part of some individuals, even the hope that this process will weaken the party's leading role in our society, I feel that we should not be deluded by these hopes and fears. Cadre selection and work with cadres has been and remains one of the party's basic functions in our political system. Of course, updating the methods and forms of party leadership and cadre selections is a different matter. The giving of orders, the omnipotence of the apparatus and secrecy surrounding new initiatives are being replaced by open and active work by communists in all labor collectives and public organizations. Formation of the party's point of view under conditions of broad intraparty democracy should become the norm.

We are delighted by the unity of our creative intelligentsia and by the responsibility shown by it recently in a difficult social situation. We are delighted with the sharp upturn in social and political activism among creative workers and the undoubtedly honest desire to express opinions on all current problems and all sore points in our public life.

But what is hindering this? First and foremost, from time to time there is obvious evidence of an inclination to dramatize events and a tendency to listen only to oneself and to not trust officials simply because they are officials.

Sometimes one even gets the impression that creative unions are accustomed only to criticizing others and making suggestions and proposing programs of actions for everyone else, while forgetting to set tasks for themselves, seemingly neglecting exactingness and a questing spirit when defining their own role and degree of responsibility for the resolution of each specific matter.

In this connection I would like to touch on one other matter, a very important and timely one.

At a recent CPSU Central Committee Plenum it was resolved that a radical educational reform would be carried out. We know that this reform has been taking shape for years, but that it has not yet gotten beyond the planning stage. As before, our schools remain on a low level, and our educational system is barely limping along.



This is a nationwide problem, however it is not one that can be solved in Estonia following all-union standards. We must find our own specific solution which will dialectically combine both all-union requirements and the needs dictated by our specific national characteristics.

How do we teach children the history of their people? How should the subject of Estonian culture be taught? What part of Estonian culture should be popularized among members of the other peoples living in our republic? This is not merely a strictly pedagogical problem; it is one which will require in-depth theoretical work both by philosophers and sociologists and by creative workers.

Of late creative unions have shown a great deal of political activism, setting up what might be called a "shadow cabinet"; their position has had an influence on the making of important economic decisions. However, despite some attempts to take the initiative, not enough has been done with regard to educational policy, with regard to implementation of the school reform. Now Estonia has great rights and the freedom to resolve independently problems pertaining to the organization of education and to draw up republic curricula in the humanities, and not just for schools in which Estonian is the language of instruction.

Our children's spiritual level, conscientiousness and level of culture today will determine how the Estonian people will enter the 21st century. If we overlook something important today as we go about reorganizing our schools it will be difficult to rectify that omission later on.

Now is the time to resolve certain issues clearly and unambiguously. And new Estonian schools founded on the concept of socialist national culture should become one of our constant values.

Comrades! Renewal of our society and achievement of a new level of morality and spiritual life assumes and requires reestablishment of the values of Soviet national cultures. Until now this issue has been ignored, but the deep problems which are being brought up in the process of glasnost bespeak its seriousness and the inevitability of reaching a fundamental decision on it. It is essential that we free ourselves from the false notion, and the complexes based thereon, that the development of an ethnic culture would by nature be directed against the interethnic component in our culture. Quite the contrary. Soviet culture is by nature an integrated phenomenon, and it is as strong as the unique national cultures which comprise it.

Developing Estonian culture within the framework of Soviet culture means above all increasing its ethnic contribution to that multiethnic culture.

Currently we are in a period in which we are critically reappraising and reexamining the present day and our historical heritage. And it is precisely in this period that we are encountering ever more frequent and categorical expressions of the opinion that Estonian culture is lagging disastrously behind, even that it is inferior. It is an undisputed fact that nationalities policy and cultural policy during the period of the personality cult did serious damage to the development of Estonian culture. It is also true that during the period of stagnation braking mechanisms exerted ever greater pressure; therefore the potential of culture and the framework of its development were under constraints. However, anyone who has studied the processes and periods in the development of our culture at a deeper level than the emotional level is aware that it is precisely in the area of culture that Estonian backwardness is the most relative, as paradoxical as that might seem. The level of Estonian art and the intensity of Estonian culture life overall permit us to hold our heads high on the international cultural scene in a majority of types of art. We must realize that relative glasnost and tolerance in both official and public opinion over the past decades has been the basis of our achievements.

Glasnost concerning and analysis of the process of migration in recent decades have yielded some new approaches to prospects for the development of our national culture. Currently one can sense in public matters growing anxiety among the Estonian populace concerning their ethnic identity and the prospects for their ethnic culture. Changes in our republic's ethnic structure are definitely a problem requiring in-depth sociological analysis and a political-economic approach, but we should not overly dramatize the matter of preservation of the Estonian people and development of their ethnic culture. The preservation of a people depends on the vitality of that people's culture.

In order to ensure that a culture remains vital, it is not enough for it merely to exist; it must represent something and must be constantly developing and striving for perfection. Without this striving, without an understanding of the fact that not just individuals but also the national culture as a whole should be in a process of ongoing development, without a realization that some things should be borrowed from other cultures and some things given to them in return, it is impossible to participate in the general cultural process today.

Culture is the primary precondition for and dominant aspect of ethnic self-awareness. Free development of a nation depends on free development of its ethnic culture and a highly subjective evaluation of ethnic culture, on measures which provide for utilization of our native language. Toward this end it is essential at the present time that we employ even well-known administrative means. When doing so we must bear in mind that in a democratic society either direct or indirect coercion in favor of the use of a single language is unthinkable, and the right and practical opportunity to use each language must be guaranteed.



Estonian is the principal language of our republic, regardless of whether that fact is presently stated in the Constitution or not. In a national republic there are well-known, self-evident principles according to which all state and non-state institutions and organizations should be guided. Of course, in this respect as well we must keep sight of reality. For example, it would be unrealistic to demand that the majority of residents of Narva or Sillamae suddenly, as of such-and-such a date, begin speaking and conducting all their business in Estonian. But it is a basic requirement that in our republic Estonians be able to conduct all their official business in their native language, and we should make this a reality in the near future. Specifically, those in attendance here today are probably aware of the Estonian CP Central Committee Buro's decision and the program approved by it with respect to normalization of the language situation in our republic. I am glad that this decision has received enthusiastic support at a number of forums of the creative intelligentsia as well. However, I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate that we must adopt the worldwide practice, most prevalent in multilingual states, according to which persons who through their jobs come in contact with members of various nationalities must have a knowledge of several languages as a mandatory condition of employment, and under which knowledge of languages is an elementary and official sign of the level of one's professional training. It is quite realistic to require persons holding certain positions in our republic to know two languages, and that is the policy which we are going to pursue.

In the context of our whole cultural life today problems pertaining to the relationship between various cultures and their role in the development of and outlook for our ethnic culture are more acute than ever before.

One characteristic feature of the current cultural situation is a desire to define our attitude toward emigre culture, as well as an intensive desire to integrate the culture of Estonians abroad into our national cultural wealth. This interest in something which has been kept quiet for decades is only natural, a completely normal phenomenon. Today our culture is open and ready to accept anything that is suitable to it, that is it capable of accepting and that will truly make a positive contribution to our national culture. There is good art and bad art, and there are things which cannot be termed art at all; therefore adoption of emigre art should not be carried out on the basis of a decree, but rather as part of a process of normal cultural exchange. The opportunities for such an exchange are better today than ever before. As for the publication or dissemination in any other form of works by emigre authors in Estonia, we must simply follow the elementary rules governing cultural imports. An author living abroad must agree to be published here, and the work to be published should be of artistic or informational interest to us. When we commence something new we should always be aware that we must pay for everything we wish to receive, and in each instance we must know who will bear the expense

for a given thing to be done. For example, publication of works by Estonians living abroad should, in my opinion, be done to the extent that those authors are capable of competing with authors living in the Motherland, as well as with the translated works which Estonians want to have on their bookshelves. The same applies to paintings and music. Experience has shown that creative unions could render very useful professional assistance in determining proper proportions in this respect.

Comrades!

The definitive role of culture in restoring a people's ethical values is the reason behind the ever increasing need for a clear, long-range cultural concept. It seems to me that the root of our problems today is to be found in the lack of a constructive, Marxist cultural concept which would meet the needs of today and form the basis for the cultural policy of tomorrow. The need for a cultural concept has been made more acute by a certain bewilderment at the opportunities unexpectedly presented by restructuring. Frank discussion of problems has created a situation in which the members of our national intelligentsia are still not completely sure of what they want or in which direction they want to lead Estonian national culture and the cultural level of our republic. This is underscored by the fact that opinions concerning the primary and secondary needs of our culture, ways to develop its material base, the need to erect national cultural facilities, the scale and precedence for such projects, etc. are so confused and often even diametrically opposed to each other! Should we expand research in the field of culture at VUZs and academy institutes, or should we establish a single research center to study culture? Should we continue to develop cadre training in the field of culture as we have been doing, or should we establish an institute of culture as an independent VUZ? And so on, and so forth. So many problems and questions!

Not a single democratic procedure connected with the posing and resolution of matters and the development and evaluation of concepts and scenarios should neglect the demands of competence. Each field of endeavor has its own specificity with which one must be familiar. But we are still seeing that familiar situation in which some people regard themselves as competent on all matters! Whereas previously this ailment was as a rule typical of administrators, it has now become quite widespread.

Recently in party work we have begun distancing ourselves from the viewpoint, quite common for many years, that party work in and of itself is a profession not requiring in-depth knowledge of any specific field. No, without specialization it is unlikely that we will be able to make the necessary decisions in a competent manner; we must know how to make use of experts' professional assistance. And we are going to make broader and broader use of such assistance.

Another fundamental problem with the development of culture is the need to reorganize administration of the cultural system and to change its nature.

The definitive aspects of the planned reorganization of the administrative system should not be formal structural edifices or mechanical staff reductions, but rather efficiency and competence in administrative work.

The basis of the reform will be improvement of administrative methods and delegation of powers to lower branches, which will have genuine authority to resolve problems.

One of the most painful results of the period of stagnation is the devaluation of the individual and the nation in our social perceptions and in the minds of the people.

A society based on bureaucracy, its ideology and the social scientists who served as its apologists in effect set about eradicating the individual, utilizing to that end the educational system, sham economy and, pardon my frankness, sham culture. The personality cult hated the individual, and stagnation was an anti-individual social condition. A bureaucratic system and a bureaucratic style of administration cannot tolerate uniqueness; it hinders their rule and is dangerous to the authority of the bosses. Bureaucracy did not require and still does not require independent and original thinking, debate or doubts concerning the opinion of those in higher positions. Bureaucracy requires people who can function within precisely defined parameters; individuals are troublesome and inconvenient.

During the period of the personality cult and stagnation there was, either consciously or unconsciously, a depreciation in the value of the ethnic component of the individual and in attitudes toward the nationalities question in general. In an attempt to accelerate the process of a worldwide blending of peoples and nations which beckoned from a distant, "ideal" horizon ethnicity came to be regarded as something second-rate, a part of the past, and the delineation of one's own people and talk of ethnic problems and the demand for more ambitious development of ethnic culture were even viewed as a tendency toward nationalism. Often efforts were made to hide ethnic problems rather than resolve them.

Restructuring supports the growth of a national self-awareness not only among Estonians, but also among all the other ethnic groups living in Estonia. We have nothing but respect for the desire to be a worthy representative of one's people and to be morally beyond reproach, i.e. to hold high the honor of one's nationality and one's people.

However, it should not be forgotten that the most important prerequisites for ethnic dignity is respect for the ethnic dignity of other peoples and tolerance of other people's ethnic traits.

The serious social problems which accompany migration are not directly linked to the ethnic nature or structure of migration. The complex of negative phenomena connected with migration are the natural companion and unfortunate consequence of an extensive and poorly planned economic policy. But in addition to this those problems are also a lesson which we should not forget.

A number of administrative measures are currently being taken for the purpose of limiting migration, but we must realize that basic solutions must be at the economic and political level, through planning of development in the area of production and in the social sphere which will take the availability of labor resources into account. However, we would like to stress once again that no democratic state, and especially no socialist state, can afford ethnic discrimination. This is one of the most important political and ethical foundations of the process of democratization in our country.

When we talk about ensuring the sovereignty of Estonia as one of the union republics of the USSR, that is not so much an "Estonian" problem as it is a common problem for all the citizens of our union republic. And just as we want to resolve for ourselves economic and social problems within our own territory, we ourselves must also solve the problems arising from interethnic relations in our multiethnic republic.

In this connection I would like to say a few words concerning internationalism and internationalist education. I realize that these concepts were compromised during the period of stagnation, but we should not have any misconceptions on this point.

It would be completely incorrect to think that an internationalist consciousness conflicts with a developed ethnic self-awareness. On the contrary, the more strongly and consciously we love our own people and its culture and history the better able we will be to respect another people, accept the culture of another people, appreciate their achievements and understand their history. This truth is equally applicable to Estonians and to Russians, or to Armenians and Azerbaijanis. Only people who have a well-developed ethnic self-awareness are capable of real rather than formal friendship among peoples.

In order to achieve fruitful cooperation among the nations living in Estonia it is necessary that we understand and respect one another. We also need to create the proper conditions for the cultural self-realization of all the nations living in our republic. Today's task is to create, while simultaneously developing Estonian national culture, more favorable conditions for the development of the cultures of people of other nationalities in our republic and to provide cultural services for persons who speak other languages.

The issue brought up by representatives of your creative unions, i.e. that not only Russians but all nationalities living in Estonia should have an opportunity to develop

their national cultures, is of fundamental importance in this respect. However, it is clear that with regard to small ethnic groups what is needed is initiative on their part, and it is the duty of our cultural and educational organs to support that initiative.

Restructuring in Estonia is a part of restructuring throughout the entire Soviet Union. Many of the innovations which we have proposed cannot be realized within the bounds of our republic, but rather will depend on the development of restructuring on an all-union scale. The mission of Estonian communists and of all supporters of the party's restructuring policy is to support the restructuring process not just from the standpoint of local interests. By historic fate we are now connected and will continue to be connected with our great Motherland, the Soviet Union. Our task now, perhaps more than ever, is to regard ourselves as citizens of the Soviet Union and realize that the problems of our republic are simultaneously the problems of the entire Soviet Union, that the interests of the Soviet Union as a whole cannot be separated from the interests of Estonia, that a correct and reasonable solution to Estonia's problems is in the interests of the entire Soviet Union. There can be no doubt that Moscow also has an objective stake in finding reasonable solutions at the local level to both economic and social problems, because the success of our entire great land of socialism will depend on the successes of each republic.

Restructuring assumes active participation by our republic, our communists and our citizens, including the intelligentsia, in efforts to resolve problems on an all-union scale. Our problems and the solutions that we suggest need to be broadly publicized as part of our participation in the all-union process of renewal. Some of our social scientists and cultural figures have already done so in the all-union press, and quite successfully. Unfortunately, disinformation has also been published in the all-union mass information media. One of our most urgent tasks is to recognize and truly feel our responsibility for the fate of restructuring as a whole. We must realize that we are as great as the problems which we are attempting to resolve.

The party hopes that our creative intelligentsia will march in the front ranks of the struggle to reestablish the ethnic convictions of our people both through their creative work and through their participation in broad-scale public and propagandistic work, that they will support each new and vital upsurge of social optimism.

12825

**Latvian Cultural Restoration Goals Discussed**  
18000339 Riga KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII  
in Russian No 4, Apr 88 (signed to press 23 Mar 88) pp  
56-61

[Article by Viktor Daugmalis: "The Latvian Culture Fund: Its First Achievements, First Problems"]

[Excerpt] The work of the Latvian Culture Fund must be viewed in the context of the work of the entire Soviet Culture Fund. This applies not only to its basic principles and directions, but also to the concrete exchange of experience and close cooperation in the implementation of the aims and tasks of culture building. In this there are many common problems.

The search for works of art and other treasures of national culture which are presently in other countries and their return to the motherland is not being conducted actively enough; currency payments are negligible. A list of donations has not yet been made up. Work in setting up contacts with collectors in whose private possession are to be found significant cultural-historical treasures, which should and must be actively drawn into the present-day spiritual life of our society, is not being conducted well.

But there are already many examples of truly creative understanding of the tasks of the culture fund and of the concrete experience of work in different republics which can be adopted, copied, and developed. This has, for example, been demonstrated in Georgia, where groups of activists are being formed at industrial enterprises. The Lithuanian Culture Fund has found a successful form of propaganda in the decorated information stands. In Leningrad a center for the ecology of culture has been created and an interesting and useful seminar was set up devoted to different aspects of the theory and practice of the work of the fund in which representatives of foreign countries also took part. Also, under the aegis of the culture fund, a charity movement is taking shape where participants provide immediate assistance to the aged and handicapped living alone. Apropos to our situation, perhaps it would be useful to have a movement that would provide assistance to parents of young children, since the demographic situation in the republic is far from favorable.

The culture fund is becoming a real participant in changes in the life of our society. For the beginning of May, a republic-wide action is planned for fixing up all the cemeteries, fraternal graves, and burial places on the territory of Latvia. It is a large-scale undertaking being done for the first time, and it is quite clear that there are many enormous difficulties. However, if we succeed in turning this into a tradition, where each spring and autumn one free day's work is devoted to the memory of past generations, the moral effect, above all, will be truly great.

What else are fund supporters working on? Proposals are being studied for the return of old, historic names to the streets and squares of cities, the idea is being considered of the renewal and revival of the concept of the sanctity of wells, there are proposals for erecting monuments to prominent Latvian composers at Riga's Opera Square, for handing over to residents of the city separate sections of city parks for individual pursuits, for writing the history of Latvia's agriculture (perhaps the history of the

land, which is a most significant and interesting history). Recently, Janis Peters, chairman of the Board of the Union of Latvian Writers, proposed the idea of creating a national park on the Salantse River. This is also a concern of the fund.

Work is also being conducted on setting up a program for the study and popularization of the folklore heritage of the Latvian people, a project is being planned for the restoration of Riga castle, and the possibility of restoring the wooden buildings of Riga is being studied. An alarming, if not to say catastrophic, situation exists at the republic's libraries and at the J. Rainis Museum of the History of Literature and Art.

The problems and concerns are numerous. That is why it is so important that the Latvian CP Central Committee has passed a resolution on the drafting of a republic complex program for the development of culture and art up to the year 2000 (its draft will be widely discussed in the press, television, and radio). Undoubtedly, this essentially indispensable program will assist the culture

fund in delineating more clearly and in more detail its tasks and its role in the program's implementation. In the recent resolution on the Latvian Culture Fund passed by the republic's Council of Ministers is discussed, in part, the necessity of the close interaction of the fund with various ministries and departments for the purpose of transferring to the fund, without compensation, individual shops, sections and enterprises for setting up production needed to accomplish its goals. The Latvian SSR Gosplan must aid the fund in the creation of production facilities, and also in setting corresponding limits on material input.

There will be results. There already are. But that they be as significant as possible, have serious impact, and endure for a long time should be the concern of each citizen, each one of us who holds dear honor, dignity, and the striving toward spirituality and toward the light.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KP Latvii. "Kommunist Sovetskoy Latvii" 1988.

**Estonian MVD Official Discusses New Visa Regulations**

18000289 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 27 Mar 88 p 6

[Interview with Mati Yaanovich Pays, chief, Visa and Foreign Registration Division, Estonian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, by M. Roginskiy, special correspondent: "Regarding Trips Abroad"; date and place not given; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA introduction]

[Text] Mati PAYS, lieutenant colonel of internal service and chief, Visa and Foreign Registration Division, Estonian SSR MVD, herewith answers our correspondent's questions.

[Question] We know, Mati Yaanovich, that since 1 January 1987 a decree of the USSR Council of Ministers has been in effect which specifically regulates the procedure for Soviet citizens traveling abroad at the invitation of relatives or acquaintances.

[Answer] All that is correct. I would merely add, by way of clarification, that a letter has also been received from the USSR Minister of Internal Affairs, entitled "On Measures To Improve the Issuing of Permits for Traveling Abroad."

[Question] And what is the result of this?

[Answer] The procedure has been simplified considerably. Let's begin with the fact that, in order to take a trip abroad, a person no longer needs to have a character reference from his place of employment. Komsomol or Communist Party members no longer need the consent of their party or rayon committees. We simply issue the person a questionnaire, which has only eight questions (there used to be 21). He can take it home, fill it out, and on the next day bring it to the passport desk for his place of residence. Without any visas, official stamps, seals, etc.

[Question] It would be interesting to know which questions were dropped.

[Answer] For example, the questions about party or Komsomol membership, education, academic degree, past involvement in court cases, status regarding military obligation, amount of wages currently received, service in elected positions....

[Question] Surname—first name—patronymic, country to be entered, certain information concerning the persons who have issued the invitation, including the following: if he or she were born within the borders of the present-day territory of the USSR, then we need to know when he left here. We also require information about the

closest relatives—who they are and where they live. Also about the places of employment, but not for all years, as was the case previously, but rather only for the last 15 years.

[Question] As a journalist, I cannot help being curious as to how the checkup on the data furnished in the questionnaire is organized.

[Answer] As an official of the MVD system, I can only reply as follows: this should not worry you. No illegal acts whatsoever are committed here.

[Question] Our readers have many questions, Mati Yaanovich, about the very principles of issuing permits to go abroad—either as a guest or for permanent residence. Who can and who cannot?

[Answer] Well now, let me first explain more precisely who can do this. For permanent residence—those who are attempting to rejoin their families: children to their parents or the other way around. And as guests—it depends on the country involved. In the case of a capitalist country, as a rule, an invitation from the closest relatives is necessary. Permission is also granted to attend the funeral of one's parents or to visit their grave.

[Question] And can a person go abroad upon receiving an invitation from acquaintances?

[Answer] He can. In principle, we place no obstacles in the way of this.

[Question] Obviously, it's simpler to travel to a socialist country. But what specifically is involved here?

[Answer] Well, in this case, it's sufficient to receive an invitation from acquaintances rather than just relatives. And the questionnaire is even shorter.

[Question] Who cannot go abroad?

[Answer] There is a list of prohibitions: possession of service-related secret information, property-type or other obligations to individuals or the state, being under investigation, violation of customs regulations while on a previous trip....

[Question] Mati Yaanovich! The formal criteria are known in general. But I'd like to ask you about some specifics. Suppose, for example, that a citizen went on a tour abroad and remained there for good. There have been such cases. Could he invite his wife to join him?

[Answer] He could do that, but we would be against it, inasmuch as he remained there—have I understood you correctly?—illegally.

[Question] And what if a citizeness is engaged in prostitution?

[Answer] We have the right to refuse her permission to leave on grounds of morality.

[Question] What about a drug addict, an alcoholic, or a hooligan?

[Answer] They too would be refused. All the more so if they had been punished according to an administrative procedure. In that case, they would have to wait at least one year.

[Question] What if a person lied on the questionnaire?

[Answer] That's grounds for refusal.

[Question] Do all these obstacles also apply to wives going abroad to join their husbands, or do they apply the other way around?

[Answer] Absolutely. By the way, there is also the following change. Previously, children under the age of 18 could travel abroad with their relatives and, in certain cases, even with their parents' acquaintances. Now they can do so only with their parents.

[Question] What can an applicant do, if you have refused to grant him a permit?

[Answer] He can try again. But not until at least six months have elapsed.

[Question] Now about the procedure for traveling abroad....

[Answer] Travel abroad to the CEMA countries has been substantially simplified. Thus, for parents, children, and spouses, a visa is valid for six months, and during this half a year they can make as many round trips as they like without any additional permission being necessary. Each time there must be an invitation, certified by the official stamp of the country to be entered. And the passport must constantly remain in the visitor's possession. This is sometimes quite important for purchasing an airline ticket or staying at a hotel. Another thing is that a passport to go abroad does not allow a person to execute certain financial-legal acts—to authorize donations or to swap apartments. But it is possible to get married, for example, with this document. What else? Nowadays we do not indicate in passports the period of time to be spent abroad. This is the case for all countries. Previously, people used to request the following: for five days, for 20 days. But now we put down six months, and it's up to the person involved to choose the exact time period. The currency provisions have also been changed accordingly. On a trip to the CEMA countries, for example, the exchange is conducted on the basis of 15 rubles a day, but no more than 1,350 rubles. On a trip to Yugoslavia this figure amounts to 300 rubles. On trips to all other countries it cannot exceed 420 rubles.

[Question] Are permits issued for taking trips to those countries with which the Soviet Union has no diplomatic relations at the present time? I am thinking primarily of Israel, where many Soviet citizens have close relatives living.

[Answer] That's a very complicated matter. You see, trips abroad are conducted on the basis of bilateral agreements. And not only concerning the procedures for entry and exit, but also regarding the procedure for protecting an individual and compensation for possible material or even moral harm. To put it bluntly, suppose that while you were abroad, someone—either an individual or the authorities—insulted you, slandered you, and involved you in a lawsuit, perhaps even a criminal case. A state is obligated to protect its own citizens. But if there are no relations, then there are usually no agreements of this kind. Therefore, trips to Israel, as well as trips from there to the USSR, are permitted only in exceptional cases. But if, as has frequently happened, a person has proceeded through the channels of emigration to Israel and has become a citizen of another state with which the USSR does maintain diplomatic relations, for example, the United States, the FRG, or Australia, then there are no obstacles for an appropriate visit. That is to say, it would be conducted on principles which are common to the capitalist countries.

[Question] Could you give us an idea of the scope of your work?

[Answer] I don't think that you will find more dynamic growth anywhere else. Let me give you a simple example. Formerly, we used to receive an average of 3,000-3,500 applications a year for visits to foreign relatives or acquaintances. Last year there were 70 percent more than there were the year before last. And this year, as of 15 March, we have 1500 applications for travel to the capitalist countries and just as many to the CEMA countries.

[Question] According to the regulations, it seems that these applications must be examined within a month's time.

[Answer] Yes, they must. But we are not succeeding in doing this. And I must simply offer my apologies through your newspaper to those persons who have to wait twice as long as the time period established by the regulations. Let me say straightforwardly that we are working 10-12 hours a day, and recently a colleague spoke to me for the first time, stating that she wished to be let go—the work had become just too hard. And so that's the kind of situation that we have here.

[Question] Perhaps your staff should be expanded, and fees introduced for the applications.

[Answer] We have posed the question of staff personnel, and we are hoping for a favorable solution. But with regard to fees, we must give it some thought. This is a

question not only of economics but also of politics, a question of a person's rights. Why should he have to pay without knowing the result? Paying for a visa is another matter. And, you know, a state customs duty of 200 rubles is already charged for a visa when it is a matter of permanent residence. And one ruble is charged for a passport.

[Question] As I see, you have a whole packet of these passports on your desk. Do you issue new ones for each trip?

[Answer] That would be too expensive. At present we have the following procedure: a passport is valid for five years, and we can extend it for another five-year period.

[Question] I want to lament a bit, Mati Yaanovich. At one time it was possible to leave any country and go to

the ends of the earth without explaining your reasons or filling out any questionnaires—all you had to have was enough money....

[Answer] What can I say in reply to you? As a lover of adventure stories, I'm also sad that nowadays such trips practically border on the fantastic. But as an official of the OVIR, I am obligated to recognize the realities of the present-day world. And not only political but also economic. Every trip abroad is linked for our state with the expenditure of international currency which it would still be preferable to spend on buying machine tools, equipment, materials, and technologies needed by the society as a whole, rather than paying for trips, food, or let's admit it, souvenirs for an individual citizen. Do you agree?

2384

**Armenian Komsomol Exhorted to 'Internationalist Brotherhood'**

18300208a Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian  
29 Mar 88 p 1

[Editorial: "On the Basis of Equality and Brotherhood"]

[Text] Even yesterday we did not suspect the kind of difficulties we would encounter along the path of perestroika that have now arisen in the country. They are occurring in no simple or smooth way; errors and failures of the past have surfaced in a most vulnerable and delicate sphere—interethnic relations. In the appeal from CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev to the workers and peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia and in the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium we see the concern for the situation that has taken shape in the Azerbaijan SSR and the Armenian SSR in connection with the events in Nagornyy Karabakh, and the appeal sounds out: in no circumstances inflict damage on the brotherhood of the republics and the further strengthening of the friendship of the peoples of the USSR. It is essential today to create a calm and businesslike atmosphere and mobilize efforts to resolve the tasks of the revolutionary transformations taking place in our society.

The Komsomol is assigned a not insignificant role in this. As the Armenian Leninist Komsomol Central Committee appeal to members of the Komsomol in the republic noted, in a unified formation with the communists, each Komsomol organization must resolve with initiative and interest the immediate issues affecting all aspects of Komsomol and youth mutual relations.

Unfortunately, in recent months there has been a weakening in the work of a number of Komsomol organizations. In the dust of the polemic and the meetings and demonstrations, many workers, representatives of our scientific and creative intelligentsia, and students and pupils at vocational and technical schools have somehow forgotten their first duties—to resolve through productive and high-quality labor and with mastery of knowledge about the diversity of youth, the problems that must be resolved under the conditions of perestroika. Komsomol leaders have encountered a situation that is new for them and have found that the former link with the youth masses has been lost and that political-indoctrination and mass agitation work has weakened.

Today life is gradually returning to normal. The Komsomol committees in the republic are obliged to analyze in a self-critical manner everything that has taken place, draw up a concrete program of action and in a short time achieve the activation of Komsomol life in all its fullness.

The complex and delicate task for the Komsomol organizations is to strengthen trust and cooperation between the youth in the fraternal Transcaucasian republics, and

contacts between the peoples. A meeting of soldier-internationalists who carried out their duty in Afghanistan has just concluded in Gorkiy Oblast, as has a symposium of young scientists of Azerbaijan and Armenia at the Komsomol Central Committee Higher Komsomol School. The long-standing links between the Komsomol committees and political institutions in Yerevan and Baku have been continued.

During the school vacations in the republic groups of tourists have come to study the various corners of our country. And it is very important that they sense a feeling of hospitality and true comradeship. It is essential that we do everything necessary to make these and many other arrangements and meetings unite rather than disunite youth, and that they strengthen internationalism in fact not just in words.

It is high time that youth understood internationalism as something global, that is seen on the notable shock Komsomol constriction sites in Siberia or in the cleanup following natural calamities in Georgia and Moldavia; that is, wherever it acts and shows itself in concrete deeds. For here at home, too, we have unresolved problems and places where the efforts of youth can be applied. True internationalism is inconceivable with real patriotism, and this means the ability and desire to live for the interests of one's own labor collective and for one's own Komsomol organization.

Today the task for the Komsomol organizations and for each young worker is to make a maximum effort to make up what has been lost, first and foremost the arrears in contractual deliveries to enterprises in the fraternal republics, and to prepare for the Leninist communist subotnik on 16 April.

It is harvest time for rural workers and spring field work is in full spring. The success of the future harvest depends directly on collective effort and on whether or not the people able to champion state interests work thinking as one.

Members of the Komsomol, the future of the republic is in your hands. Its further socioeconomic development depends on you, and on the contribution that each person makes in the provision of public services and amenities in his own village, rayon or city. And on proper order at each work place and in the student lecture halls and classrooms. Today it is important to greet the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the 70th anniversary of the Leninist Komsomol with shock labor, outstanding study and a strengthening of the international ties between all the peoples of our great motherland.

It was V.I. Lenin's habit in difficult and complicated times to seek advice from Marx. The present generation of young people must develop within itself the habit of seeking advice from Lenin in the indoctrination of real internationalists, relying on the fundamental Leninist



thought that "by organizing production without class oppression, and insuring the well-being of all members of the state, socialism... precisely because of this facilitates and accelerates enormously the rapprochement and fusion of the nations."

It is said of us that we are born internationalists. This does not mean that the role of international indoctrination becomes any less. The vestiges of the past and the many centuries of reprisals and errors sometimes turn out to be stronger than the fraternal mutual relations that have been formed during the years of Soviet power. Each rising generation must go through the school of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism, and the proud sense of belonging to the unified and great Soviet motherland. Time shows that intensive economic and social development in each of our republics accelerates the process of their comprehensive approximation. It is on this that perestroika focuses us—on the burgeoning and mutual enrichment of the national cultures on the basis of equality and brotherhood.

09642

**Joint Armenian-Azerbaijani Komsomol Resolution on Increasing Interaction**

18300208b Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian  
7 Apr 88 p 1

[Editorial: In the Armenian and Azerbaijani Leninist Komsomol Central Committees"]

[Text] The bureaus of the Azerbaijani and Armenian Komsomol central committees have adopted a joint resolution "On Measures by the Azerbaijani and Armenian Komsomol Central Committees To Extend Bilateral Contacts between Youth and Shape in Young Men and Women a High Level of Culture in Interethnic Dealings in Light of the Appeal Issued by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev to the Workers and Peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia."

The resolution reflects the main directions in work by the Komsomol organizations in the two republics in the international and patriotic indoctrination of young men and women, and extending bilateral contacts between youth and shaping in it the fundamental Leninist principles of international intercourse. The resolutions pay special attention to strengthening the friendship between youth in the two republics and to establishing closer contacts between the Komsomol organizations in the cities, rayons, enterprises, institutions and educational establishments.

For the purpose of conducting an in-depth and comprehensive study of problems in international and patriotic indoctrination it is planned to set up a working group to develop a set of long-term measures to improve the international indoctrination of youth in Azerbaijan and Armenia. Provision has been made to hold zonal and rayon conference-seminars of Komsomol cadres and the

aktiv on these issues and to exchange methodological literature, and also to organize on the base of the republic Komsomol schools weekly courses for the exchange of experience in Komsomol and pioneer work.

In the organization of agitation and propaganda work it is planned to make more extensive use of forms such as exchanges of agitation teams and artistic-propaganda groups, and delegations of representatives of the various categories of working, rural, scientific and creative youth. This includes the holding of special days devoted to the newspaper MOLODEZH AZERBAIDZHANA in Yerevan, and to the newspaper KOMSOMOLETS in Baku, and to publish joint editions and special-purpose columns and air television broadcasts devoted to strengthening the friendship between youth in the two republics.

It is intended to conduct via the pages of the youth and children's newspapers and magazines in the two republics quizzes and competitions for the best knowledge of the history, geography, life and culture of the two peoples in the fraternal Transcaucasian republics and to organize special youth tourist exchange groups from among the winners and those participating actively in the competitions. During 1988 it is planned to hold joint competitions of professional skills and exchange exhibitions and sales of consumer goods for young people made by members of the comprehensive youth collectives, students at vocational and technical schools and the youth cooperatives.

In order to further expand contacts between scientific youth in the Transcaucasian republics it is planned to hold scientific-practical conferences of young scientists and a series of meetings, discussions and roundtables to establish friendly ties and exchange experience between scientific and technical creative youth in the two republics, and also to set up an interrepublic comprehensive creative youth collective to carry out urgent work.

It is intended to organize exhibitions by young artists in Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia and to prepare for publication anthologies of poetry produced through the literary associations of the Azerbaijani and Armenian Komsomol central committees. It is proposed to hold in Yerevan city a meeting of soldier-internationalists from the Transcaucasus who have served in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, under the slogan "We Are Strong in Leninist Friendship," and to organize joint competitions on technical and military-related kinds of sport among young men of predraft age in the cities of Baku and Yerevan, and also to hold a rally of young friends of the border guards in Azerbaijan and Armenia.

The joint plans envisaging the expansion of ties between student youth contain much that is new. They include participation by school activists in Armenia and Georgia in the work of the republic Komsomol and pioneer camp by the aktiv of the "Krasnaya gvozдика" in Kuba city in the Azerbaijan SSR, and the organization of an active

correspondence between pioneers and schoolchildren and joint visits by them to pioneer camps during the summer vacation; and keeping international watches in the labor camps and leisure camps for schoolchildren and the formation of student exchange detachments of communist labor and international student production brigades to work on the construction and repair of social and cultural projects and kindergartens and boarding schools.

The cause of the communist indoctrination of student youth will be served by the creation of an interrepublic school to disseminate teaching experience; sessions will be held alternately in secondary schools in the Transcaucasian republics.

The next three years of the present five-year plan will become for the youth of the country an important stage on the road to great socioeconomic transformations. Ahead lie two important milestones, namely, the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the 70th anniversary of the Komsomol. It is important already today to prepare to greet them in a worthy manner and consistently to implement measures to realize the program of perestroika, and to regard as the main and immediate task giving due consideration to the indoctrination of youth and the entire population in the spirit of internationalism.

09642

**Appeal to Armenian Komsomol Members for Discipline, Public Order**  
*18300209a Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian*  
*24 Mar 88 p 1*

[Text of Armenian Komsomol Central Committee Appeal]

[Text]

**An Appeal of the Armenian Leninist Komsomol Central Committee to Komsomol Members in the Republic.**

Comrades,

The events in Nagorny Karabakh and around it have been continuing for a long time. Many young people have become involved, many of whom cannot imagine the consequences of deviations in the work of the labor collectives, establishments and organizations for the republic's socioeconomic development, mutual relations between young people and all workers in Armenia and Azerbaijan, and the sociopolitical climate in the country.

Most Komsomol committees and Komsomol activists, understanding the situation, are taking steps to normalize it under the leadership of the communists.

At the same time individual Komsomol organizations and Komsomol members who do not have sufficient experience of life or political experience have taken a wait-and-see and reconciliatory stance on these issues. In some places the student and creative youth has fallen outside the Komsomol's field of vision, and discipline within the Komsomol has been weakened.

The Armenian Leninist Komsomol Central Committee calls upon all members of the Komsomol in the republic to show political awareness, be guided undeviatingly in all their actions by the appeal from CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Comrade M.S. Gorbachev by not indulging in spontaneous acts, and to be an example for the young men and women at work and in study and to observe public order.

The civic maturity of Komsomol members should be displayed today, understanding that, as was noted at the 9 March 1988 meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, all problems that have arisen will be resolved within the framework of democracy and the Soviet law.

In a unified formation with the communists, each Komsomol organization must resolve with initiative and interest the immediate issues affecting all aspects of mutual relations between the Komsomol and youth of Armenia and Azerbaijan.

At this time the close link between members of the Komsomol and party and war veterans and veterans of labor is more important than at any other time. It is our filial duty to preserve and continue the invaluable traditions of proletarian internationalism and socialist patriotism passed down to us by the older generations.

Members of the Komsomol,

The youth of the republic is its future. And what this future will be depends on you today.

(signed) The Armenian Leninist Komsomol Central Committee

9642

**Official on Armenian Efforts To Provide Education for Azerbaijani Residents**  
*18300209b Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian*  
*24 Mar 88 p 6*

[Article by Isfaril Mamedov, Armenian SSR deputy minister of education: "To Stir up What Is Good in Hearts"]

[Text] No matter how often we repeat the truth it does not alter. Our peoples have always been on the same road in the joint quest for their destiny. There have been many sad, anxious and alarming days. Throughout the

centuries fate has not indulged any one nation in the Caucasus. The evil enslavers nearby, a crafty bourgeoisie, and national enmity have ravaged the people.

The 68-year path of the development of our Caucasian republics have been inseparably molded by the centuries during which the land of Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan gave the world great artists and thinkers, people of education and advanced convictions. These milestones and centuries make up the single historical monolith that evokes legitimate pride among our contemporaries. In the depth of those distant centuries we hear well the voices of those who called us to peace and friendship. Since time immemorial across the Caucasus—that magical and wonderful place—the bewitching song of the people has rung out—the people who live side by side and ardently and selflessly love their sons, who, dreaming of a happy future for their people, have fought for the happiness of all humankind.

Both the Armenian and the Azerbaijani literature is filled with shining and unforgettable warmly written pages about the true friendship of the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples. We recall the vivid and striking images created by Kh. Abovyan and O. Tumanyan, A. Isaakyan and D. Demirchyan and many other figures of Armenian literature. All the great masters of Azerbaijani literature—Nizami and Khagani, Akhundov and Dzhabbarly—wrote of the selfless love and respect for the Armenian people.

All the rivers and streams, all the highways and byways that unite our peoples as through the centuries they have overcome the multitude of obstacles, have brought down to our times the most precious spiritual wealth, which, in the words of the poet, have now grown into a sense of unified family. In the most difficult times, at the sharpest turns in history, at any time the friendship between our peoples has always found actual expression, concrete features and vital and essential meaning. And today, when undying memory is combined with aspiration for the future, historicism in thinking with inspired activity, moral lyricism with the joy of life and the sense of well-being, I speak of the friendship of the peoples with particular sensitivity because the processes of renewal in the life of society and democratization and glasnost demand from us increasing attention to questions of national policy and the problems of international indocination.

We must have a dialectical understanding of the questions of history. It is necessary to understand that we are all answerable for our national brotherhood and for the high standard of relations between the nations.

The writer expresses popular expectations. He must know that possession of a national culture excludes nationalism and that internationalism is not a bird of passage that flies off when he has sung his song... Internationalism must live in people's hearts and bring warmth into their lives, their work and their struggle; it

must be a person's inseparable companion, beating out the rhythm of kind feelings with every passing minute. In order to be permeated with an ultimate trust and respect we must know a great deal about each other, with a full understanding of the meaning of internationalism, under the sun of the new era of friendship of the peoples. This is my own short personal account of this score: for the past two decades I have combined service and creative activity and translated into Azeri nine plays by Armenian dramatists along with all official materials and legislative acts published on the pages of the republic newspapers, including the Constitution of the Armenian SSR, materials from party congresses, sessions of the Supreme Soviet and so forth. I have translated and prepared for print an anthology of 50 standard printed sheets of Armenian prose and I am working on books entitled "The Armenian Writers on Samed Vurgun and Samed Vurgun on Armenia" and "Azerbaijani Culture in Armenia," and I have completed work on creating a new version of an Armenian-Azeri and Azeri-Armenian dictionary; and so forth. Samed Vurgun said of these modest efforts: "Though the gift of a friend were merely a sliver of wood, yet could I sail the seas on that sliver."

I would like to note the great attention that is given in the republic to constantly satisfying the cultural and spiritual needs of the Azerbaijani population. During the period 1925-1988 about 500 books and pamphlets have been published in Azeri. In recent years alone here in the republic we have translated into Armenian and published 10 books by Azerbaijani authors, with a total combined print run of 60,000.

The libraries of clubs and houses of culture in Amasiyskiy, Vardenisskiy, Kafanskiy, Krasnoselskiy, Masisskiy, Sisianskiy, Merginskiy and other rayons in the republic are being consistently stocked with artistic, political and agitation and propaganda literature in Azeri. In 1986 these establishments received 261 titles totaling 5,683 copies, and during the period covering 1987 and January and February 1988 those figures were 429 titles and 25,113 copies.

The library stock in schools that teach in Azeri is about 1 million. In 1987 alone, the libraries of schools teaching in Azeri received 59 titles (textbooks and literature) totaling 94,937 copies.

Ethnic ensembles and circles devoted to applied forms of the national arts and arts studies have been set up in the clubs and houses of culture. There are now 91 of these collectives within the republic. The Azerbaijani amateur ensemble from Zangilar Masisskiy rayon, which plays national instruments, enjoys great public popularity, as does the ensemble from the village of Kzlishafag in Kalininskiy rayon and other collectives.

At the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, which dealt with the subject of "The Course of Perestroika in the Secondary and Higher School and Party

Tasks To Implement It," it was noted that it is impermissible for establishments within the educational system to act according to the widespread and complacent ideas that there are no problems in relationships between the nations. Yes, this was quite unambiguous, and subsequent events have been a graphic confirmation of this. Many important problems that must be quickly resolved also face the national school.

Our peoples—Armenians and Azerbaijanis—have always been good neighbors. And thus it came about that many Armenians live on the territory of Azerbaijan, and many Azerbaijanis live in Armenia. And so in the matter of education and indoctrination for the rising generation it is essential to be particularly careful and attentive and not to permit regrettable blunders, localistic tendencies or lack of flexibility.

A great deal of attention is paid to the national schools in Armenia. Let me cite the following figures as an illustration: 148 schools are operating in the republic, teaching in Azeri, along with 37 mixed schools, where 34,735 young Azerbaijanis are studying science. The numbers are growing continuously: from 1976 to 1987 some 17 of the 8-grade Azerbaijani schools were converted to secondary schools. Some 4,246 teachers are working in schools where the teaching is in Azeri, and 3,590 of those teachers have a higher education while 7 have the title of candidate of sciences. Over the past 10 years 39 school premises have been brought into operation. During the 12th Five-Year Plan it is planned to build 39 school premises with a total of 12,512 places; seven of them have already been put into operation.

Of course, there are difficulties in material and technical supplies for the schools, and the training system for teachers to make up the collectives in the Azerbaijani schools is still unsatisfactory. And although the number of specialists with diplomas has risen (whereas in the 1975-1976 academic year 68.3 percent of teachers had a higher education, in 1986 the figure was 84.3 percent), there is still a palpable shortage of teaching personnel for the Azerbaijani schools, particularly in rural areas in the republic. And the greatest problem is the shortage of teachers of Russian and Armenian and teachers for preschool establishments.

The Azerbaijani schools located on the territory of Armenia have their own specific problems. As has already been noted, the Armenian language and the history and geography of Armenia have not been studied in these schools, and there has been no corresponding study of the literature. Of course, in the matter of language, no privileges or limitations, and even less, coercion, are permissible. But I think that at the same time it is essential to encourage study of the local language of representatives of other nationalities living on the same territory. Guided by these principles and moving to meet the wishes of numerous parents, we are preparing a textbook for the Armenian language for grades 5 through 10 in the Azerbaijani schools, and I

hope that from 1 September next year Armenian language studies will be included in the teaching program for schools teaching in Azeri. Of course, the pupil in the Azerbaijani secondary school has two languages, namely, his native tongue and Russian, and he is also obliged to know some other foreign language, and also the language of the given republic. But the hours allotted to study these four languages are extremely few. It is necessary to give this some thought.

I myself am now working on the translation into Azeri of textbooks on the history and geography of Armenia. I think that this is very important, if only for the fact that it is impossible to instill love for the land without knowing its past and its entire historical path.

In short, today the school is also included actively in the process of perestroika as it implements in a practical way the program to effect radical improvement in education and indoctrination. This is an international task, as is everything being implemented to comply with the program outlined by the CPSU for the socioeconomic transformation of our society. Being a patriot and internationalist means to strive with all one's might for success in perestroika. And M.S. Gorbachev was quite right when he noted in his appeal to the workers and people of Azerbaijan and Armenia that "true brotherhood and unity—this is our path." No one and nothing will push us from this path. There can be no end to the roads of friendship and the roads of internationalism. Let us fill the new exercise book of the noble heart of each child with these words.

9642

### **Armenian Government Scores Failures, Lagging in Development of Cooperatives**

*18300212 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian  
12 Feb 88 pp 1-2*

[Article by Armenpress: "Cooperatives Should Receive Most Favored Treatment: From a Conference of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] This republic's Council of Ministers held a conference of ispolkom chairmen from the city and rayon Soviets of People's Deputies, as well as the leading officials from ministries and departments; it was devoted to the problems of further developing cooperative and individual labor activity in the republic. Its participants also discussed the tasks of improving the organization of paid services to the population and ensuring the fulfillment of the cash plan and the goods-turnover plan in 1988.

F. Sarkisyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers, opened the conference with a brief introductory speech.

The report by S. Arutyunyan, first deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers, and the ensuing discussions thoroughly analyzed in detail the status and future prospects for the development of cooperatives and individual labor in the republic; they revealed serious shortcomings and omissions in this matter.

Taking part in the conference were the following persons: M. Murayan, secretary of the Armenian CP Central Committee; E. Avakyan, candidate member of the Armenian CP Central Committee Buro and ispolkom chairman of the Yerevan City Soviet of People's Deputies; S. Avetisyan and M. Mkrtchyan, deputy chairman of this republic's Council of Ministers; as well as A. Arzumanyan and G. Arutyunyan, section chiefs of the Armenian CP Central Committee.

\* \* \*

The discussion in the Council of Ministers essentially, so to speak, summed up the results of the work which had been accomplished in 1987 with regard to the widespread development of cooperative and individual labor activity in this republic. It was supposed to provide answers to the many questions which are of general interest, such as the following: To what extent are the new measures effective? How are the soviet and economic organs operating along these lines? What still remains to be done in order to provide a new, powerful impulse to cooperative and individual labor, and to channel it into the necessary course?

The first and, probably, the most basic impression is that an important reserve has been put into operation and is asserting itself for accelerating the development of consumer-goods production, as well as the service sphere and public dining. Cooperative and individual labor are supplementing our economy with a system of small production facilities, capable of reacting more quickly and flexibly to the change in consumer demand, of satisfying more effectively and at a higher qualitative level the population's needs for small-series output and a wide assortment of services. At the same time good future prospects have emerged for a further utilization of local materials and secondary raw materials, as well as for attracting citizens who are unemployed in public production into this business.

During this brief interval of time cooperatives have given a good account of themselves and have demonstrated their usefulness. At present 276 cooperatives are operating in this republic. Last year the more than 4,000 persons employed in them produced goods and rendered services worth a total of more than 17 million rubles. Some 11.6 million rubles of this amount **comprised consumer goods**. These included sewn and knitted items, footwear, leather and textile haberdashery articles, souvenirs, housewares, furniture, table, pottery, ceramic items, and certain types of foodstuffs. At present 149 cooperatives are engaged in **producing such items**; 46 cooperatives with a turnover of 2.2 million rubles are

functioning in the sphere of public dining; while 73 cooperatives, which have rendered services worth 1.7 million rubles, are engaged in **everyday services to the population**.

The nature of the activity being carried out by persons engaging in individual labor is just as diverse in form. More than 5,000 persons are working in the handicrafts field, 4,438 persons are employed in everyday services, and 304 are in the sociocultural sphere. And a total of 10,500 citizens have received patents and registration certificates for individual labor activity.

Also diverse is the social composition of persons engaged in cooperative and individual labor activities. They include pensioners and housewives, invalids and student youths, as well as people who, because of objective circumstances, have not been able to engage in socially useful labor up to now. Quite a few of them are employees at enterprises and institutions who engage in these other businesses in their free time. All this attests to the high degree of activity among the republic's inhabitants, their readiness to support the important initiative of the party and the government, an initiative which is of enormous economic and social significance.

Nevertheless, the predominant tone which pervaded the discussion of this question was more critical than satisfied, and there were more than enough grounds for this. Because, of course, many persons came to the conference with a solid load of shortcomings and problems which are hindering the expansion of the scale of the cooperative movement.

The first thing that causes a great deal of alarm and concern is the large disproportion between the number of registered cooperatives and those which are actually in operation. Almost a thousand such associations still exist only on paper. And the demand for such an abnormal situation comes, in the first place, from the leading officials of the local soviets, who have been charged with the responsibility for the creation and productive operation of the cooperatives.

To be sure, it was noted at the conference that recently there has been some lively activity among the ispolkoms of the Yerevan, Leninakan, Kirovakan, Dilizhan, Charentsavan City, as well as those of the Akhuryanskiy, Idzhevanskiy, Masisskiy, Noyemberyanskiy, Sisianskiy, and Stepanavanskiy Rayon Soviets of People's Deputies along these lines. This cannot be said, for example, about the cities of Ararat, Ashtarak, Oktembryan, or the Amasiyskiy, Kalinskiy, Kafanskiy, Marguninskiy, and Megrinskiy Rayons, where 35 cooperatives have been registered in toto, but not a single one is in operation. In Goris—city and rayon—not a single one of the 26 cooperatives which were formed has yet become operational.

The situation is not much better in the Abobyanskiy, Spirtakskiy, Aparanskiy, Artikskiy, Nairyskiy, and several other rayons, as well as in the cities of Razdan and Spitak, where each of them has 15-20 cooperatives registered but only one or two in operation.

How does such a picture square with that stubborn persistence with which the leading officials of these cities and rayons "camp out" on the thresholds of the republic-level organs, demanding that individual enterprises be created in their localities in order to place their own unemployed manpower in jobs? Why do they take the position of observers on the sidelines when these very same people themselves show initiative in solving these problems and, at the same time, attempt to participate in the process of improving the delivery of supplies and services to the population?

But the stereotype of the old-style thinking, formalism, and bureaucratism, along with indifference to the population's demands, still prevail among the leading officials of many local Soviets of People's Deputies. These factors hinder them from supporting and developing the initiative of working people, and in necessary cases, even hamper them in playing the role of organizers of the cooperative movement. This is also attested to by the numerous letters from working people which are sent to the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers, as well as by items published in the republic's press, and materials from various checkups. Having approved a cooperative's charter or having granted permission for individual labor activity to begin, the local soviets frequently tick the matter off in their reports and consider their mission accomplished. Left to the whims of fate, the cooperative members go for months without being able to solve the problems of rooms for their work, their repair and outfitting, seeking the means and tools for producing, while the holders of patents and registration certificates are still trying to sell their products.

People at the conference expressed the justifiable apprehension that such an attitude would inevitably affect the population's degree of activity, make people wary, and even frighten them off, and hinder the on-schedule amortization of debts owed to the state. Because, of course, the total sum of short-term and long-term credits granted to cooperative members in this republic has already exceeded 13 million rubles.

Cooperatives operating in conjunction with enterprises, ministries, and departments are in a relatively better position. For example, 14 cooperatives engaged in procuring and processing secondary raw materials are functioning within this republic's Gossnab system. They have produced 2.7 million rubles worth of goods, including 2.2 million rubles worth of consumer goods. The people employed here are, primarily, those who are not engaged in public production.

During the period of their existence the Gossnab cooperatives have utilized more than 400 tons of secondary raw materials. Meriting our attention here is the work begun on organizing such cooperatives directly at industrial enterprises. This simplifies the participation by veterans of the given collectives in socially useful labor and steers the cooperatives in the direction of procuring and utilizing pulped paper, cullet, rubber, construction materials, and scrap metal in their production, in addition to plastic, textile, leather, and wood by-products.

Some 79 cooperatives of the Aykoop system account for 45 percent of the total volume of goods and services sold by all this republic's cooperative members. Practical experience has shown that these associations can play a significant role in improving the delivery of small-series and good-quality items to the rural population. Family-type cooperatives, operating primarily out of their own homes, have particularly good future prospects here.

There have been marked changes in the work done by the ministries of consumer services, trade, light industry, and local industry. Unfortunately, matters are different in the Ministry of the Paper and Wood Pulp Industry, Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, Ministry of Construction, Ministry of Housing and Municipal Services, as well as other ministries and departments in this republic which have refrained from developing cooperatives or assisting persons who wish to engage in individual labor. The Ministry of Culture and the State Committee for Physical Education and Sports, as well as the Gosagroprom have been passive, and only two cooperatives have been registered in its system.

Justifiable reproaches were leveled at enterprises under union jurisdiction which have at their disposal a considerable material-technical base, secondary resources, and production by-products. This republic numbers more than 120 such associations, enterprises, and organizations, but they have only 18 cooperatives in operation. There are none at all at enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry, Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry, and Ministry of the Radio Industry.

There is still too small a proportion of cooperatives engaged in housing construction and repair, rendering services in laying out gardens, orchards, and farmstead plots, as well as in procuring and processing surplus agricultural products.

Last year certain changes occurred in the question of supplying cooperatives with material-technical and raw-material resources through the associations, enterprises, and organizations under which they had been created, as well as through material-technical supply organs. Centers for renting machinery and equipment were opened within this republic's Gossnab system. Thus, the republic-level Armelektromashsnab Association issues instruments, equipment, and technical items for temporary

use through rental centers. The Ministry of Local Industry has organized the sale of by-products and goods of which they have a surplus through the Chinara company-type store. And other ministries and departments should not be deterred from following the example of this experiment.

However, the delivery of material and technical supplies to cooperatives, and especially to citizens engaging in individual labor activities, remains, just as before, a substantial hindrance in their work. There are still many unsolved problems in the matter of supplying cooperatives and persons engaged in individual labor with raw-material resources. To this day, for example, the certification of by-products has not been done in any way at this republic's enterprises, nor has their normal sale through the trade network been well set up. The conference participants noted that delays, interdepartmental obstacles, and confusion in this area not only retard the development of new forms of labor activity, but also create the soil for thefts, black marketeering, and a negative attitude toward the cooperative movement on the part of the population.

The following characteristic example was brought up at the conference. The 28 public-dining cooperatives which operate within the Ministry of Trade system over a year's time sold products worth 837,000 rubles. A third of this comprises the cost of products purchased in state and cooperative stores. Is this not at times the reason for a shortage of an entire range of products in the retail-trade network? To this day the overwhelming majority of city and rayon ispolkoms have not carried out the directive of this republic's government to specify a precise list of items which the cooperative members are permitted to buy in the state and cooperative networks.

Something else should also be mentioned in this connection. The principal task of citizens engaged in cooperative and individual labor in this sphere is producing foodstuffs and public catering, utilizing for this purpose surplus agricultural products purchased from the population, kolkhozes and sovkhoses, or in kolkhoz markets. Perhaps there could also be such a variant as the following: the cooperatives themselves would produce meat, vegetables, and other products. However, the local soviets are extremely unwilling to allot them territory to construct hothouses on or areas for maintaining livestock and cultivating various types of plants.

Nor are matters any better in the sphere of producing consumer goods and rendering services. There are no spare parts or components for repairing radio and television sets and household appliances. It is not known what paths to take in seeking out cloth for use in sewing outerwear, materials for stitching footwear, or where people obtain food dyes and essences, a brisk trade in which has developed in Yerevan's most populous districts.

A lack of monitoring controls also threatens to bring about other dangerous consequences. In December of last year the republic's sanitation service conducted 130 checkups on the working conditions of cooperative members engaged in preparing food products. One out of every three checkups showed violations of sanitary norms and regulations capable of causing intestinal diseases and poisoning. Raw materials and finished products are transported in any old motor vehicles which were not designed at all for this purpose, bread and other bakery items, pirozhki and ponchki are sold from the trunks of cars, from every kind of post or box; and they are sold by persons dressed in clothing of dubious cleanliness.

One gets the impression that the city and rayon authorities have not thoroughly elaborated a policy of forming cooperatives which would take into account their purposes and production capacities. But, of course, this is extremely important—to help people find a socially useful application for their own efforts and possibilities!

As to individual labor activity, the extremely essential question of how the results of the individual labor are to be sold remains unresolved here. For all practical purposes, this matter has been allowed to drift. Not much has happened yet with regard to selling items from commission stores. Remaining as the main channel are the unattractive, ill-assorted kiosks, little bins, and booths which spring up "spontaneously" in places where people congregate, and which spoil the appearance of Yerevan.

Cooperatives must take all measures to develop the collective principle in administering affairs. In practice, it happens that the chairmen sometimes fail to coordinate the questions of wages at meetings of the cooperative members; they use their own judgement in hiring and firing employees. The cooperatives' material and financial assets are often expended without monitoring controls, and this leads to instances of various thefts and misappropriations of monetary funds.

It is utterly inadmissible when, after cooperatives are registered in ispolkoms, the production and sale of the items being turned out by them are performed without opening accounts at banking institutions. This, in turn, leads to the following serious violations: the proceeds earned from selling the items are not deposited at a banking institutions, the income tax is not paid out, nor is the volume of the products being turned out accounted for.

In order to put a stop to negative phenomena, we must likewise intensify monitoring controls on the part of ispolkoms and the appropriate banks for filling out the documents and issuing bank credits.

Nor must we lose sight of the quality and aesthetic form of products being turned out by cooperatives and persons engaged in individual labor. At times this is an



obvious lack of taste or just a copying of imported items with foreign symbolics. Our country's national symbolics are not being used sufficiently.

As noted at the conference, matters are extremely bad here with regard to setting up an advertising-and-information service. The public is poorly informed about the addresses and types of services available, while the cooperative members and the citizens engaging in individual labor are informed about which enterprises, which surpluses of valuable commodities and by-products there are, as well as what it is and how it can be obtained. Nor is the advisory service for those persons who wish to engage in individual labor on a sufficiently high level.

In several cities in this country special advertising-and-information bulletins are published for this purpose. The conference participants proposed that we organize a similar publication in our republic. And the following question was also posed: why not organize exhibits of the products made by cooperative members and by persons engaged in individual labor? And why not conduct tasting parties, contests, and reviews?

The Armenian CP Central Committee and the republic's Council of Ministers recently adopted a number of decrees opening up broad possibilities for further developing cooperative and individual labor activities. The duty of the leading officials of the republic's ministries and departments, associations and enterprises is to provide most favored treatment for the new forms of labor activity, which are capable of playing a significant role in solving the problems of more fully satisfying the population's demands for goods and services.

2384

### **Officials on New Uzbek Water Resource Management Organization**

*18300196a Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Mar 88 p 1*

[Article by N. Sadullayev: "Harvest-88: Let Us Manage in a New Way. To Water—Strict Accounting"; commentaries by V. K. Zarubin, USSR deputy minister of land reclamation and water management, and M. Khamidov, chief of the Syrdarya Inter-Republic Basin Administration of Water Intake Works and Water Development]

[Text] A new service has been created in Uzbekistan—The Syrdarya Inter-Republic Basin Administration of Water Intake Works and Water Development (uprvodkhoz "Syrdarya").

The question may arise: How is it that at a time when the administrative apparatus is being reduced the creation of such an organization has been undertaken? But here is a special case. In recent times there has been an increase in the incidents of thoughtless and wasteful use of water. And the situation is a difficult one as it is. The growth of

areas under crops and the construction of cities and settlements require increasingly more water. And the supplies are not unlimited. And so Syrdarya was instructed to set up strict accounting and the rational use of this important resource, to put a stop to departmentalism and localism. The main task is to be an impartial "mirab" of the Uzbek, Kazakh, Tajik, and Kirghiz union republics.

V. K. Zarubin, USSR deputy minister of land reclamation and water management, comments:

The administration, as we expect, will undertake the balance of about 80 large key water intake points and will control about 200 small ones. The goal is to observe equity in the distribution of water during the entire duration of the season. You see, the inhabitants of the Central Asian republics do not find themselves in equal conditions. Those who are in the upper reaches of the rivers and canals can take more. The lower along the stream, the more meager the flow. Hence the well-founded claims. Now all calculations will be built on a reliable basis. Let us assume that in some oblast of one of the republics there are about 200,000 hectares of irrigated land. In the administration they know what crops are being cultivated there. Each one requires a certain quantity of moisture. With the aid of computers, the precise requirement is calculated and in accordance with it water is provided.

It goes without saying that every year is not the same. During the dry seasons the water reservoirs—the Toktogulskoye, Charvakskoye and Chardarinskoye reservoirs—will help. . . . Incidentally, the outlook for this year is favorable. But this does not mean that we can allow wastefulness. On the contrary, control will be intensified. In so doing, the new organization will deliver a blow also to those who engage in report padding and try to "raise" the yield through hectares concealed from the calculation.

The administration needs modern equipment and skilled specialists. The basic computer has already been installed and debugged in Tashkent. This is a machine of the latest generation.

The chief of the Syrdarya Inter-Republic Basin Administration of Water Intake Works and Water Development, M. Khamidov is on the telephone:

Computers will be equipped in Uchkurgan, Chardara and Chirchik. Electronic equipment has been switched on at the headwork of the Canal imeni Kirov in Gulistan. Simultaneously they are training specialists—hydraulic engineers, economists, programmers, builders, and mathematicians.

Already during the current year, the whole Syrdarya Basin will be placed under control. If thrift is exercised in the distribution of water, there will be enough for all farms, cities and villages, enterprises, and steam power



plants. Strict measures will be taken against wasters. Those who have already used their limit will simply have their water supply stopped. And those who have achieved savings will, if necessary, receive additional allotments of the saved cubic meters.

The Syrdarya Inter-Republic Basin of Water Intake Works and Water Development will be the master of the situation in every section of the flow and have long-term forecasts. For example, from the ice-house of Abramov in the Pamir-Alay Mountains, the glaciologists will report on the state of the snow cover and specialists of scientific research institutions and planners will calculate the need for water. These data will be fed into the computer around the clock and will be processed instantly.

We will also pay serious attention to the quality of the water. Until recently, practically no control was exercised over the escape of various waste products into the river. We are organizing a closed water cycle and we are building purification equipment. Already many enterprises are working on the basis of waste-free technology. But the pollution of rivers is far from ended. Funds for purification equipment are nevertheless being allotted in accordance with the "residue principle." The approach to this important matter must be fundamentally changed.

8970

### **Benefits of Using Urbanites in Uzbek Cotton Harvesting Questioned**

18300196b Moscow *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* in Russian No 11, 16 Mar 88 p 11

[Article by Vladimir Sokolov, *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* own correspondent for UzSSR affairs: "Urbanites in Cotton: Another Look at a Chronic Problem"]

[Text] In Uzbekistan it is spring. Soon the first cotton seeds will lie in the soil, summer will fly by, the harvest toil will begin, and once again the question of questions arises: How to manage the harvest without millions of urbanites? . . .

In the history of our republic there has not been a year when cotton would come easily, but it has never come as hard as during the 1987 season. As if April was not cold enough, which delayed the sowings by a month and a half, the catastrophic May downpours made it necessary to resow every fifth hectare. The stormy and gloomy summer failed to give sufficient warmth for the ripening of a standard harvest, and the intense heat that set in unexpectedly in August forced the cotton plant to shed the ovary. In October, when the greater part of the harvest is usually brought into the storage pills, snowfalls suddenly burst forth.

And nevertheless, about 500 million tons of cotton were wrested from the elements—this alone is indicative of the strength of the farms and of society as a whole. We take into account that not a single peasant was ruined and became a beggar whose house and fields were washed away by mud-torrents. We remember that the regions of comparative prosperity not only shared their goods with those who had suffered misfortune, but still increased output above their own plans, above their own forces, knowing that in so doing they help their countrymen. Let us also not forget the fact that when the time came not to pick—to take by force from the bad weather what had been grown, then buses filled with urbanites came from the cities to help the village.

A low bow to all those who saved the 1987 cotton harvest.

But the battle manifests not only the heroism of those who joined in the fighting. The weaknesses, too.

### **The Truth from the Trenches**

No matter how many circulars are published in the republic about the necessity to provide those involved in the cotton harvest with warm clothes and footwear, to create for them the requisite housing and living conditions, and to organize the necessary nourishment, medical and cultural services, nevertheless the urbanites are equipped at their own expense and themselves repair the barracks in the fields. Their enterprises go all out providing their envoys at least with the semblance of "the requisite nourishment." And this is only one side of the truth that broke through on the pages of the local newspapers last fall. But there is also another side.

Last year, "the pupils gathered a total of a little over 250,000 tons of raw cotton. The national economy of the republic could fully cope with this volume. But, on the other hand, we would avoid the mass illnesses and even deaths of children in agricultural work. . . ." (from the article in the newspaper *PRAVDA VOSTOKA* by the second secretary of the Uzbek CP Central Committee, V. P. Anishev).

Moreover, *SELSKAYA ZHIZN* reports that, let us say, in the Sovkhoz imeni U. Yusupov they have completely renounced the help of urbanites and have counted on machines. Having economized on the harvest periods, they sold 1,100 tons of top-quality raw cotton above the plan. Previously, involving people from the side, the sovkhoz spent three times more in funds for the harvest. It is no wonder—a machine operator is paid 6 rubles per ton of harvested raw cotton, the urbanite is paid 100 rubles for the same amount.

In the trenches "of the battle for the harvest" the urbanite is not at all tormented by the inhospitality of the hosts or by a shortage of circulars, but by the fact that

often he is simply not needed there and is not advantageous. He is disadvantageous—and not for the world will a normal chairman begin to spend funds for him for social, cultural and everyday needs.

Then why do we, who have the most grandiose park of cotton combines in the world, every fall drive and drive millions of pickers from the cities and settlements into the fields?

As a matter of fact, as far as the combines are concerned, there is no secret. Our combines are poor, unreliable, they are laid up sometimes by the shortage of spare parts, sometimes by bad weather, sometimes by the poor quality of defoliation, as well as by the poor health of the combine operators, for only veritable bogatyr can manage their pedal. Consequently, before very long the seasonal class of pickers will also disappear. The secret here lies elsewhere—why urbanites?

Two-thirds of the population of Uzbekistan lives in villages. One and a half million able peasants are engaged precisely in cotton-growing. Thus, they can simultaneously go into the fields. The newspapers glorify the record harvests per day: One and a half to two quintals, at times up to three. But records are not needed. Let a villager in the prime of his strength pick 60 kilograms (the norm for a first-year girl student), and then in 2 months harvesting time he will turn in 3.5 tons to the khirman. Multiply this a little, please, and you find that the village inhabitants are capable on their own, without straining themselves at all, to pick by hand over five million tons of raw cotton! Practically the entire plan for the republic, having left nothing for the machines!

Knowing the industry of the peasant, I do not accept the idea that, after having worked in the cotton field in the spring under heavy downpours and in the summer under the hellish sun, he suddenly in the fall loses interest in the fruits of his labor. This can be explained only by enormous economic flaws.

And, in my view, this is the whole thing. According to current rates, the kolkhoz worker is paid 8 kopecks per kilogram of manual picking (the urbanite slightly more—10 kopecks). But you see, during this time of the year the harvest in his kitchen-garden ripens as well as his watermelons, and for the same day at the market he makes several hundred! And the kitchen-garden, the garden, the vineyard, and the watermelons of the peasant are also poured on him then, but this harvest, in contrast to the cotton harvest, no one gathers for him and gets going. And if his harvest perishes, then a fairly sizable share of his family's annual income perishes, in comparison with which the 200-300 rubles, which he can pull out from cotton bolls, are ridiculous.

Not really. The kolkhoz farmer will send, instead of himself, children that are a little older, will hire a truck under the table for an exorbitant sum, and through any

obstacles will make it to the market. For on the market in the meantime to no smaller extent than on the cotton field depends his well-being and even the very existence of his family.

But the picture will change if the rates are raised significantly. At 30 kopecks per kilogram, the not too zealous picker earns no less than 1,000 rubles a season, and such earnings he will not dare to give up to a stranger. It will make sense to increase the zeal, and to pick the bushes cleaner, and to call on relatives for help. Moreover, I propose that, if it is possible to earn 1,000 rubles a month honestly, even if stretching to the limit, a great many urbanites themselves would prefer to spend their holiday in a cotton field, instead of going to engage in illicit work in the northern regions. What is more, even among students there would not be a retreat under such conditions.

But the first objection to such wage rates is instinctive, like a sneeze to a straw that has gotten into the nose: There is an increase in the production cost of cotton!

#### "Free" Raw Cotton?

Let us estimate, what it is at present, the production cost? More correctly, that part of it which the cost of involving urbanites in the picking constitutes?

To estimate, it is true, proves to be anything but simple. It turns out that the UzSSR State Committee for Statistics. . . does not undertake any calculations along this line. It does not know either the quantity of raw cotton gathered precisely by the urbanites, or how much the farms paid them for this cotton, and also unknown are the sums of the wages and stipends received by the pickers in the village. Even the number of urbanites in the cotton [harvest] is unknown! But what is the point of the State Committee on Statistics when the State Agroindustrial Committee of Uzbekistan and it do not know how many urban people every year pull it out of the quagmire and what these rescue operations cost the state!

Why, it remains for us to estimate ourselves, even if indirectly. It is true, if we are to believe the data of the USSR Central Statistical Administration, in 1985 the urbanites of Uzbekistan spent almost 6 million man-days in agricultural work, but if we are to believe the Ministry of Finance of the republic, the farms paid them more than 160 million rubles during the same year. A simple division produces a fantastic result—the urbanite received in the village more than 27 rubles a day! Let us leave the fantasy to the control organs and let us work with more reliable figures.

During the 2 months of the cotton harvest toil, a student picks on the average 700 kilograms of raw cotton. The 70 rubles due to him for this from the kolkhoz is enough only for covering the expenses of the kolkhoz for food. But the VUZ pays the student, who is not studying, another 70 rubles in the form of a stipend, and thereby

the cost of the cotton picked by students comes to 20 kopecks per kilogram. To bring and take a person costs the state approximately 10 rubles, and he personally pays out 50 rubles for equipment (boots, padded jacket, cot). So we see that, for the "gratuitous" student raw cotton, society pays in actual fact in no way less than 30 kopecks per kilogram. And we are still not taking into account the damage to the studies. . . .

The expenses for an engineer, physician, and skilled worker laboring in a garden bed are significantly higher. The average wage of each one is 8.5 rubles a day, and he picks, God knows, 40 kilograms of cotton during this day. And the plant, the institute, and the polyclinic, from their own budgets, pay him no less than 20 kopecks in addition for every kilogram (in addition to the 10 kopecks from the kolkhoz). And this is what the absence of a specialist from his work place in the city costs the state.

The true cost of the harvesting of cotton (potatoes, beets, hay, vegetables, etc.) by urbanites in our homeland has become a metaphysical magnitude, from which only the fact is clear that it is always much greater than the 10 kopecks from the kolkhoz. Like sand through the fingers, statistics for years on end pour forth myriads of man-days, rubles, and units of "unfinished production", and they do not find time to include them in the reporting. Why?

But you don't deceive the economy with the 10 kopecks from the kolkhoz. If socially necessary labor costs so much, it compels, at any rate, to pay for itself no less than that. If not directly to the kolkhoz farmer, then to the urbanite, if not through one kolkhoz department, then through two-three different accounting departments, through compulsion and senseless losses—but all the same this cotton will be paid for in full.

Then why not acknowledge openly that today manual picking is expensive, much more than 10 kopecks? But having acknowledged this, why not at once offer this money to the peasant? These are by no means only economic questions. The matter has gone far. Having made the final link of his labor disadvantageous for the cotton-grower, the ridiculously low wage rate thereby:

—has deformed the family of the cotton-grower morally, and physically as well, having compelled him to send his children, women and old men, to perform heavy work, and having dispatched himself off to the market for more significant earnings;

—has condemned society to the regular diversion of hundreds of thousands of skilled workers from their main duties;

—has created a channel for the overpumping of the budget to cover the difference between the imaginary and true cost of manual harvesting, and in this channel—the possibility of financial crimes;

—has practically brought about the collapse of the rural school, has undermined higher and secondary specialized education in the cities of the cotton-growing zones, and has secured its public health the last place in the country;

—and has led to the increase of tension in the relations between city and village, administration and the workers.

#### It Is Easy to Say. . . .

. . . . To do, of course, is much more difficult. The agroindustry, of course, does not and will not have spare money to throw out several hundred million rubles for manual harvesting. But can the same "reserves" not come to the rescue here which habitually every year set in motion the economy as a whole?

For example, the expenditures for the transportation of urbanites to the fields and back. Last fall, for Tashkent and the cities of the capital oblast alone, they came to about 3 million rubles. If these monies were to be turned over to the farms in the form of subsidies (dotatsii) for the harvest, they would be sufficient to pay an additional 20 kopecks per kilogram for 15,000 tons of manually-picked raw cotton. And these millions would with benefit go into the family budget of the peasants, and would not be scattered to the wind by hundreds of buses.

The enterprises of the cities are presently surrounded by an allotment of "patronage assistance." But can the allotment be replaced with a monetary tax? It seems to me, the directors would gladly agree to send to the harvest, instead of people, the equivalent part of the profit that these people produce. In return, the volumes and rhythm of production do not suffer.

Finally, a very important reserve is hidden in the profit of the very farms to which the state pays from 77 kopecks to 1 ruble per kilogram of raw cotton. If the share of the picker is to be raised from the current 8-10 kopecks to, let us say, 20 kopecks, there is a risk, of course, that there will be a reduction in the profit of the kolkhoz, but on the other hand there will be an increase in the interest of the chairman in cheap machine harvesting proportional to this risk. He has an alternative! The time has come, finally, to acknowledge that the scanty pay for manual harvesting does not at all help to move machines into the fields as was, apparently, planned, and that only high pay, which absorbs a fair share of the profit, regardless of whether urbanites stoop in the beds or their own people, forces the chairman to acquire the motors of combines.

The illusory cheapness of the labor of urbanites and the anarchy in its utilization every year lead to monstrous overexpenditures. According to calculations of the UzSSR State Agroindustrial Committee, the actual need for additional manpower during the harvest season comes to a total of 50,000-60,000 people, but meanwhile last fall, counting only students and students from two

oblasts, more than 60,000 were taken out, and students of vocational-technical schools in the republic—140,000. The Ministry of Education sent more than 700,000 pupils and teachers into the fields! In so doing, more often than not, there is nothing for the urbanites to pick in the empty fields, but the tactic of “the battle for the harvest” requires to remain in the ranks to the last cartridge, that is to the last box, which is not yet harvested somewhere in a neighboring rayon. Only reasonable and advantageous pay will compel the replacement of the tactic of “the battle” with the tactic of usual work, where the detachments of volunteers and seasonal workers (persons on leave or students, as well as rural youth from regions with a labor surplus), will themselves propose to the farms on contract bases to harvest in the best periods what remains from the machines.

One cannot assert, needless to say, that it will prove to be possible, by a change of one wage-rate alone, to rectify all the defects of many years that have been engendered by it. The “gratuitous” harvest has been living for so long and it has grown into the economy and into the collective psychology of millions of urbanites and villagers to such an extent that to simply take and raise the possible wage can prove to be even dangerous.

Rural kiddies. It is no secret that even now their modest additional earnings in the garden beds, 2-3 rubles a day, support the budget of the peasant family to such an extent that dads and moms, it happens, even without any direction from the raykom, send the kids into the fields. And if the probable earnings increase threefold? Will not their studies in school and sports go completely awry? It is absolutely necessary, with the increase in the rates for adults, to make child labor totally disadvantageous and to achieve the observance of the laws here through the strictest measures.

The courtyard of a peasant. You see, it does not provide him alone with produce, but it feeds a great number of urban people. For this reason, any damage to it will inflict a bad blow on the city. Attracting the peasant to the harvest of cotton, one should not draw him away from his personal farm, and for this it is necessary to secure the fall purchase (at market, advantageous prices) of his harvest and its export from his kitchen-garden to the market.

One can guess other problems as well, which will have to be encountered on this path, but all of them do not compare with the fantastic losses, economic and social, which the status-quo guarantees to us.

8970

#### **Dissemination of Unverified Ecological Disaster Data Decried**

18000333 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 2 Apr 88 p 1

[ELTA report: “ELTA Report”]

[Text] Recently in the republic there has been widespread discussion of the ecological situation. Justifiable concern is caused by the pollution of the earth, water,

and air which occurs as a result of inappropriate or outmoded technology at industrial and agricultural enterprises and the indifference and poor management of some leaders. Such facts are not hushed up today, the mass media, the press and television effectively inform us and analyze the problems. More than that, all that is possible is being done to correct the situation. However, unfounded and unverified facts are disseminated about the catastrophic ecological state of the republic. Similar notions were also expressed at the open party meeting of the Lithuanian SSR Writers' Union, which was reported in the weekly LITERATURA IR MENAS No 11, 1988, with abridged material republished in GIMTASIS KRASTAS No 12, 1988.

After thorough investigation by competent organs, ELTA was authorized to report that certain data, situations and conclusions presented by the speakers at that meeting do not reflect reality. For example, at the meeting it was noted that the quantity of chemical substances in food products exceeds the set norms by 60 to 70 times. According to data of the Lithuanian SSR Ministry of Health, in 1987, out of 3,589 tested food products the permitted level of pesticides was exceeded in only 2.2 percent of the samples. Last year in testing for the presence of nitrates in vegetables and potatoes, only 2 percent of the 3,380 samples tested exceeded the level by two or more. The republic's Ministry of Health does not have statistics available on acute poisoning from food products due to the presence of chemicals.

The average life expectancy in the republic in 1987 was 72, not 61 years of age. According to R. Gayauskaite, an instructor at an institute for improving qualifications of farm specialists, it “exceeds” by almost a decade the average life span of the Japanese.

According to statistics of the Ministry of Health, anemia requiring clinical observation was noted in only 0.5 percent of the children. This fact also contradicts the statement that in our republic every fourth child suffers from this illness. Such are the true facts.

Such irresponsible declarations mislead the people, and cause distrust and confusion. That is why now, during these times of glasnost and democratization, each self-respecting lecturer, writer, and journalist must honestly and seriously verify with the appropriate competent organs those of their own conclusions and statistics which they are planning to use in their speeches or in print.

#### **Safety of Ignalina AES Operation Underscored**

18000332 [Editorial Report] Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian on 24 March 1988 carries on page 4 a 500-word ELTA report on a 22 March visit to Lithuania's Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant by representatives of Lithuania's creative intelligentsia and several members of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee. Two representatives of the USSR Gosnadzor and G. Negrivod, chief

engineer of the Ignalina AES, answered questions after the tour, stressing that "since the power plant came on line not even once have the very stringent international standards for atmospheric pollution been exceeded." Negrivod added that at the present there are more than 100 specialists working on safety procedures and radioactivity safety at the AES, as well as 11 special Gosnadzor stations at the AES and in Ignalina Rayon which daily monitor the state of radioactivity and the effect on the surrounding environment.

Negrivod also recounted the safety procedures adopted at the Ignalina AES after the Chernobyl accident, mentioning the later-than-planned start-up of the second unit of the AES and the major overhaul of the first unit. He

noted that powerful diagnostic instruments had been set up for the control and safety systems of the reactor, which allow for the detection of the most minor deviation from normal operation at the very earliest stages and the improvement in the use of the safety shields which allowed the Ignalina AES unit test to be conducted with the immersion of the absorbers assembly into the reactor's active zone in 2.1 seconds. Now all of the country's power units of the Ignalina AES type will be equipped with these. He ended by stressing that all the above and as well as other measures ensure full safe utilization of atomic energy.

**END**