



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC DOWNGRADING AND
DECLASSIFICATION
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

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

19980812 133

10
106
AΦ6

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-003

CONTENTS

25 JANUARY 1988

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Usmankhodzhayev on History, Nationalities, Perestroyka Goals [PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 6 Nov 87]	1
Demirchyan on Soviet Achievements, Perestroyka in Armenia [KOMMUNIST, 6 Nov 87]	9
Masaliyev on Soviet History, Perestroyka Efforts in Kirgiziya [A.M. Masaliyev; SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, 6 Nov 87]	12
Lukyanov Speaks At Grishkyavichus Funeral [A.I. Lukyanov; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 18 Nov 87]	17
RSFSR Supsov Addresses Published	18
RSFSR Gosplan Chairman Report [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 30 Oct 87]	18
Finance Minister Report [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 30 Oct 87]	25
Budget, Planning Committee Co-report [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 31 Oct 87]	29
Praise for Ousted Tajikistan Party Leader	31

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Historians Plan New Examinations of Komintern Issues [L.G. Babichenko; VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, No 10, Oct 87]	32
Career, Purge of Government Official Yan Rudzutak Detailed [I. Donkov; OGONEK, No 36, Sep 87]	40
Author on 23-Year Effort to Write, Publish Litvinov Biography [MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 24 Sep 87]	45
Distinction Between Terrorism, Political Assassination Explained [Ye. Losoto; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 6 Oct 87]	47
Inadequate Study of Tajik History Decried	51

CULTURE

Aytmatov Gives Letters, Comments on Bilingualism [Ch. Aytmatov; SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, 24 Sep 87]	53
Resolution on Preservation of Historic Moscow Detailed [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, No 127, 24 Oct 87]	58
Ukrainian Novel Describes Indifference of Farmers [M. Sinelnikov; PRAVDA, 13 Oct 87]	59
Emigre Literature Must Be Seen in Historical Context [F. Kuznetsov; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 21 Oct 87]	61

SOCIAL ISSUES

Jurist Proposes New Legislation for Economic Crimes [Yu. Lyapunov; SOVETSKAYA YUSTITSIYA, No 18, Sep 87]	67
Jurists Consider Nationwide Discussion of Legislation [M. Shafir, Ye. Koveshnikov; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA ZAKONNOST, No 9, Sep 87]	70
Response to Story on 'Fascist' Youth	74
School Official Refutes Story [LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 5 Aug 87]	74
Readers' Letters on Story, Upbringing [I. Churin; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 16 Sep 87]	75
Demographic, Labor Issues Discussed at Kazakh Seminar [KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 6 Oct 87]	79
Estonian Conference Urges New Studies on Nationality Relations [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 23 Oct 87]	84
LiSSR Nationalist's Proposals Receive Official Commentary [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 27 Oct 87]	86
Azerbaijan CP CC Polls Readers on Perestroyka [BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 28 Nov 87 p 3]	91
Controversy Over Family Planning in Tajikistan	92
Needed to Curb High Mortality Rate	92
Reader Opinion Divided	93
More Readers Respond	93
Tajik Supreme Soviet Issues Decree on AIDS	94

REGIONAL ISSUES

Debate on Proposed Danube-Dnieper Canal Continues [V. Khorev, V. Laskavyy; <i>RABOCHAYA GAZETA</i> , 23 Oct 87]	95
Industrial Waste Pipeline To Irkut River Opposed [D. Stom, S. Karkhanin; <i>SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA</i> , 11 Nov 87]	98
Concern Over Low Percentage of Ethnic Kirghiz in Industry [L. Lebedeva, Z. Toktokhodzhayeva; <i>SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA</i> , 9 Oct 87]	101
Infectious Disease Concern in Tajikistan	102

**Usmankhodzhayev on History, Nationalities,
Perestroyka Goals**

18300040a Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
6 Nov 87 pp 2-4

[Unattributed report: "According to Lenin's Behests, Along the Road of the October. The Report of Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary I.B. Usmankhodzhayev at a Joint Ceremonial Meeting of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee and the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Devoted to the 70th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution."]

[Excerpts]

Under the Leninist Banner of the Friendship of the Peoples.

During the course of the building of socialism one of the most complex questions—the national question—has been resolved. National oppression and inequality have been ended forever. A new socialist and international community has been formed—the Soviet people. Rapid economic, social and cultural progress has been insured for the former national outlying districts. For the first time in history a unique international community—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—has been created within the framework of a single state.

One of the most important gains of the October has been the friendship of the Soviet peoples. Everything that has been achieved and in which Soviet people take pride, has been linked inseparably with the socialist order and with the life-giving friendship of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR. As they celebrate the outstanding achievements of Leninist national policy the people of our country offer their deep respects and gratitude to the great Russian people for their selfless and real internationalism and for the invaluable contribution that they have made to the creation, development and consolidation of the socialist union of free and equal republics and to the economic, social and cultural progress of all peoples in the land of the soviets.

As for any of the fraternal union republics that make up the great Soviet Union, the Uzbek SSR is the shining embodiment of party national policy. The republic's working class, kolkhoz peasantry and intelligentsia hold dear their membership in the land of the soviets and are happy to live and work according to Lenin's behests and the laws of international brotherhood.

Thanks to the victory of the October, along with the other peoples, the Uzbek people have acquired socialist statehood, true freedom, and a broad spaciousness for real social transformations.

From the heights of this 70th anniversary it is easy to see how wretched the economy was on the territory of Uzbekistan and the status of lack of rights and backwardness in which the popular masses used to live under the conditions of colonial and feudal-despotic oppression. The path traversed by the workers of Uzbekistan to a new and happy life was opened up by the October, by Lenin, and by the Communist Party.

Developing the ideas of Marx and Engels, Lenin formulated the program principles for resolving the national question that were in line with the innermost aspirations of oppressed peoples. He underscored the indissolubility of the tasks of social and national emancipation for the workers. Only the victory of the working class and the liquidation of the exploiter stratum were able to guarantee the establishment of the new relations between peoples.

The founder of the CPSU paid great attention to the historical destinies of the peoples of the East. He believed deeply in their revolutionary potentialities and creative strengths. Leninist theory and the CPSU program on the national-colonial question has become the banner of the national liberation movement. The entry of the Russian working class into the world arena as the leader of oppressed people exerted a revolutionary effect on the development of the national liberation movement in Turkestan.

Armed with the ideas of Lenin the Bolsheviks raised up the workers for the struggle and supported the growing revolutionary movement in Central Asia. Speaking at the 7th (April) Conference of Bolsheviks, V.I. Lenin said the following: "We in no way want the muzhik of Khiva to live under the Khiva khanate. We will influence the oppressed masses through the development of our revolution."

And the October did become a truly popular revolution, when the proletarian struggle for socialism, the peasant struggle for land, the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples and the struggle by the workers against the imperialist war coalesced into a single movement.

The establishment of Soviet power in the land was no easy matter. Enormous efforts and help were needed from Soviet Russia and much had to be overcome before the power of the people was finally established. The road ahead from the feudal past was lit up by the genius of Lenin and his teaching on backward peoples' transition to socialism. These ideas were creatively applied to a variety of specific conditions in Central Asia. And there was no sphere of social life where the decisive ideological and organizing role of the party was not felt, nor where the comprehensive assistance from the peoples of our country, first and foremost the Russian people, was not seen.

In his historic letter "To the Comrade Communists of Turkestan" V.I. Lenin emphasized that the establishment of fraternal relations with the peoples of Turkestan was of worldwide-historic importance for the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic. And what persistence, tenacity and skill were needed to find the ways and methods to establish those relations!

True to its international duty the party provided all possible kinds of assistance to the young communist organizations in Turkestan, Bukhara and Khorezm. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee and RSFSR Soviet of People's Commissars Commission on Turkestan Affairs and the party central committee Turkestan Buro and Central Asian Buro made an invaluable contribution in consolidating them. The champions of Lenin's ideas included eminent party and state figures—Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin, Valeryan Vladimirovich Kuybyshev, Mikhail Vasilyevich Frunze, Shalva Zurabovich Eliava, Yan Ernestovich Rudzutak, Sergey Ivanovich Gusev, Panteleymon Nikolayevich Lepeshinskiy, Karl Yanovich Bauman, Viktor Pavlovich Nogin and others.

Those years brought harsh tests. The communists marched in the front ranks of the class struggles. The exploits of the 14 Commissars will live forever in the people's memory. The Bolsheviks mobilized the people to defend the gains of the revolution. Poorly armed Turkestan fighters routed the Basmachi gangs that were supplied by the imperialist countries. In mortal combat the will of the workers and their desire for a new life won through.

The formation in 1925 of the republic party organization was a great event in the history of the peoples of Uzbekistan. Loyal Leninists and internationalist patriots Vladimir Ivanovich Ivanov and Akmal Ikramov were elected secretaries of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee.

The feeling of international solidarity was consolidated in the workers in the joint struggle against internal counterrevolution and the foreign intervention. Selfless warriors fighting to embody the ideas of the October rose up from among the Uzbek people. Party and soviet workers and authoritative leaders of the masses Yuldash Akhunbabayev and Fayzulla Khodzhayev, Red commanders Mirkamil Mirsharapov and Abdulla Yarumkhamedov, the remarkable troubadour of the October Revolution Khamza Khakim-zade, Komsomol members Abdulla Nabyev and Israil Artikov, and tens and hundreds and thousands of the builders of the new world have occupied worthy places in the history of the Uzbek SSR. The transition from feudal relations to socialism, bypassing capitalism, became a truly revolutionary feat to which the party raised the people.

The great friendship of the peoples was a source of strength, a mighty engine for the advance along this road. Born in the fire of revolution, it was tempered and tested

for strength in the years of the first five-year plans. The liquidation of backwardness required not only enormous material and financial resources. Help from the specialists, workers, engineers, agronomists, physicians, scientists and land improvement experts whom the Russian Federation sent to Uzbekistan and the other republics was also needed.

The creation of industry in short order, and the training of cadres were possible only on the basis of aid to the regions that remained economically backward. And it was the Russian people, the Russian working class, who provided this comprehensive support. During the first three five-year plans more than 500 major industrial projects were completed in the republic. A number of light industry enterprises together with equipment and work personnel were transferred from central Russia to Uzbekistan.

With the help of the fraternal peoples agriculture was also rebuilt. The rich landowners and kulaks and the urban bourgeoisie and clergy hampered the building of a new life in the countryside in every possible way. But the main mass of the working peasantry embarked irrevocably on the path of collectivization, and it was this that determined its successful accomplishment. Thousands of workers, party members from Moscow, Leningrad and Ivanovo-Voznesensk were dispatched to help in the collectivization of the countryside in Uzbekistan and the other Central Asian republics. These people, tempered and having great experience in the class struggle, brought to the masses the ideas of proletarian internationalism and leading agricultural methods. The largest industrial enterprises in the RSFSR increased their patronage help for the districts and regions of the republic.

Under very difficult conditions and in the absence of mechanization, and living on half-rations, the people produced miracles. The Pact of the Thousands, the Stakhanovite movement and other initiatives helped in overcoming the devastation. And now a firm friendship was forged and endures to this day between the cotton growers of Tashkent and the textile workers of Ivanovo, between the farmers of Fergana and the workers at the Kirov Plant in Leningrad, between the kolkhoz farmers of Kashka-Darya and workers in Moscow, between the workers of Karakalpak and the workers of the RSFSR.

The water-management construction, which was started by Lenin's decree "On the Allocation of R50 million for Irrigation Work in Turkestan and the Organization of This Work," became the symbol of the liberated energy of the people. And it is a reason for happiness among us that in M.S. Gorbachev's report at the ceremonial meeting, the Great Fergana Canal, built using the method of the national khashar, was named as one of the great construction sites of the first five-year plans. Hundreds of thousands of people amicably built the canals and weirs, and then the plants and the highways and the cities.

One of the most important law-governed patterns in the construction of the building of socialism has been the cultural revolution. The October opened up for the broadest masses of the workers access to all the values of science and culture.

The women of the East moved out onto the broad and shining path of building the new life. The courage and fearlessness of those involved in the "Khudzhum," who threw down a challenge to the reactionaries and obscurantists, will go down forever in history.

The building of the new life was difficult and filled with contradictions and complexities. Many people were killed by the bullets and knives of the Basmachi and the rich landowners and fanatics. The forces of the old world did not surrender their positions without a fight.

There were mistakes and extremes along our path. But nothing could push the people from the road on which they had embarked in 1917. People sensed that they were the participants in a great cause and their patriotism acquired a new, socialist content.

The strength and indestructibility of the friendship of the peoples were also tested in the difficult trials of the Great Patriotic War. During the war years Uzbekistan became one of the major military arsenals, providing weapons and ammunition and food and clothing for the front. The republic accepted about 100 major industrial enterprises and provided shelter for more than a million people. The evacuees included hundreds of thousands of children. They found refuge not only in the children's homes but also in the families of the workers. The Shamakhmudov family took on the upbringing of 16 children of various nationalities. And there were thousands of such families.

All the very complicated work in mobilizing the workers in the rear was done by the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee headed by the eminent Leninist, internationalist and pre-eminent organizer Usman Yusupov. His image will remain forever bright in our hearts and in the memories of the workers in the republics.

In those difficult days the Uzbek people wrote the following in a letter to the Uzbek fighting men: "Free son and free daughter of the Uzbek people!... The German Basmach has broken into the house of your older brother—the Russian—and into the houses of your brothers—the Belorussian and the Ukrainian. But the house of the Russian is also your house, the house of the Ukrainian and of the Belorussian is also your house... Make sure that... within your happy family you can say with voices raised in pride: 'And I was among those who in the terrible years of the Patriotic War defended the motherland against destruction and devastation!'" The Turkestan Military District became the forge for military personnel. Dozens of divisions and brigades and hundreds of reserve subunits were formed and trained there.

Shoulder to shoulder with the sons of other peoples, the fighters from Uzbekistan stood to the death at Moscow and on the banks of the Volga and the Don, and they liberated the Ukraine and Belorussia and the countries of East Europe. The soldiers showed that the Soviet people, the party, socialism and the October are indissoluble, and that there is no force in the world that can destroy this unity.

Perestroika: A Direct Continuation of the Cause of the October.

Comrades. During the time that has elapsed since the victory of the Great October our country has achieved outstanding successes. They are a source of pride among Soviet people.

At the same time, as M.S. Gorbachev has noted, there have also been many tragic pages in our history. It is necessary to assess the past with a sense of historical responsibility and on the basis of historical truth. Absence of the necessary level of democratization in Soviet society also made possible both the cult of personality and the violations of legality and the tyranny and repressions of the Thirties.

Nor did our republic avoid crimes rooted in the soil of abuse of power. Akmal Ikramov and Fayzulla Khodzhaev, communists and nonparty people, economic cadres and military personnel, and scientists and cultural figures were also the victims of repression and lawlessness. We know now that the accusations made against them were the result of deliberate falsification. The painful questions of history cannot be escaped. This would be a neglect of historical truth and lack of respect for those who were the innocent victims of lawlessness and tyranny. We must also not do this because truthful analysis should help us to solve today's problems: democratization, legality, glasnost, and dealing with bureaucracy. An honest understanding both of our enormous achievements and past misfortunes and the full and proper political assessment of them will provide a true moral reference point for the future.

The voluntarism and elements of social corrosion and the trends alien to socialism that appeared at the turn of the Seventies and Eighties have been exerting a constraining influence on our development.

Healthy forces in the party and in society have sensed with growing acuteness the real requirement and need to deal with negative phenomena and strive to achieve a moral purification and renewal of socialism. And the answer to this acute need was provided by the concept and strategy put forward by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum for accelerating socioeconomic development, and developed in the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums and formulated in the general line of the revolutionary restructuring of all aspects of life in socialist society.

Perestroika is not only getting rid of the stagnation and conservatism of the preceding period and correcting the mistakes that were made, but also overcoming historically hidebound, outdated features in social organization and work methods. It consists of imparting to socialism the most up-to-date forms, and it is a relatively prolonged process of revolutionary renewal of society, with its own logic and stages.

The aim of perestroika is to restore fully, theoretically and in practice, the Leninist concept of socialism, in which the unquestionable priority is the worker and his ideals and interests, and humanistic values in economics, social and political relations and culture.

Two key problems in the development of society determine the fate of perestroika. These are the democratization of all public life and radical economic reform.

Continuing the cause of the October, perestroika has posed as the priority task that of further deepening and developing socialist democracy. The democratization of society is the soul of perestroika, and the success of perestroika itself and—and this can be said without exaggeration—the future of socialism in general, depend on how this proceeds.

The aim of the radical economic reform on which the country has embarked is to guarantee over the next two or three years the transition from an excessively centralized, command system of management to a democratic form of management based predominantly on economic methods and an optimal combination of centralism and self-management. It presupposes a sharp extension of independence for associations and enterprises and their transfer to full cost accounting and self-financing, and providing the labor collectives with everything needed for these rights.

Much work has been done since the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum. The country finds itself at a major turning point. The first stage of perestroika is now basically complete. A new political and moral-and-psychological situation has now been created in society. The party has succeeded in increasing people's interest in public affairs and their activeness, and has raised the level of exactingness, criticism and self-criticism and glasnost, and has created the prerequisites for real changes in people's thinking and attitudes.

Like the majority of Soviet people, the workers of Uzbekistan support perestroika and think that it should be steadily advanced. Workers, kolkhoz farmers and the intelligentsia have an understanding attitude toward the need to enhance discipline, efficiency and the quality of labor.

Perestroika has a special meaning for our republic. As you know, it was noted at the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee January Plenum that the economic and scientific and technical potential that has

been created in Uzbekistan is being used inefficiently, and negative phenomena have been seen here in their most acute form. With a great deal of assistance from the CPSU Central Committee, at the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee 16th Plenum that took place in June 1984, and later at their own 21st Congress, communists in the republic revealed and sharply criticized and unconditionally condemned the gross miscalculations and obvious failures in economic management and the public sphere, and the serious violations in the activity of party, soviet, state and economic organs and public organizations in the republic.

When analyzing the roots of these phenomena consideration must be given to the fact that since the departure of U. Yusupov from the post of Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary, there have been frequent and repeated replacements among the top echelons of the republic leadership. This cadre instability has exerted an adverse effect on the moral-political situation among the party and economic aktiv and introduced elements of subjectivism into the solutions offered for very important socioeconomic questions and the selection and placement of cadres.

It was in this situation that it became possible for Sh. Rashidov to be elected to the leading post in the republic party organization. As has been noted on more than one occasion, he is to blame for the implantation of a discredited style. Ostentation and strutting, ignoring criticism and self-criticism, casting aside all modesty and in some cases even a sense of probity, resulted in the spread of intrigue and led to embezzlement and bribe-taking.

The Uzbek Communist Party has learned from this very serious lesson and will not permit the abuse of power in any form to be repeated in our republic. Steps have been taken to purge organs and organizations of criminals and persons who have compromised themselves, and to strengthen all sectors with worthy people capable of dealing with matters with a firm hand.

We have received and are receiving invaluable help from the CPSU Central Committee, which has sent about 400 people from all-union organizations and the country's major party organizations for permanent work in Uzbekistan. This has made it possible not only to strengthen many sectors but also accumulate the best work experience gained in other regions. In this we see a continuation of the glorious traditions established by V.I. Lenin.

In the difficult struggle to instill proper order, the republic workers can feel on a day-to-day basis the help from the party, the firm hand of friendship and the fraternal assistance and support from all the nations in the country. This is the spirit of unity and cohesion—one of the greatest gains of the October. The CPSU Central

Committee and the Soviet government are paying great attention to the development of Uzbekistan's economy and culture and are going out of their way to satisfy our requests and wishes.

Special attention is being paid to increasing the return from the agro-industrial complex. It has been decided to review the volumes of production and procurements of raw cotton in line with realistic opportunities and the requirements of scientifically sound crop-rotation systems. This will make it possible substantially to improve land fertility and expand the production of fodder crops and fruit and vegetables and thus accelerate resolution of the food question. We have been armed with a clear-cut program of action and we know how to implement it. This is how the task has been set: to make the most efficient use of the production and scientific and technical potential.

The tasks of the 12th Five-Year Plan are targeting us on this. It is planned to increase the output of industrial goods 28 percent. Construction workers must build 560,000 apartments, schools with places for 924,000 students, children's preschool facilities with places for 412,000, and many other projects. Average annual gross agricultural output will increase.

The first positive result of perestroika in the republic has been the broad understanding of the need for uncompromising struggle against negative phenomena and affirmation of the sense of organization and exactingness and the businesslike approach. As a result a process of normalizing all spheres of public life has been initiated. At the plants and construction sites and kolkhozes and sovkhozes and in the scientific research organizations a strenuous search is underway for new forms of organization and wages. People are now becoming more exacting, both toward themselves and toward the leaders and specialists, and they are speaking out decisively against mismanagement and irresponsibility.

At the same time, in general the situation in the national economy remains tense. Many enterprises are failing to realize their opportunities and are not fulfilling plans and pledges. The plan for the commissioning of fixed capital is not being fulfilled. Plans for retail trade turnover and the marketing of personal services are being frustrated.

Perestroika is proceeding with great difficulties in the agro-industrial complex. The per hectare yields from irrigated land are growing only slowly. A pro forma approach is seen toward the assimilation of intensive technologies and the transfer of brigades and farmsteads to cost accounting and contract work. Social problems in perestroika in the countryside are being resolved poorly.

In cotton growing this is the most complicated year in its history. The situation in the fields has now become acute. The fate of the harvest is threatened. However,

not everyone is displaying a sense of care and organization. The cotton is there in the fields and there is enough of it to meet the targets that have been set. The experience of leading growers shows this. Workers in Khankinskiy rayon, about 50 farms and 3,000 brigades, have fulfilled the plans and are producing enough cotton to meet their socialist pledges.

The extraordinary situation demands extraordinary measures. People and equipment must work at full capacity and the stepped-up schedules must be maintained. Selfless labor in the fields and along the rural routes and at the cotton-collecting points must become a manifestation of the international duty of each worker in the republic.

In agriculture and in other sectors of the economy urgent measures are needed to correct the situation and translate the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January, June and October plenums into practical deeds. Our most immediate task is fulfill the plans and pledges for this jubilee year without references to difficulties. This requires enormous efforts by the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia and by all our cadres. Life itself now demands that we check over our ideas, approaches and work methods.

Here, it is also essential to see which old methods developed over the decades might be hampering perestroika. Command-administrative forms hamper management. The dogmatic type of thinking hampers. Finally, there are the open and hidden opponents of perestroika—the people whose self-seeking interests run counter to the interests of the whole of society, and those who are being deprived of their unearned incomes and privileges for which they do not work, and those who are being dismissed from posts because they have lost the credit of the people's trust.

It is essential to learn to recognize, unmask and neutralize the maneuvers of the opponents of perestroika—those who are applying the brakes and throwing wrenches into the wheels.

As was noted at the ceremonial meeting in Moscow, perestroika continues the cause of the revolution. And today the ability to master fully the tool of revolutionary tenacity is absolutely essential. This tenacity is found not in sitting in a chair or swimming with the current. It is found in the ability to evaluate a situation realistically, not to sit passively in the face of difficulties, not to panic, not to lose one's head in either success or failure; in the ability to labor each day and each hour in a strenuous and purposeful manner, and everywhere and in everything to find the optimal solutions that life itself dictates.

This year the republic's workers face great and complex tasks. It is envisaged that national income will increase 4.8 percent while industrial output will grow 5.3 percent and agricultural output 13 percent (in average annual figures).

Economic management methods are now being brought to the forefront in the organizational and political activity of the party committees and organizations. The business for today is the switch from partial "work completed" and "remodeling" to an integrated radical reform in management. This year the Law on Enterprises—the basis of the new management system—must be assimilated in practice, and comprehensive preparations must be made for its full operation during the 13th Five-Year Plan.

Within the republic 1,248 enterprises are today operating under the new conditions, and from next year another 796 enterprises and organizations and the Surkhan-Darya Oblast Agro-industrial Committee will be added. For a certain period of time both the new and the old management methods will be operating. And at this major turning point it is extremely important that work to reshape the economic mechanism receives the constant and unremitting attention of the party organizations and committees.

Implementation of the economic reform depends largely on improvements in the activity of the managerial apparatus. Inflated staffs give rise to irresponsibility. A substantial reduction (up to 50 percent) is therefore planned in the apparatus of the republic management wing and through this a consolidation of the basic production elements.

One most important condition for production intensification is the extensive introduction of brigade forms in the organization of labor, and cost accounting. However, in and of itself no economic mechanism can provide the full effect if cadres and all workers do not master it. And for this, what is needed is for mass economic education to be developed more actively, from republic leaders and the managers of enterprises and farms down to the workers. The first principle of skillful management is not where to obtain the greatest resources but how best to use resources. The times demand that consideration be given not only to the ruble but also the kopeck, and that thrift should become the law of economic life.

Rational utilization of the labor force and recruitment of the unemployed population into social production is an important economic and political task. This is the more essential because the republic is lagging behind the average all-union indicators for per capita generation of national income and in terms of development of the infrastructure. Last year 150,000 people entered social production. What has been done is only the start of much work on many planes. In addition to creating new work places it is necessary to activate internal production reserves, and first and foremost improve the shift coefficient. The rates and quality of training for skilled personnel must be improved, especially for those from among the local population. Attitudes toward the organization of cooperatives, home work and part-time work must be radically re-examined.

Uzbekistan's help in transforming the Nonchernozem lands and in opening up the resources of Siberia is a matter of great international importance. Some 30,000 emissaries from the republic are now working in those places. Before the end of the five-year plan we must send at least 82,000 people to the all-union construction sites.

The task for the party organizations is to target economic leaders and labor collectives on fulfilling contracts, achieving high quality, helping enterprises, farms and organizations to switch to the principles of cost accounting and self-financing, and doing everything necessary to insure that the republic's economy embarks on the next five-year plan with a smooth-running economic mechanism.

Comrades. The CPSU sees the highest meaning of the acceleration and perestroyka in steadily, step by step improving the well-being of the people. Today Soviet society is a society in which many major social problems have been resolved. However, perestroyka also demands here a new approach to the assessment of the existing state of affairs. The distortion that occurred earlier, leaning toward a technocratic approach, led to a decline in workers' interest in the results of labor weaker discipline, and to other negative phenomena.

Tasks whose resolution would significantly improve living conditions for the individual are being moved to the forefront. On this plane we have made certain advances. Compared with the three previous years, during the period 1984-1986 some 173,000 more square meters of housing were commissioned, along with schools with places for 48,000 students and children's preschool facilities with places for more than 8,000. Consumer sales of meat, milk and eggs increased. Real growth rates for user-fee and personal services improved.

Our priority task is to make better use of our opportunities and local resources, and to blunt the edge of a number of problems in the near future. Here, of course, the Food Program is being moved to the forefront. In the light of propositions from the meeting in the CPSU Central Committee devoted to the accelerated development of the processing sectors in the agro-industrial complex, special attention should be paid to the introduction of intensive technologies, collective and family contract work, and development of private subsidiary plots for enterprises and in the individual sector. With the change in investment policy, instead of opening up new land, funds are being used to improve land fertility, increase fodder production, and sharply improve productivity in livestock farming. All of this is making it possible to improve supplies of foodstuffs for the population.

Fulfillment of the task set by the 27th CPSU Congress, namely, providing each family with an individual apartment or individual home, should become a practical matter for the entire nation. Housing construction in the republic is being expanded. From these sources, in 1988

almost 7.4 million square meters of housing will be commissioned, which is 530,000 square meters more than the five-year plan target.

We now have more than 240,000 families waiting for apartments. In order to fulfill the housing program it is essential to make every possible use of local materials and additional financial and manpower resources. The housing-construction combines can and must make a major contribution. Local soviets of people's deputies and management and the trade union committees at enterprises and organizations and in kolkhozes and sovkhozes must examine in greater depth the housing concerns of the workers and remove all barriers on the road of individual construction. The creation of youth housing complexes should be reliably supported in every possible way.

One very important task is saturate the market with high-quality goods. Next year's plans to increase sales of goods and provide services have been set up so as to exclude the excess income over expenditure that occurred in the five-year plan.

It is essential to make maximum use of opportunities and resources, take note of things promptly and support and extensively disseminate useful initiative. The reserves here are enormous. And in order to bring them into play it is essential to switch the production of consumer goods more rapidly to up-to-date technologies and try to achieve sharp improvements in quality. Each labor collective must find its own specific place in improving consumer supplies of foodstuffs and extending the range and improving the quality of goods.

Public health needs radical restructuring. Finding solutions to this and other problems is a matter of priority importance. The political maturity of each party organization will be seen in how skillfully and actively party instructions are implemented at the local level. For people judge perestroika primarily by how the state of affairs changes on those sectors that impinge directly on their lives.

Undeviating implementation of the principle of social justice is pivotal in social policy. Those who work conscientiously and creatively should receive material and moral encouragement. More from the individual but more for the individual, the honest worker: this is the dialectic of our society, where labor and well-being are inseparably fused.

In order to march at the head of democratization and perestroika the party is paying special attention to the development of democracy in its own ranks. The practical work of party committees has been enriched with forms and methods of work such as cadre certification and regular accountability to the primary party organizations and labor collectives, and the discussion in open party meetings of all candidate put forward for promotion, and much else.

The republic party organization is working to perfect the mechanism for accountability reports and to enhance their efficacy, and to establish businesslike control over responses to critical remarks and proposals.

Appointment by election as a form of glasnost is acquiring special importance. More than 18,000 leaders—party and soviet workers, enterprise directors, kolkhoz and sovkhoz chairmen, managers of construction organizations and rectors of educational establishments—have been elected by vote with preliminary discussion of two or more candidates.

But the potential for party influence on perestroika has still not been fully switched in. The assimilation of political methods in leadership is taking place with great difficulty. The party raykoms and gorkoms are being restructured in this direction the most slowly. Meanwhile, they make up a very important element in the system of party leadership.

Today, the party committees at all levels must consistently follow the line of improving the style of work, with the emphasis on the primary party organizations, labor collectives and public organizations.

Being equal to the demands of the times means for the party committees and organizations and for each communist the application of tried and true Leninist principles and asseveration of the Leninist style in work. This style is characterized first and foremost by the scientific approach to finding solutions to the tasks facing them, and realism in evaluating the situation on any sector. It requires clear-cut control and checking on execution, collectivity in leadership, and skillful selection, placement and indoctrination of cadres. One of its inprescriptible features is its firm link with the masses, the critical appraisal of what has been achieved, and a self-critical attitude toward one's own activity.

We shall not accomplish perestroika without sharp activation in the life of all party organizations. Therefore, the greater the businesslike approach, the greater democratism and the greater organization and discipline. And then we shall succeed in putting perestroika into top gear and in imparting new impulses to all our work.

Ideological work should be in line with the demands of life and address itself to what has gone wrong and what is causing problems. It is precisely on this that our successes will depend in the struggle for people's hearts and minds that is today underway in the world. And it is precisely because of this that their ideological tempering and indoctrination in the spirit of high class vigilance and readiness to defend the motherland against any encroachments have been and remain the most important sectors in the activity of the entire party. This is the more important because the years of stagnation also exerted an adverse effect in the spiritual sphere. A sense of jumping on the bandwagon, apathy and cynicism, and

disbelief in the possibility of positive changes have taken root in the public consciousness. A significant gap has been formed between word and deed. The clergy has been activated. Ideological-moral values have to some degree been devalued.

It is therefore necessary to make fundamental improvements in the multilevel work in human spiritual development. People who are worried about things or who are exacting toward and impatient of mismanagement and red tape need perestroyka. Perestroyka is also needed by the political warriors who are boundlessly devoted to communist ideals.

The party has recently been seeking out new approaches to work and striving to achieve enhancement in the effectiveness of the various forms of agitation and propaganda activity. Political days are held regularly. The interest of readers and viewers in newspapers and in television and radio broadcasts has been increased.

Notwithstanding, this has not succeeded in eradicating formalism and didacticism in party training and verbal and visual political agitation and propaganda. The effectiveness of atheistic indoctrination is poor. Party committees must improve the effectiveness of current and future training for the ideological aktiv.

During the course of democratization and insuring widespread glasnost, particularly crucial tasks in developing criticism and self-criticism lie with the mass information and propaganda media and the party press. It is now especially important that our press catch precisely the outshoots of what is new and advanced, born out of perestroyka in all spheres of life, and that it help in making them universally accessible.

The Leninist spirit of internationalism must also be further strengthened in the masses. For us the friendship and cooperation of the peoples of the USSR is a sacred thing. The jubilee measures are further strengthening international indoctrination. Days of Literature and the Arts of the Uzbek SSR have been held in the Ukrainian SSR and Irkutsk Oblast, and Days of Uzbekistan at the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements. In turn, figures in literature and the arts from the Ukrainian SSR have visited Tashkent, and exhibitions of the works of artists in Turkmenia, the Ukraine and Latvia have been held; and it is intended to hold meetings of figures in Soviet theater under the motto "The Theater and the Times." Links have been expanded between workers in Uzbekistan and Bulgaria, and contacts are being strengthened with Macedonia. Patronage has been established over the northern provinces of Afghanistan.

The task is to enhance the effectiveness of propaganda of the Soviet way of life and skillfully link the ideological-political tempering of youth with military-patriotic indoctrination. A sense of being a defender of the motherland must be formed in every person from youth. To

this end the party and Komsomol organizations in the republic are cooperating with soldiers from the Red Banner Turkestan Military District, who are multiplying the glorious traditions of the Soviet Army and reliably defending the southern borders of our motherland.

I want to say a special word about the young people who have undergone their baptism of fire in Afghanistan. We must show more concern for them and involve them actively in military-patriotic indoctrination.

It is important to shape not contemplative but creative internationalism. The internationalist is the person who fears no difficulties and overcomes obstacles, and acts in the interests of the country. Internationalism in deed is the republic's growing contribution to the unified national economic complex. It is also the further strengthening of the national cadres of the working class. And mutual enrichment with spiritual values. And, of course, bilingualism. The comprehensive "Russian Language" program has now been developed in the republic. It is essential to strive to insure that it is undeviatingly implemented in all educational establishments and labor collectives.

New tasks face those working in schools and VUZ's. They must abandon the old stereotypes and educate real citizens for whom ideological conviction and communist morality are not just formulas conned by rote but essential qualities for the individual. It is necessary to make a major leap forward and achieve radical changes in this sphere.

We expect much from scientific workers in the republic. It is important to improve results from scientific research work and achieve more extensive utilization of the scientific potential in order radically to rearm the national economy and to switch the agro-industrial complex, first and foremost cotton growing, onto the rails of intensification and the introduction of resource-saving, waste-free processes.

In shaping the new man it is difficult to overestimate the role of the social sciences. We are the witnesses of a growing interest in social affairs, and particularly toward the past, among broad strata of the population. This requires a very careful attitude toward everything that shapes the political, and particularly the historical, awareness of the people.

The history of our state must not be presented as a string of mistakes and delusions. But varnishing reality and jumping on the bandwagon and depersonalization of the historical process are also harmful. Much must be approached in a new way in throwing light on a number of important periods in the history of the peoples of Central Asia and the activity of the Uzbek Communist Party, and the "blank spots" must be filled in while

strictly adhering to the principle of historicism and truth. It is important that a clear-cut, world-outlook position is present during the examination of any phenomena of the past and the present.

New processes are also gathering strength in the republic's cultural life. Past congresses of the creative unions have taken place in an atmosphere of democracy. At the same time the process of renewal in the cultural sphere is not a simple progression. Perestroyka is not a pretext for settling accounts. It is difficult and prolonged work that requires the cohesion of all efforts. It is toward this that the party influence must be directed.

The republic party organizations is counting on the active civic and social position of our intelligentsia. Scientists and inventors, writers and journalists, artists and artistes, teachers—all workers in the various spheres of culture and education are called upon to be champions of perestroyka. In cultural development, as anywhere else, what is needed is people who are not indifferent and who approach matters with true innovation.

One essential part of perestroyka is purging the moral atmosphere in society. A merciless war has been declared on plunderers, bribe-takers, falsifiers and drunkards—on all who grossly flout the laws and the norms of socialist communal living. There will be no weakening in this struggle.

Working skillfully with the masses, convincing the masses, influencing their consciousness and psychology, and catching exactly the mood of the people, and providing answers for worrying questions are all, as Lenin emphasized, very difficult but very important matters.

09642

Demirchyan on Soviet Achievements, Perestroyka in Armenia

18300024a Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
6 Nov 87 pp 1-2

[ARMENPRESS report: "Verity to the Cause of October and Leninist Precepts—The Ceremonial Session of the Armenian CP Central Committee and the ArSSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Excerpts] A ceremonial session of the Armenian CP Central Committee and the ArSSR Supreme Soviet devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution opened November 5th in the concert hall of the Sports and Concert Center.

In the hall were members and candidate members of the Armenian CP Central Committee, members of the Auditing Commission of the Armenian CP, deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the ArSSR Supreme Soviet, party veterans, participants in the fight to establish Soviet power in Armenia, the Civil War and the

Great Patriotic War, leaders of production, soldiers of the Soviet Army, scientific and cultural figures and representatives of social organizations and the press.

On the presidium were comrades K.S. Demirchyan, G.M. Voskanyan, F.T. Sarkisyan, Yu.P. Kochetkov, R.A. Arzumanyan, D.A. Arutyunyan, M.K. Arutyunyan, K.A. Gambaryan, T.A. Dilanyan, M.O. Muradyan, S.M. Petrosyan, L.G. Saakyan, E.P. Avakyan, Kh.L. Mandal-yan, G.A. Martirosyan, G.A. Oganyan, M.A. Yuzbash-yan and comrade Yu.K. Kuznetsov, deputy chairmen of the Presidium of the ArSSR Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the ArSSR Council of Ministers, ministers, party veterans, elders of the republic, prominent scientific and cultural figures and leading party, Soviet, trade-union and Komsomol workers.

The floor was given over to ArSSR CP Central Committee First Secretary K.S. Demirchyan for a report on the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

We have covered a great path of the struggle to create and reinforce a new society which, however, was not easy or only an ascent. In the days of the great anniversary, we are flush with pride for what has been achieved, and we recall those millions of people, each of which made a contribution to our common socialist conquests, and we reflect on how difficult and ambiguous our affairs and fate took shape at times. There were all types—heroic and tragic, great victories and bitter failures—when we bore heavy losses, there were victims that were the result of the personality cult, violations of legality, arbitrariness and repression in the 1930s.

"Our path of the trailblazer is enormous and difficult," said comrade M.S. Gorbachev. "...What we have passed through—its heroism and drama—cannot fail to arouse the minds of our contemporaries. We have one history, it is irreversible. And whatever emotions it has aroused—it is our history, it is dear to us. Today we are addressing those October days that shook the world, and we are seeking and finding in them both solid spiritual support and instructive lessons. We are convinced time and time again of the correctness of the socialist choice made by October."

The October Revolution—continued comrade K.S. Demirchyan—has laid the foundation for a fundamentally new and just social order, has put an end to national oppression once and for all and has instilled the principles for resolving the national question in our country. V.I. Lenin said that only on the basis of socialism are possible such "lofty forms of human society where the legal requirements and progressive aspirations of the working masses of any nationality are satisfied for the first time in an internationalist whole..."

With the victory of October and the creation of the republics, we have in fact affirmed the equality of peoples and their close collaboration and ensured rapid

economic, social and cultural progress for the former national areas. The Soviet republics have received all-round development. A unified national-economic complex for the country has been created. A unified Soviet people has taken shape that is proud of its common achievements and is ready to defend socialist conquests from any encroachments. An ideo-political unity of Soviet society, a feeling of a family united and an inviolable Leninist friendship of peoples has been formed and affirmed based on the common interests of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, the popular intelligentsia and the laborers of all nationalities, and a spirit of internationalism and patriotism has been reinforced among the broad masses.

The successes of the national policies of our party are indisputable, and this is testified to by the historic achievements of all the republics in the building of a new life. One of the most shining examples of the renaissance and unprecedented ascent of economics and culture and the flowering of all of spiritual life in the fraternal family of the Soviet peoples is Soviet Armenia.

Today, from the heights of the 1980s, it is even difficult for us to imagine the tragedy of the situation in which our people found themselves on the eve of the establishment of Soviet power, a people that had just suffered through the hell of genocide, that suffered from poverty, hunger, epidemics, that was once again threatened by the Turkish yataghan, this people sought a way to salvation. The Dashnak government was not only unable to resolve the questions facing the nation, their adventurist and short-sighted policies even further worsened the situation and the social and political crisis. The sole true path to social and national liberation was shown by the Armenian communists. They lifted up the workers and the people for revolutionary struggle. The aroused masses, under the leadership of the communists, won an historic victory—they overthrew the Dashnak government and established Soviet power. The people, having found long-sought freedom, entered onto the high road of the building of socialism.

The new power received a very difficult legacy in Armenia. A tormented land, a valley of tears, it turned out, less suited than any for transformation into a valley of roses, great happiness and flourishing. But the people, inspired with the ideas of October, led by the party, accomplished this historic miracle. It was accomplished thanks to the fraternal assistance of the Russian people and the other peoples of the country of the soviets. The hand of revolutionary solidarity and aid extended to the young republic by Soviet Russia was an expression of true brotherhood and great nobility. And this was the beginning of the enormous and unselfish aid rendered to our republic at all stages of socialist construction.

Could the Armenians scattered across the whole world have ever dreamed that the statehood of their native land would be resurrected, that Soviet Armenia would take its prodigal sons into its arms and become the support and guarantor of the preservation of the nation?

The workers of our republic and the whole Armenian people are profoundly aware that all of the attainments of Soviet Armenia have been achieved under the banner of Great October, under the leadership of the party of Lenin, through the joint struggle and labor of all of the peoples of our Motherland, thanks to the incarnation of the wise Leninist national policies of the CPSU, the friendship and unselfish assistance of all of the peoples of the Soviet Union and, first and foremost, the wonderful Russian people.

The Armenian people, like the other peoples of our country, are nourished by a feeling of profound respect, love and gratitude toward our big brother—the great Russian people. The Russian people have won these feelings of respect and love with their heroic struggle for freedom and happiness, with their selflessness, mighty talents, true internationalism, creative genius, devotion to the ideals of Marxism-Leninism and the invaluable contribution they made to the cause of creating, developing and reinforcing the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

At the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, the country has begun to slacken its rate of advance, and most serious problems have begun to accumulate both in the socio-economic sphere and in the moral and spiritual realms. Elements of social corrosion and tendencies alien to socialism have appeared. And in order to bring the country out of this state, the party Central Committee, in April of 1985, adopted a policy of radical renewal of socialism, the surmounting of stagnant tendencies, difficulties and unresolved problems that have accumulated, the eradication of phenomena alien to socialist society and the utmost acceleration of socio-economic development.

The 27th CPSU Congress, having interpreted the times we are passing through in a profound and Leninist manner, became a lesson in truth, gave an uncompromising and open evaluation of everything that is impeding progress, made historic decisions and formulated the program goals and key issues of party strategy at this crucial stage in the development of Soviet society.

Restructuring is a direct continuation of the cause of October, the consistent implementation of the ideals inscribed on the banner of our revolution, an answer to the historical challenge of the times.

The Soviet people have taken it that way, have taken it as their intimate affair, completely support the practical policy of profound transformations and are permeated with faith in the party, the creative powers of the people and its sense, talents and labor.

The two and a half years that have passed since the April Plenum were an extremely important initial stage for the implementation of the policies of acceleration, restructuring and democratization. Indisputable positive shifts are evident not only in the awareness of the tasks and

problems of restructuring, but in the practical approaches, concrete affairs and their results as well. The fundamental directions of the work in the political, economic and social spheres have been determined. And in order to bring to life everything that has been planned, we must all work solidly. It is important, moreover, to work and live under the conditions of expanding democracy, and to manifest an unchanging creative approach, boldness and determination in all of our activity.

"We are all now learning," noted Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, "we are all completing the great school of life. We are completing the school of truth and glasnost. We are completing the school of the expansion of democracy. We are completing the school of internationalism and patriotism."

The main thing today is to strive to see that the ideas of restructuring are translated everywhere into the practical plane, the rate of transformation is increased to the utmost, that the new way of thinking and the new behavior of people are affirmed, that the chief active individual for the renewal of society—the person of labor—is raised up, that his reputation and dignity are raised and his abilities and talents are revealed.

Restructuring, however, it must be said, has really not reached a number of places, and furthermore, as was noted at the June (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, a number of party organizations are lagging behind the prevailing sentiment and dynamic processes that are unfolding in society.

The republic party organization is currently conducting consistent work to surmount shortcomings in all realms of our vital activity and is directing its efforts toward accelerating and deepening restructuring, as was required by the June Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. In order to ensure success in this matter, the forces of all communists and all workers of the republic must be mobilized, the policy of the 27th CPSU Congress must be realized persistently and with Bolshevik consistency and efforts must be directed toward solving topical problems in socio-economic and cultural development and multiplying personal contributions to the process of renewal of our society.

Two key problems determine the fate of restructuring. They are the democratization of all of social life and radical economic reform. The essence of restructuring is the fact that it unites socialism and democracy, it restores the wholly theoretical and practical Leninist concept of socialist construction.

As was noted in the report of the CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, a solid foundation for an accelerated advance in all directions can be created only on the basis of radical changes in the economy. Restructuring itself gathers full force only when it profoundly stirs the national economy.

The economy is the main field of restructuring for us. We must provide everywhere for a real turnaround in the work of industry, capital construction and the agrarian sector and bring to life all of the latest party and government decisions for the development of the national economy.

Ensuring the transition from command-administrative management methods that slow our movement to economic ones and the creation of an anti-spending mechanism and an integral, efficient and flexible system of economic management with its widespread democratization is taking on exceptional importance.

A most important criterion of the efficiency of our actions in the principal areas of the economy is the indicator of the fulfillment of plan targets and socialist obligations for the 12th Five-Year Plan. We have already covered a third of the way. Summing up the results of the work that has been done, it should be stated that considerable success has been achieved on this way, but very many serious shortcomings remain unsurmounted.

Overall, the economy of the republic is developing in accordance with the limits envisaged by the five-year plan. Many labor collectives in a number of sectors of the national economy have achieved certain successes in the cause of raising the efficiency of production based on scientific and technical progress with the aid of incorporating the practices of new management methods. Many items with high technical and economic specifications have been assimilated and are being produced.

Behind the generally favorable numbers, however, are concealed many more enterprises and farms where they are not coping with the tasks posed, are producing poor-quality output and are proving unprepared for work under the conditions of a restructuring of the economic mechanism and transition to full economic accountability [khozrashchet] and self-financing. One serious shortcoming is that delivery obligations are not being met. In some places they still do not take seriously the resolution of the tasks of an increase in production efficiency, the reconstruction and technical retooling of enterprises, the renewal of products and an increase in labor productivity, and they are still not fully cognizant of the exceptional importance of a steady strengthening of a policy of rational consumption of material and labor resources, that resource conservation is in essence becoming the sole source of satisfaction of the growing needs of the national economy. They are not fighting energetically enough in some areas to increase their contribution to resolving the Food Program.

Success in restructuring is conditioned by strong social policies. The cardinal transformations being carried out in our society are subordinate to a lofty and noble goal—raising the welfare of the people and providing for the all-round development of the individual.

Our paramount tasks are solving the food and housing problems, saturating the market with the whole essential range of consumer goods and providing a modern level of services and for the accelerated development of all services in health and protecting the habitation environment of the person. The utmost utilization of opportunities for economizing and improving the organization of natural-resources utilization and raising the ecological culture of our people for these purposes, which should become an indispensable element of the overall culture of developing socialism, is taking on especial importance from this point of view.

As we know, specific steps aimed at resolving the issues noted have been realized and are being implemented in our republic of late. Housing construction is expanding, and more and more capital investment is being directed toward that purpose. The output of consumer items is growing and the volume and amounts of services are increasing in accordance with the program that has been developed. A program for improving medical, trade, domestic, transport and municipal support for the population is being realized.

The ArSSR CP Central Committee and the government of the republic have developed and are implementing an extensive plan of measures to ensure the protection of the environment in the ArSSR. At the behest of the ArSSR Party Central Committee, the ArSSR Council of Ministers is developing a long-term state program for the protection of the environment and the rational utilization of protected natural resources for the 13th Five-Year Plan and in the future to the year 2005, which will provide a comprehensive solution to ecological problems, including all types of activity in protecting the environment and the rational utilization and reproduction of natural resources.

In resolving socio-economic tasks, we should steadfastly keep all ideological and moral questions at the center of our attention. We must be rid of the shortcomings that exist in this matter without delay, and a healthy moral climate and a creative atmosphere must be established in all collectives without exception.

We must universally improve political educational work, ensure widespread glasnost, develop criticism and self-criticism and expand the active fight against bribery, speculation, protectionism, thefts of socialist property and all negative phenomena in order to surmount the unhealthy sentiments and opportunism, apathy and disbelief in the possibility of positive changes that have taken root in the consciousness of some. We must unswervingly bring to life the principle of socialist justice. Those who work creatively and honestly should be encouraged both materially and morally, while unbearable conditions must be created for loafers and parasites.

As was emphasized in the report of comrade M.S. Gorbachev, success in restructuring depends first and foremost on the energy, purposefulness and power of

example of the party and each communist. A radical improvement in the activity of party organizations and party organs and core personnel is becoming the chief task of today. A turnaround must be achieved in the activity of every party organization and the work of every party organ and every communist must be made more active.

We ourselves should strive in most active fashion to see that restructuring takes on a firmer pace in all spheres of life. To strive means to labor persistently, to fulfill one's duty conscientiously and creatively, to make one's worthy contribution to the common cause. Everything planned can be accomplished only by us, only by our selfless labor.

Thus, this means more efficiency, more organization, more discipline and more energetic work.

12821

Masaliyev on Soviet History, Perestroika Efforts in Kirgiziya

18300023 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 6 Nov 87 pp 1-3

[Unattributed report on speech by A. M. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz CP Central Committee, at a Joint Ceremonial Session of the Kirghiz CP Central Committee and the Kirghiz SSR Supreme Soviet Dedicated to the 70th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution: "70 Years Under the Banner of the Great October"]

[Excerpts] Comrades!

Our country has traveled a difficult, complex road in 70 years. Having defended the attainments of the October [Revolution] in the Civil War and in the struggle against the interventionists, the young Republic of the Soviets undertook the construction of a new life under the incredibly difficult conditions of devastation and starvation. "We can and do take pride in the fact," Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote, "that it was our happy lot to **begin** the construction of the Soviet state and in so doing to **begin** a new era in world history...."

There were no ready solutions to extremely complex problems. But there was a party that was armed with the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism. There was a heroic working class and its firm alliance with the working peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia. There was an enormous upsurge of creative energy of the working people of all nations and nationalities. And there was a strategic plan of socialist reforms—developed by Lenin and the Central Committee—of unprecedented depth and scale. It articulated the general line of industrialization, collectivization, and the cultural revolution.

Comrades! In the process of addressing relations between nations within the country, the party examined problems of national statehood with the utmost attention. In 1920, Vladimir Ilich Lenin pointed out the need for the detailed clarification of the terms of Turkestan's division into Uzbekistan, Kirghizia and Turkmenia and for preventing undue haste in this direction. National-state boundaries were established on the basis of the interests and traditions of the indigenous population, its economic living conditions, and the free and sovereign will of the peoples of Central Asia. The Kirghiz People, like other peoples, received its national socialist statehood.

While consistently implementing Leninist national policy, the party maintained a course of accelerated development of the previously backward hinterlands. The aid of the great Russian people and of other fraternal peoples was also decisive here. It acquired the character of all-union economic policy.

Kirghizia, which lacked resources, specialists, and production organizers, would not have been able to create its own industry in such a short period of time without the participation and support of fraternal peoples. Scores of our industrial enterprises were built with their material aid during the prewar five-year plans. Construction was for the most part financed by the Russian Federation budget. Machines, machine tools and equipment came from large Russian cities. Over 1000 party and soviet officials and approximately 15,000 skilled workers came to us. Thousands of Kirghizes were trained in and mastered blue-collar occupations. Leningrad greatly assisted the republic in developing its productive forces and in forming its working class.

An enormous creative effort was carried out under incredibly difficult conditions. But people realized through their class sense that there was no other way of making the Homeland a mighty power capable of defending the cause of revolution, the cause of October.

Socialist reforms in the countryside were implemented according to Lenin's cooperative plan. An integral part of these reforms was the conversion of more than 300,000 persons [from a nomadic] to a settled way of life. It was necessary to struggle against the most firmly entrenched patriarchal-feudal survivals, to overcome the fierce resistance of kulak and bai-manap [rich landowning-feudal aristocratic] elements. The state allocated over 30 million rubles for the living and housing arrangements of former nomads. Three hundred settlements and more than 34,000 houses were built for them. Mass conversion to a settled way of life undermined age-old roots of ancestral-tribal relations, destroyed the subsistence mode of economic life and opened the door to broad collectivization.

The class-oriented aid [klassovaya pomoshch] of workers in this large and complex area should not be forgotten. In 1929, Moscow, Leningrad, and Ivanovo-Voznesensk

sent more than 25,000 front-rank workers to the countryside, who went down in history as the legendary twenty-five thousanders. Two hundred nineteen of them came to Kirghizia. They brought new ideas and new views to the ails [aily], helped the dekhkans [dekhkany] to overcome patriarchal thinking, and inculcated a socialist attitude toward labor.

Collectivization occasionally went too far. The principles of voluntariness and gradualness were violated in the course of this difficult process. Cooperative techniques from other regions of the nation were mechanically applied without regard to the local conditions.

This fact notwithstanding, collectivization became the turning point in the radical restructuring of the countryside. By the end of the '30's, it was practically complete. Machinery came into the fields, the construction of irrigation facilities expanded, and labor productivity increased dramatically. Far-reaching reforms in the agrarian sector were instrumental in instilling peasants with collective psychology, in inculcating social consciousness. Collectivization created a new class: the kolkhoz peasantry.

Socialism, which was proclaimed by the October Revolution as a goal to strive for, as a task to be realized, became a reality, became the creative human, became the life of millions. It actually embodied humanistic ideals and general human moral values. It incorporated the talent, the magnificence of spirit, and the self-sacrificing attitude of those who erected the bright edifice of socialism and defended it against its enemies.

There were errors, delusions and miscalculations. There were dramatic and occasionally tragic events.

Comrade M. S. Gorbachev's report provided a comprehensive political evaluation of every period in our history. At the same time that proper due was given to Stalin's role in the struggle against Trotskyism and the "new opposition," in defending Lenin's policy of industrialization and collectivization, and in the Great Patriotic War, the bitter truth was also told about his tyranny and repressions. Evaluations of accomplishments in socialist construction were made together with candid exposures of blunders that complicated socialism's rise to the next stage and led to disparities between its high principles and real life in the '60's.

But nothing could turn our country away from the road it set forth on in 1917. Nothing could shake the people-creator which, despite all difficulties, held high the banner of October, endured, and triumphed! "The road we have traveled—its heroism and dramatism," M. S. Gorbachev stated, "cannot fail to excite the mind of our contemporaries. We have one history and it is irreversible. No matter what emotions it evokes, it is our history and it is dear to us."

Comrades! The ideas, lessons, and experience of the Great October are important even today. They permeate the decisions of the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, and the subsequent plenums of the Central Committee. They are at the basis of the party's strategic course of acceleration of the country's socio-economic development.

Restructuring is the new historic stage in Soviet society's forward progress. Its goal is to give socialism the most sophisticated forms and to reveal its enormous social reserves to the fullest. The revolutionary reforms under way in the nation continue the historical experience of bolshevism and the continuity of October's causes and accomplishments.

The Soviet people are entitled to take pride in everything they have created in past years of intensive labor and struggle, that is the firm foundation for addressing important new tasks. But these accomplishments must not overshadow contradictions in the development of society or the errors and omissions of the late '70's and early '80's.

As emphasized at the 27th Party Congress and in the report at the ceremonial meeting in Moscow, the reason for these negative phenomena was the failure to evaluate the economic situation in good time and the lack of political will and decisiveness to change it. Many party, soviet, and economic leaders did not realize the full urgency of converting the economy to intensive methods of development, did not display steadfastness and consistency in addressing important problems in the restructuring of economic policy. The result of frequent instances of wishful thinking was that a demanding, self-critical attitude gave way to complacency.

Much that was negative accumulated in ideological work. There were serious flaws in cadre policy. Subservience, groveling and servility were encouraged. Unprepared officials were frequently promoted to executive posts.

While objectively evaluating the existing situation in the economy, in the social sphere, in social relations, the CPSU Central Committee and its Politburo most candidly and forthrightly exposed stagnation, difficulties and unresolved problems and decisively worked to sharply turn matters around for us and to change the lives of all Soviet people for the better. The basic social renewal policy of the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the 27th Party Congress won the approval and support of all the people.

Restructuring, having absorbed revolutionary thought, creative energy, and the party's political will is already producing its initial results. People's attitude toward labor is changing, the foundations of the new economic mechanism are being laid, reserves associated with the

use of full cost accounting, self-support, and self-financing are brought into play, and the interests of society, the collective and the individual are merging more closely with one another.

The party has begun the deep, large-scale reform of our economy's management. We have begun the decisive turn from administrative methods of national economic management to economic methods, to the broad democratization of the entire practice of economic management.

Based on the historic attainments of October, the party is pursuing a line of priority development of the social sphere. The task of substantially improving people's working and living conditions has been advanced to the forefront. The reference is primarily to the food supply, to housing construction, and to consumer goods production.

Restructuring has given new impetus to the people's spiritual life and to ideological work. The country's moral and political situation is characterized by the deepening and development of socialist democratism, glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism. The party organizations that are called upon to provide political leadership of the entire course of the ongoing reforms are being restructured.

This work has also commenced in our republic. As is known, the economy was for many years primarily oriented toward the extensive path of development. The growth rate of gross output, national income, and the productivity of social labor has declined sharply. This could not fail to be reflected in the well-being of the working people. The republic was at a virtual standstill in the per capita production and consumption of meat, fish, and vegetables in the last 10 years.

A difficult situation was created in the social sphere. The development of its material-technical base was poor. Stagnation, complacency and stereotypes have been vividly manifested in ideological work. Leninist principles of selecting and placing cadres have been violated. An atmosphere of license and permissiveness has been created around certain self-interested, dishonest people.

Many shortcomings and derelictions in the republic were the result of serious deviations in the activity of the Central Committee leadership, in the work style and methods which were dominated by elements of ostentation and complacency. The 18th Congress of the Kirghiz CP made an incisive, highly principled evaluation of the existing situation and declared an uncompromising fight against voluntarism and servility.

The Kirghiz CP Central Committee is drawing conclusions from criticism of the republic party organization at the 27th CPSU Congress and is working to eradicate the errors that have been committed. The Central Committee's Buro and the Council of Ministers are trying to

create conditions for active, creative work, to strengthen order and discipline and to restore the highest principle of party leadership—collectivism.

In the economic area, the change has been made to intensive development, to new conditions of management, and to the acceleration of scientific-technological progress. The share of resources allocated for technical retooling and reconstruction increased 1.5 fold during the elapsed period of the five-year plan. The population's real income has increased. Plans for commissioning housing, hospitals, general education schools, and preschool institutions are being fulfilled. Workers in the agroindustrial complex have increased the production of basic types of products and their sale to the state.

But these changes have not as yet acquired the necessary stability. Restructuring has not yet become the vital cause of many cadres and work collectives. The general situation in the economy remains complex. This applies to industry in particular.

Owing to the downturn, last year the republic did not meet its two-year plan targets for such key indicators as industrial output growth rates and retail trade turnover. There are many unresolved problems in the machine building complex. The required breakthrough has not occurred in capital construction, in the consumer goods and services market. The attained level of agricultural production does not correspond to our potential and our needs. The residual principle has not been overcome entirely in the development of the sociocultural sphere.

The new economic management mechanism is slowly gaining momentum, administrative methods of national economic management are being eliminated, not all cadres are showing deep interest in economic and financial analysis and are able to think in terms of credit, costs, income, profit, and consumer demand.

There are great and important tasks ahead of us. They require new, bold and enterprising approaches to the work. Already in 1988, we will have to increase industrial output by 6.6 percent and agricultural output by 3.3 percent. The electric power industry, the coal industry, and nonferrous metallurgy must be developed at an accelerated rate. Prerequisites for expanding the scale of the machine building complex must be used actively. Reserves of branches that process agricultural products must be brought into play. The possibility of machine building and light industry to increase consumer goods production and to improve their quality must be skillfully combined.

We must intensively develop animal husbandry, the leading branch of agriculture. We must overcome the existing lag behind the existing lag behind the all-union level in the per capita consumption of foodstuffs, in providing the population with housing, schools, preschool institutions, and hospitals; and in rendering paid services.

We must rationally and effectively develop our region's natural resources. We must develop the construction of sanatoria, holiday hotels, sports bases, and tourism, and other forms of organization of the population's leisure pursuits. At the same time, it will be necessary to save and preserve our unique natural regions—Issyk-Kul, Arslanbob, Sary-Chelek, and others.

We must decisively renounce feelings of dependency, learn how to manage independently, satisfy our needs more completely primarily on the basis of our own economic potential.

The successful solution of these important tasks places great responsibility on us, requires high discipline, initiative, competence, skillful practical actions, the assimilation of economic methods, a great deal of organizational work of party and soviet organs, social organizations, and the efforts of each communist, Komsomol, and all working people. With this condition, we will ensure the dynamism of economic development and will create a reliable basis for the fulfillment of the five-year plan. It must be considered that these tasks must be realized simultaneously with the restructuring of the economic mechanism and state administration while making wide use of the Law on the State Enterprise (Association).

In the republic, one can already speak of visible signs of restructuring. The number of working people involved in work under the new conditions of operation and state acceptance of products in industry is growing. The collective contract and cost accounting have become a more prominent feature in the agrarian sector, in construction and in trade. The share of capital investments in the financing of the development of production and the social sphere on the basis of the collectives' own earnings is growing appreciably. These processes will undoubtedly gain momentum. The party will not permit deviations from the adopted economic reform principles. This was clearly stated in the report at the ceremonial sitting.

It would be wrong to think that certain people lived during the time of stagnation and that the people living today are completely different. All of us must to one degree or another acknowledge our participation in everything that happened. Otherwise, we may entertain the illusion that the mistakes of "others" not "our" mistakes can be quickly corrected. While we cannot expect to restructure everything instantaneously, we must immediately determine who should be pushed slightly, who should be helped to understand the situation, who should simply be compelled to do their civic duty, and we must act accordingly.

We must be fully aware that if the proper progress is not being made in a work collective in which deficiencies have been noted, this means that restructuring has not

really gotten off the ground. And, as noted in the report, this is the direct result of political and organizational slackness and the lack of initiative of party committees and their leaders.

The realization of all our plans is to a decisive degree a question of the correct choice and placement of cadres. Party committees and primary party organizations are doing much to strengthen this work. In the last 2 years, the republic's leading party, soviet, and economic cadres have been renewed.

We all have to learn how to improve economic training, to master the basic restructuring of management and the new economic mechanism.

The further development of democratization is a key problem in the present stage of restructuring. Glasnost, openness, criticism, and self-criticism have already put down their roots, which is creating favorable possibilities for every person's more complete realization of his civil rights, liberties, and obligations. At the same time it is essential to raise the level of socialist democratism. And the level of socialist democratism does not tolerate a commanding style and organizational diffuseness. To the contrary, there is need for the all-round strengthening of socialist legality, legal order, organization, and conscious discipline. The rights and potential of Soviets of People's Deputies, trade unions, the Komsomol, and social organizations must be used more actively in restructuring and in the development of democracy.

Large-scale reforms require a decisive breakthrough in ideological work. They require that it be brought closer to the tasks and practice of restructuring the national economy, and of acceleration. Workers in this sphere have an important role in creating a healthy moral and psychological atmosphere in collectives, in fostering intensive creative activity, and in patriotic and international education. Representatives of more than 80 nations and nationalities live and work in the family as one harmonious family. And even though we do not have the basis for nationalism and chauvinism, here and there in recent years there have been manifestations of negative phenomena, especially among the intelligentsia and students. This is the consequence of serious shortcomings in the work of party and social organizations.

Party committees and our cadres must be more attentive to and tactful toward everything that concerns the national interests or national feelings of people.

Much still remains so that the entire atmosphere in our life, the family and the school, literature and art would effectively inculcate people, especially youth, with the feeling of socialist internationalism and Soviet patriotism. We must intensify the concern for creating the appropriate living conditions for all nations and nationalities, for satisfying their needs and interests, and for the realization of socialist guarantees. We must decisively halt all attempts at national discrimination, raise the

level of intercourse between nations, and struggle against the exaltation of one nation over another. We must not underestimate the danger of the relaxation of atheistic education and antireligious propaganda, especially Islam.

Bourgeois propaganda has of late stepped up its efforts to drive a wedge between the peoples of our country. Arguments regarding the mythical infringement of the rights of individual nations, regarding the Russification of a number of republics, including Kirghizia, are once again brought out of the arsenal. The hopes here are vain. But the need for the vigorous, reasoned exposure of these plans is equally obvious. "Friendship and cooperation among peoples of the USSR," M. S. Gorbachev stated, "are a sacred matter to us. That is how it has been and that is how it will be. This is in keeping with the spirit of Leninism, with the traditions of Great October, and with the basic interests of all the nations and nationalities inhabiting our Homeland." (Applause).

The acceleration of socioeconomic development is inconceivable without the acceleration of spiritual progress. The spirit of democratism and glasnost, the critical evaluation of the state of affairs, and the atmosphere of principle and demandingness are affirmed in the republic's creative collectives, institutions, and educational institutions. Among writers and poets, artists and composers, actors and scholars there is now appreciably greater interest in the past. There is the struggle of opinions and this is natural, but the unfounded rejection of our cultural legacy, like an uncritical attitude toward it, is inadmissible here. Phenomena and facts from the past must be viewed from class and party positions, with due regard to the interests of socialism and the working people and the strengthening of friendship among peoples.

Comrades! The lessons of truth and of the bolshevistically direct and open analysis of the most acute problems taught by the 27th CPSU Congress are more and more deeply permeating our everyday practical life.

At the same time, on this festive day it should be said that we still have many unresolved problems. Some party organizations have not found a proper place in the restructuring and lag behind the dynamic processes of democratization. Many collectives are reconciled to mismanagement. We have not succeeded in seeing to it that every communist sets a personal example of restructuring and abandons the position of one who waits, of an outside observer.

The first, initial stage in the restructuring, when the party was formulating its new course, when it was creating its ideological-theoretical and organizational platform, is essentially complete. It has received the wholehearted support of the people. We are today entering a new stage in which the most important thing is the practical implementation of the restructuring program. Life itself begins to verify our ideas, plans, and work

methods. Internal contradictions of restructuring are revealed and we must perform daily, painstaking work with everything stagnant and obsolete.

Under these conditions, the basic improvement of the activity of party organizations and cadres acquires paramount importance. As emphasized in the report at the ceremonial sitting, restructuring makes higher demands on primary party organizations. The course of the reforms, the ability to mobilize and inspire people, the ability to secure concrete improvements in the work, Mikhail Sergeyevich stated, depend primarily on their initiative. In this regard, there must be more efficiency, more democratism, more discipline and organization in the activity of the primary party organizations.

Preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference and scheduled reports of all elected party organs, including primary party organizations, on the leadership of restructuring, should be used more completely for the intensification of modernization processes. The bureau of party committees will report on these questions at plenums. In the process, it will be necessary to make an exacting evaluation of the activity of party organizations and their secretaries, and to resolve urgent cadre questions.

We must all do more. We must decisively rid ourselves of the burden of old views. This also applies to Soviets of People's Deputies that are called upon to assume greater responsibility for the solution of social problems, for the implementation of the principles of socialist self-government of the people.

The army of more than 1.5 million Kirghizstan trade union members possesses great potential. It is their direct duty to help working people master economic knowledge, the progressive experience of management, progressive forms of labor organization and work incentives, and to defend the rights of Soviet man and the interests of the state.

The party calls upon Komsomol members and youth to understand the changes that have begun and to continue the traditions of October worthily.

Comrades! The renovation of socialism has a profound influence on the entire world, on the entire system of international relations. The firm will of the party and its initiative to attain a lasting and safe peace, that express the vital interests of the people, are embodied in the decisions of the 27th Congress, in the new redaction of the Program of the CPSU, in M. S. Gorbachev's Declaration of 15 January 1986, and in the report devoted to the 70th anniversary of Great October. They are reflected in tangible actions, in new political thought, that is affirmed by the party in international relations after the April Plenum of the Central Committee.

The working people of Kirghizstan, like all Soviet people, warmly support these energetic efforts toward an honest and candid dialogue. The agreement on the meeting scheduled for 7 December between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and R. Reagan, President of the United States of America, for the purpose of concluding a treaty eliminating an entire class of nuclear arms was received with great satisfaction.

We are all well aware that the weight, influence and authority of the Soviet state in the international arena depend to a decisive degree on the fate of the nation's restructuring and on the strengthening of socialism. Therefore, our task is to strengthen the Homeland's might, to accelerate socioeconomic development, and to secure the modernization of all aspects of social life through practical efforts.

5013

Lukyanov Speaks At Grishkyavichus Funeral
18000087a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
18 Nov 87 p 1

[Report on speech by A. I. Lukyanov at the funeral of P. P. Grishkyavichus, first secretary of the LiSSR CP Central Committee: "Speech By Comrade A. I. Lukyanov"]

[Text] Dear comrades! It is with deep sorrow that we are gathered here today to bid farewell to Pyatras Pyatrovich Grishkyavichus, member of the CPSU Central Committee, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the LiSSR CP Central Committee. We have lost an eminent figure of the party and the state, a loyal son of the Communist Party who dedicated his entire conscious life without reservation to the cause of the Great October Revolution, the party of Lenin and the interests of the working people. Our entire party and our entire multiethnic Motherland share with us the sorrow of this great loss.

The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers express their deep sympathy to the LiSSR CP Central Committee, the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers, the communists and all working people of the LiSSR in connection with this great misfortune. Pyatras Pyatrovich Grishkyavichus' entire life was a brilliant example of selfless service to the party and our socialist Fatherland.

He became a Komsomol member in 1940, a difficult year in the history of our republic, and joined the Communist Party in 1945. Pyatras Pyatrovich demonstrated his boundless loyalty to the Motherland in battle against the German Fascist invaders. Weapon in hand he fought the enemy in a partisan unit until Lithuania was

completely liberated from its occupiers. During the post-war period communist Grishkyavichus devoted himself to the cause of socialist construction with all his characteristic energy and persistence.

As a party member Pyatras Pyatrovich grew and was tempered as a skilled journalist, a propagandist of Leninist ideas and an active organizer of the masses. Vilnius remembers him as a leader of the city party organization who was well acquainted with the people's needs and concerns and who strove to make the capital of Soviet Lithuania even more well-appointed and beautiful.

Pyatras Pyatrovich Grishkyavichus worked fruitfully in the republic CP Central Committee for over 20 years, including 15 years as first secretary of the LiSSR CP Central Committee. It was in this very difficult and responsible post that his remarkable qualities, organizational talent, diverse abilities and profound ideological conviction as a communist leader were most clearly evident.

The name of Pyatras Pyatrovich Grishkyavichus is linked to great successes by the working people of the LiSSR with regard to economic and social tasks and the development of science and culture in our republic. A great deal was done under his leadership to realize the Food Program, increase the efficiency of agricultural production and bring improve village life. By the will of the party, through the efforts of the hard-working Lithuanian people and with fraternal assistance from all the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union, Lithuania was transformed into a flourishing part of our multiethnic state.

A true patriot of the Soviet Fatherland, Pyatras Pyatrovich was a consistent and faithful internationalist. He made a great contribution to the education of workers in the spirit of communism and the strengthening of fraternal friendship between the Lithuanian people and the great Russian people and the other peoples of our Motherland. Holding nothing back, he gave all of himself in the struggle against alien ideology and any and all manifestations of nationalism. This was an expression of the wholeness of his nature and his realization that the unity of Soviet peoples must be preserved with great care, as a tribute to the fighters who died for the cause of the people, as the most important guarantee of our continual progress. Under the leadership of the LiSSR CP — one of the fighting units of the CPSU — the working class, kolkhoz peasantry and intelligentsia of this republic are today laboring successfully to perform the tasks posed by the 27th Party Congress; they are contributing all their strength to the revolutionary cause of restructuring and acceleration of the social and economic development of our society.

Pyatras Pyatrovich Grishkyavichus gave all the ardor of his spirit to that cause. He was notable for his high level of ideological conviction and party-like responsibility, adherence to principles, hard-working nature, simplicity

and modesty. These qualities won him the respect and love of our republic's workers, and he enjoyed well-deserved authority throughout the entire party.

Since the 25th Congress Pyatras Pyatrovich has been continuously elected and reelected member of the CPSU Central Committee; he was also a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet during its past three convocations, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of the Union and an active participant in the resolution of many complex issues of government- and nationwide significance.

His many-faceted work for the party and the state was highly acclaimed both in our country and abroad, and our Motherland bestowed many awards on him.

It is with pain in our hearts that we say farewell to Pyatras Pyatrovich Grishkyavichus today. We express our sincerest condolences on her irreparable loss to his wife and closest friend, Sofiya Valeryanovna, as well as to all his other relatives and friends.

The memory of a communist lives on in his deeds, in the path which he blazed, in what he did for individuals and for his people as a whole. Pyatras Pyatrovich Grishkyavichus did a great deal for this land, and he did it at the bidding of his soul and as the duty of a communist. And for that reason the clear memory of him, a person who gave his entire life in service to the interests of the Communist Party and our socialist Motherland, will always remain in the hearts of Soviet people.

12825

RSFSR Supsov Addresses Published

RSFSR Gosplan Chairman Report

18000086 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in
Russian 30 Oct 87 p 2

[Unattributed report: "On the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR in 1988 and on the Course of Fulfillment of the Plan in 1987. [Abridged] Report by N. I. Maslennikov, deputy chairman, RSFSR Council of Ministers; chairman, RSFSR Gosplan; deputy, [RSFSR Supreme Soviet]"]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies! The session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is held on the eve of a noteworthy event: the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The all-round restructuring of our society following the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee is vivid affirmation of the inexhaustible creative strength of the ideals of the October Revolution.

The 27th Congress of the Communist Party devised a strategy for accelerating the nation's socioeconomic development. The January and June (1987) plenums of

the CPSU Central Committee substantiated the concept of revolutionary restructuring that is presently being put into practice. This has found tangible reflection in the State Plan for Economic and Social Development of the USSR and the USSR State Budget for 1988, which have been ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The October (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee emphasized that the coming year would be decisive in meeting the targets of the 12th Five-Year Plan under the conditions of the large-scale restructuring of all links in production and management and will be an important stage in the implementation of the strategy for the nation's development, which is so consistently pursued by the Central Committee and its Politburo.

The working people of the Russian Federation approve and support the party line of further development of the economic potential and all-round strengthening of the might of the Soviet state.

On the course of fulfillment of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR in 1987

The nation's restructuring program is exerting a growing influence on the republic economy. The totals on the fulfillment of the targets of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR in the elapsed period of 1987 attest to positive changes in all branches of the national economy.

In industry the 9-month plan targets for production and labor productivity growth rates have been surpassed. Plans for the production of oil, gas, coal, rolled ferrous metals, mineral fertilizers and certain other types of products have been overfulfilled.

More coarse and succulent fodder has been procured than last year. More livestock, poultry, milk and eggs have been purchased and the productivity of animal husbandry has increased.

A large capital construction program is being carried out. The commissioning of fixed capital has risen by six percent. Significantly more dwelling houses, schools, preschool institutions, polyclinics and other projects in the social sphere have been commissioned.

Nevertheless the course of restructuring in the republic's national economy still does not meet the demands of the present stage. Some ministries and departments, councils of ministers of autonomous republics, krayispolkoms, oblistpolkoms, and many associations, enterprises and organizations are making serious miscalculations and are derelict in their organizational and production activity.

The work of some branches of the national economy lacks stability and rhythm. Taking delivery obligations into account, industry subordinate to the RSFSR Council of Ministers fulfilled its plan by 98.7 percent.

The plan for trade turnover is not being fulfilled. The principal reason is the insufficient supply of goods. At the same time, the work of consumer goods producing enterprises belonging to a number of union ministries located in the republic cannot be deemed satisfactory. Thus, the nine-month plan for the current year was not fulfilled by enterprises belonging to the USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances, USSR Ministry of Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry, USSR Ministry of the Radio Industry, USSR Ministry of the Communications Equipment Industry, and others.

For many years, the RSFSR Ministry of the Fuel Industry has not taken the proper measures to develop peat briquet production and has not used the existing capacities satisfactorily. The RSFSR Ministry of Construction Materials systematically fails to meet its targets for the production of walling, limestone flour and powdered dolomite.

The performance of many enterprises belonging to the RSFSR Ministry of Light Industry and RSFSR Ministry of the Textile Industry, that undersupplied their customers' orders by roughly 500 million rubles' worth of assorted products is extremely unsatisfactory. Plan targets for footwear, knitted goods and linen textiles have not been met. The mix and quality of many goods still fall short of the population's higher demands.

Kolkhozes and sovkhoses have underfulfilled the plan for sowing winter crops and for fall plowing and have not met the target for the procurement of root fodder crops.

Shortcomings in capital construction have not been eliminated. Capacities have not been commissioned at heat and electric power plants [TETs] in Lipetsk, Omsk, Khabarovsk and in certain other cities nor have facilities been commissioned at a nonwoven materials factory in Tuymazy in the Bashkir ASSR. The Novgorodskiy Experimental Metalware Plant of the RSFSR Ministry of Local Industry and a drycleaning and dyeing factory belonging to the RSFSR Ministry of Consumer Services in Nalchik have not been put into operation.

Contractor organizations belonging to the Ministry of Construction in the northern and western regions of the USSR, the Ministry of Construction in the Urals and West Siberia regions of the USSR, Ministry of Construction in the Southern Regions of the USSR, and Ministry of Construction in the Eastern Regions of the USSR performed unsatisfactorily during the elapsed period of the current year and fulfilled their plan at the level of 94-97 percent.

After examining the question of measures for securing the fulfillment of plan targets for the year and preparing the national economy for work in 1988, the RSFSR Council of Ministers demanded that ministries and departments, councils of ministers of autonomous republics, krayispolkoms, and Moscow and Leningrad gorispolkoms take exhaustive measures to fulfill the targets for the fourth quarter and for 1987 as a whole.

General economic indicators of the plan for 1988

Comrade deputies! The government of the Russian Federation has submitted the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR in 1988 for discussion by the present session. Next year will be an important stage in strengthening the trend toward further economic intensification and of changes observed in the consciousness and psychology of people. Speaking in Leningrad, Comrade M. S. Gorbachev emphasized: "This is the stage of intensification of restructuring processes, the stage in which the many million masses of working people in our entire vast country will be drawn into them."

The plan was formulated on the basis of proposals of enterprises, associations, organizations, ministries and departments, councils of ministers of autonomous republics, and ispolkoms of local soviets with the participation of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions.

A considerable number of indicators that are of secondary importance for the republic level have been deleted from the plan. Rates, proportions, and priorities of economic and social development have been set at the level of or in excess of the five-year plan.

Branches in the productive sphere are scheduled to increase national income and social labor productivity by 4.3 percent.

When the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) becomes effective on 1 January 1988 there will also be a fundamental change in the mechanism of plan implementation.

The republic is accordingly making an active effort to bring about radical reforms in the economic mechanism and to restructure the organization of management. In accordance with the decisions of the June (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the RSFSR Council of Ministers has adopted decrees on reforming planning, material-technical supply, the finance-credit mechanism, pricing, statistics, the management of labor and social development, as well as the entire system of branch and territorial management in the RSFSR. The preparation of a master plan for managing the republic's national economy is under way.

The necessary conditions are thus created for developing the principles of cost accounting and self-financing, for combining planning with the broad participation of work collectives in the management of the economy, and for expanding democratic principles in the organization of production activity.

In addition to a number of [all-] union branches, enterprises belonging to RSFSR Gosagroprom [State Agroindustrial Committee], the RSFSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, RSFSR Ministry of the Forestry Industry, RSFSR Ministry of the Fish Industry, RSFSR Ministry of Motor Transport, RSFSR Ministry of the River Fleet, RSFSR Ministry of Communications, RSFSR Ministry of Local Industry, and many enterprises belonging to the RSFSR Ministry of Consumer Services will from next year on be operating in the Russian Federation under conditions of full cost accounting and self-financing.

Profit will be the principal source of financing of production costs and of the formation of incentive funds. According to the plan for 1988, profit from all types of activity of the economy subordinate to the RSFSR Council of Ministers will increase by 7.9 percent compared with 1987. More than half of the profits earned by work collectives will remain at their disposal.

Under these conditions, increased attention to unprofitable enterprises, the number of which is still considerable, is very important.

Resource conservation is an important aspect of qualitative restructuring. In the plan for 1988, material-technical resource ceilings on state orders and capital construction are based entirely on conservation targets.

The total saving of raw materials, supplies, fuel, power, and other material resources will be four billion rubles.

Social development and raising the people's standard of living

Comrades! As noted at the June (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, man and his real interests are the focus of our economic policy and economic practice.

The task of directing production toward the attainment of a qualitatively new level of well-being for the people has been set.

No small amount of work has been done in this direction following the 27th CPSU Congress.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet during its current, eleventh convocation, has for the first time examined the draft plan for the economic and social development of the RSFSR in 1985—the first year it was in effect.

Today's session is discussing the draft plan for 1988.

Permit me to compare the indicators of these years. In 1985, 62.6 million square meters of housing were commissioned while 72.9 million square meters of housing are planned for the coming year; preschool institutions—309 and 426 thousand places; schools—521 and 806 thousand places; hospitals—31.6 and 42 thousand beds; and polyclinics—76 and 113 thousand visits a shift, respectively. Construction of clubs and cultural centers financed by state centralized capital investments will increase by 17 percent; rayon cultural centers—1.6-fold compared with the plan for 1987.

These indicators for 1988 exceed the five-year plan targets. The necessary financial and material resources have been found to secure such a considerable strengthening of the sociocultural sphere's base. There will be an increase in nonproductive construction projects financed by the enterprises' own earnings and the funds of housing construction cooperatives and the population will be solicited on a larger scale.

The plan for the first time provides for the commissioning of kindergartens and boarding schools for orphans and for increasing the construction of boarding homes for the aged and disabled, children's homes, maternity homes, gynecological clinics, and physical culture and health-improvement facilities.

It is planned to develop the vocational-technical system further, to expand the network of secondary vocational-technical training schools, and to strengthen their material-technical base.

Among the urgent problems affecting the people's everyday life, the party and government single out questions relating to housing, food, and consumer goods in particular.

The construction program for next year can be realized through the maximum mobilization of resources and the active organizational work of the ispolkoms of local soviets and ministries. This is all the more necessary because this year's experience has shown that there are substantial shortcomings in this area.

During 9 months [of the current year], the Murmansk, Kostroma and Kamchatka oblispolkoms and the councils of ministers of the Dagestan, Bashkir and Mordovian autonomous republics have lowered the rate of housing construction.

Councils of ministers of the Karelian and Buryat ASSR's, the Stavropol, Krasnoyarsk and Khabarovsk Krayispolkoms and the Novgorod, Kirov, and Astrakhan oblispolkoms have countenanced considerable lag in [the construction of] preschool institutions.

The plan for the coming year assigns local soviet ispolkoms the target of razing more than 1.8 million square meters of dilapidated housing. USSR Gosplan has also included similar targets in the plans of union ministries. The execution of these plans must be constantly monitored.

A large volume of work remains to be done in repairing housing and sociocultural facilities.

In the current year, councils of ministers of autonomous republics and ispolkoms of local soviets have made a large-scale effort to solicit funds from union ministries and departments for the construction of municipal service facilities. Accordingly, the large volume of capital investment in the construction of municipal service facilities in cities and workers' settlements will increase by 16 percent and in RSFSR Gosagroprom—by 24 percent.

Work on the installation of wireless radio [radiofikatsiya] will be continued. Compared with the plan for the current year, there will be a considerable increase in the commissioning of gas mains and gas distributions networks. This will make it possible to connect 18 cities, 36 rayon centers and workers' settlements, approximately 400 rural population centers, kolkhozes and sovkhozes to the gas supply network and will fulfill the three-year targets of the five-year plan.

Comrade deputies! The plan indicators for 1988 emphasize the orientation toward giving priority to the solution of social goals and problems.

Thus, the average monthly wage of blue- and white-collar workers will rise to 219 rubles and the pay of kolkhoz workers will increase to 185 rubles. Payments and benefits to the republic's population from social consumption funds will exceed 100 billion rubles or, on a per capita basis, will amount to 687 rubles.

An important part of the plan's social program consists of state measures to raise the living standard of the people. The central allocation for this purpose is 2.4 billion rubles, which is higher than [the amount allocated by] the five-year plan.

In the process of formulating the plan for 1988, RSFSR Gosplan, together with ministries and departments of the RSFSR, councils of ministers of autonomous republics, krayispolkoms, and oblispolkoms found ways of increasing the production of goods and services in excess of five-year plan targets.

Consumer goods deliveries (excluding the sale of alcoholic beverages) in the RSFSR are planned in the amount of 176 billion rubles—an 11 percent increase compared with the plan for 1987.

The textile and light industry product mix was formulated on the basis of the results of wholesale trade fairs. Special attention was focused on the more complete satisfaction of the demand for products for children, young people, and the elderly.

Next year's plan will fully satisfy trade organizations' orders for school uniforms. You, comrade deputies, are aware that this question was not solved satisfactorily last year and that a deputy inquiry was made in this connection at the preceding session. Permit me to report that the RSFSR Council of Ministers took appropriate measures, that the situation has been basically corrected, that the nine-month plan has been fulfilled, and that the year plan will be fulfilled.

An intensive plan has been established for the sale of paid services to the population, the volume of which will be 25 billion rubles—2.6 billion more than the five-year plan target. Their share in the population's money expenditures will also increase.

Special importance is attached to increasing the volume and improving the quality of consumer services in rural areas, where they will increase by almost 16 percent. However, it must be noted that the level of service in rural areas is lagging significantly and that the targets are not being met.

Local soviets, ministries and departments must strengthen the management of the service sphere and must restructure its work based on people's urgent needs. The aid of kolkhozes and sovkhozes must be enlisted more widely especially in assisting the population in the repair and construction of housing, in the cultivation of gardens, and in transporting and processing agricultural produce.

Cooperatives are acquiring ever greater importance in satisfying the population's demand for consumer goods and paid services. At the present time, there are 4335 cooperatives in operation in the Russian Federation. The largest number of cooperatives have been organized in the Krasnodar Kray, in the city of Moscow, and in Moscow, Rostov and Sverdlovsk oblasts.

At the same time, ministries and departments, councils of ministers of autonomous republics, and ispolkoms of local Soviets of People's Deputies are still not organizing various forms of cooperative activity to the fullest. Progress in this direction is extremely slow in Orel, Lipetsk, Astrakhan, Orenburg, Chita, and Magadan oblasts and in the Buryat and Tuva autonomous republics.

Ispolkoms of local soviets, ministries and departments must correct the state of affairs with respect to the organization and functioning of cooperatives in the shortest possible time.

Comrades! The preceding session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet examined the question of improving trade and public catering in the Russian Federation. Deputies noted serious shortcomings and omissions in the organization of trade services for the population and in consumer goods production.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet gave appropriate orders to RSFSR ministries and departments and to ispolkoms of local soviets.

The plan for 1988 also assigns much importance to these issues.

Retail trade turnover is planned in the amount of 199.3 billion rubles. Considering the importance of finding additional commodity resources and of satisfying the population's need for lumber and construction materials, in the plan for 1988 market stocks of these materials are scheduled to increase significantly and correspond to trade's orders for most items.

At the same time, there are substantial shortcomings in this area. During 9 months of the current year, the sale of local construction materials declined compared with the corresponding period last year in Ivanovo, Vladimir, Smolensk, and Omsk oblasts and in the Kabardino-Balkar, North Ossetian, and Chechen-Ingush ASSR's.

A special word must be said, comrades, regarding bricks, chippings, gravel, and lime, the funds [fondy] for which are determined on the basis of decisions by ispolkoms.

The population's need for bricks is not being satisfied in many oblasts. Local soviet ispolkoms allocate bricks for sale to the population last of all.

The RSFSR Ministry of Construction Materials systematically fails to fulfill the plan for the production of walling. Trade in construction materials is unsatisfactorily organized both in the system of state trade, where the leading position is occupied by Soyuzglavtara [Main Administration for Packages] under USSR Gosnab [State Committee for Material-Technical Supply] and consumer cooperatives.

The RSFSR Ministry of Motor Transport is doing little to fill orders from lumber yards and stores for the specialized motor transport required to deliver purchased construction materials to the population. The RSFSR Council of Ministers has obligated local soviets and trade organizations to eliminate existing shortcomings in the immediate future and to see to it that all orders for local construction materials are satisfied in the coming year. More attention must be paid to meeting the targets of the Comprehensive Program for the Development of the Production of Consumer Goods and the Service Sphere.

Raising the technical level and development of branches of material production

Comrade deputies! Science and technology development targets have been included in practically all sections of the plan for 1988 with the aim of increasing the effectiveness of the utilization of advances of scientific-technological progress in branches of the republic material production.

The targets correspond to the five-year plan and make it possible to raise the technical level of production to a significant degree. It is planned to secure two-thirds of the increase in labor productivity as a result of this factor.

The solution of the problem of raising the level of output depends in large measure on the rate of development of **machine building** and on improvements in the quality of newly developed machinery.

A substantial increase in the tempo of modernization of machine building products is planned for a number of RSFSR ministries and departments. This indicator for republic ministries and departments as a whole will be 7 percent compared with 6 percent in 1987. The production of a number of new machines and pieces of equipment will be assimilated.

The plan for 1988 calls for a two-fold increase in the manufacture of production equipment for the processing branches of the agroindustrial complex at enterprises subordinate to the RSFSR Council of Ministers compared with the plan for the current year. The production of machinery and equipment for animal husbandry and feed production will surpass five-year plan targets 3.5-fold; stationary belt conveyors—1.7-fold; equipment for catching and processing fish—1.6-fold.

The June (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee called for serious change in the population's food supply in the next 2-3 years as a top priority task. In the plan for the development of the **agroindustrial complex**, a central place is assigned to increasing the products of agriculture and animal husbandry primarily through the increased effectiveness of production.

Accordingly, the broader introduction of scientific advances in management practice and the development of progressive forms of labor organization are planned. In crop production, there will be a considerable increase in area under intensively farmed crops, progressive technologies for cultivating potatoes, vegetables, and other tillage crops will be further disseminated, and measures will be taken to improve the use of hayfields and pasture land.

In animal husbandry work will continue on improving breeding practices, on expanding the flow-shop system of milk and meat production. Scientific advances will be introduced in connection with the diffusion of such new,

effective forms of management as the collective and family contract, internal cost accounting, and the creation of science-production associations and agricultural combines of the Kuban and Novomoskovskiy type which will make it possible to secure the additional growth of labor productivity.

The plan takes into account the potential for the further development of subsidiary farms of enterprises, organizations and institutions, citizens' personal household plots and collective orchardry and gardening. It is planned to improve the supply of young livestock and feed to the population's personal household plots.

Next year, RSFSR Gosagroprom enterprises will increase their production of butter, vegetable oil, granulated sugar, meat, cheese, canned fruit and vegetables, and other types of food products.

The volume of delivery of mixed feeds and protein-vitamin additives in the RSFSR Ministry of Grain Products System is determined on the basis of allocated raw material resources.

At the same time, despite the availability of sufficient raw material resources, agroindustrial committees do not devote the necessary attention to the development of capacities for processing agricultural products or to making the fullest possible use of local raw materials.

Local soviets must focus more attention on these problems. The potential for doing so is at hand. Thus, in 1988 capital investments in the processing branches will increase 1.2-fold compared with the level of the current year. One hundred thirty million rubles more than indicated in the five-year plan must be utilized [osvo-yeno] at storage facilities in the food, meat and dairy industry. The commissioning of storage facilities for potatoes, vegetables and fruit will be 1.3-fold greater than the five-year plan targets. Targets for commissioning [grain] elevators will also be surpassed.

In all, more than 25 billion rubles of capital investments will be allocated from all sources of financing for the development of the republic's agroindustrial complex in 1988. Thirty-two percent of this sum will go to nonproductive construction projects. RSFSR Gosagroprom and RSFSR ministries and departments belonging to the republic's agroindustrial complex must take measures to see to it that the allocated capital investments are used on schedule.

The articulation of new approaches in determining rational avenues of development of the republic's economy as a whole and of its individual branches through the economic effectiveness of capital investments and not their mere division among the branches has become the principal task in the formulation of **capital construction** plans.

State capital investments in the economy subordinate to the RSFSR Council of Ministers will total 33.1 billion rubles.

The volume of capital investment by state enterprises and organizations from their own social development funds will be 1.4 billion rubles, which is 2.4 times more than last year.

Much attention is devoted to strengthening the material-technical base of branches that are carrying out the Comprehensive Program for the Development of Consumer Goods Production and the Service Sphere and the Food Program. The production infrastructure will undergo further development.

Capital investments in construction projects have been distributed in strict accordance with construction duration norms. Requests by RSFSR ministries and departments for capital investments and material resources for technical retooling and reconstruction have been fully taken into account. It is planned to allocate 500 million rubles more for these purposes in 1988 than specified in the five-year plan.

All types of **transport and communications** will undergo further development in 1988. The indicated targets correspond entirely to the five-year plan.

The commissioning of 10,900 kilometers of motor roads for common use, including 7800 kilometers of roads with improved surfaces, is planned.

Approximately 12,000 roads will also be put into operation on kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and in other agricultural organizations.

Territorial development and distribution of the productive forces

Comrade deputies! The plan for the economic and social development of the RSFSR in 1988 provides measures for the further integrated development of economic regions, autonomous republics, krais and oblasts and the cities of Moscow and Leningrad.

The plan's basic indicators were formulated with due regard to raising the role of the Soviets of People's Deputies in securing the integrated economic and social development of regions in close harmony with the projections of ministries and departments. Using the rights bestowed upon them, the Soviets of People's Deputies examined the draft plans of enterprises (associations) and organizations belonging to ministries and departments, which facilitated the solution of a number of problems relating to the improvement of the population's living conditions. It is planned to give priority to the economic and social development of the eastern regions of the RSFSR. They will make a larger contribution to the production of oil, gas, coal, electric power, machine building, and other types of products.

The plan devotes special attention to the acceleration of the economic and social development of the Far East and the respective oblasts and republics based on tasks set in the long-range state program for this region. The plan provides that the growth rates of industrial production will be higher and that the growth rates of agricultural production will be significantly higher than the average annual level under the 11th Five-Year Plan.

In the Far Eastern economic region in 1988, 4.4 million square meters of housing, general education schools with accommodations for 53,400 pupils, and hospitals with 1600 beds will be commissioned. This is considerably higher than the indicators in the plan for the current year. The formation of the West Siberian, Kansk-Achinskiy and Sayanskiy territorial production complexes will continue. The volume of work on the economic development of the BAM [Baykal-Amur Mainline] zone will grow.

The material-technical base of the agroindustrial complex of the RSFSR Nonchernozem Zone is slated to be strengthened. Accordingly, 5.3 billion rubles in state centralized capital investments have been allocated to enterprises and organizations subordinate to the RSFSR Council of Ministers. One-third of this sum will be channeled into the development of the nonproductive sphere.

Targets of the five-year plan for 1986-1990 and the Intensification-90 program were the basis for the plan for the cities of Moscow and Leningrad and Moscow and Leningrad oblasts. Much attention is devoted to the development of machine building and to increasing the production of consumer goods. The volume of housing construction is scheduled to increase.

The technical retooling and reconstruction of industry in the Urals and in the European regions of the RSFSR will continue. Measures are planned for the rational utilization of labor resources, inter alia, in regions with a manpower surplus. Large-scale tasks relating to the development of the territorial production complex of the Kursk Magnetic Anomaly and other republic regions are planned.

Ispolkoms of local Soviets of People's Deputies have devoted a great deal of attention to the formulation of measures for **protecting the environment for the rational utilization of natural resources**.

The coordination of enterprise environmental protection proposals with the ispolkoms of local soviets were instrumental in revealing additional resources for increasing the activation of new nature conservation projects and in developing specific measures to increase the effectiveness of operation of existing nature conservation facilities.

The plan for the republic economy calls for surpassing the five-year plan targets for reducing the discharge of pollutants and the total quantity of harmful substances emitted into the atmosphere from stationary sources.

Councils of ministers of autonomous republics and executive committees of local Soviets of People's Deputies must significantly increase the effectiveness of management of territorial development. They must make broader use of their rights in order to secure the integrated realization of economic, social, and nature conservation tasks and to bring all reserves for accelerating socioeconomic development into play.

Foreign economic relations

The June (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee noted that the restructuring of economic management opens the way to increasing the effectiveness of our foreign economic relations. Starting in 1988, the plan will include a special section for *foreign economic relations* which will concentrate the entire complex of questions pertaining to RSFSR commercial, economic and scientific-technical cooperation with foreign countries.

The RSFSR Council of Ministers has formed the All-Russian Cost Accounting Foreign Trade Association [Vserossiyskoye khozraschetnoye vneshnetorgovoye ob'yedineniye]. The association will be responsible for increasing the republic's export potential in every way and will actively participate in the implementation of the Comprehensive Program for Scientific-Technological Progress of CEMA Member Nations Up To The Year 2000. In 1988 the volume of foreign currency earnings from the sale of products of enterprises of republic subordination as well as from the sale of licenses will grow.

Direct relations will expand between associations, enterprises and the respective organizations of foreign countries. Questions pertaining to the creation of enterprises jointly with foreign firms on the territory of the RSFSR are in the critiquing stage.

Comrade deputies! The preceding session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet examined the fulfillment of the voters' mandates. In fulfillment of the decree of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet the RSFSR Council of Ministers, RSFSR ministries and departments, councils of ministers of autonomous republics, and ispolkoms of local Soviets of People's Deputies have intensified their work and oversight over the realization of the voters' mandates. The plan for 1988 provides measures for carrying out the mandates.

However, many shortcomings noted at the preceding session are being eliminated slowly and the execution of a number of mandates is proceeding at a slow pace. In the course of completing work on the plan for 1988 and in the course of its execution, RSFSR ministries and departments, councils of ministers of autonomous

republics and ispolkoms of local Soviets of People's Deputies must find additional ways of eliminating the existing delays in carrying out the voters' mandates.

Comrade deputies! The 19th All-Union Party Conference will take place in 1988. The upsurge of the political and labor activity of the entire Soviet people will be directed toward the fulfillment of the intensive targets of the third year of the five-year plan. The final results for the current year will also depend in large measure on their fulfillment. RSFSR ministries and departments, councils of ministers of autonomous republics and ispolkoms of Soviets of People's Deputies must take immediate measures to assist lagging enterprises and organizations, to secure the unconditional fulfillment of plan targets for 1987. We must also complete the preparation of the national economy for winter in the shortest possible time in order to create conditions for stable and rhythmic work from the first days of the new year. The timely conclusion of economic contracts between enterprises and organizations will be helpful here.

The fulfillment of the plan targets of the coming year is directly connected with the new principles and approaches to the solution of economic and social problems. Success in this area will in large measure determine the further acceleration of the Russian Federation's socioeconomic development and will require raising the level of work in krays, oblasts and autonomous republics and at every enterprise; the adoption of all necessary measures to mobilize internal reserves; the more complete utilization of existing capacities; the unconditional fulfillment of contractual obligations; and the observance of the strictest economy measures.

Today the economy is the shock front of restructuring. The working people of the Russian Federation are through their practical work supporting the CPSU's strategic course of radical economic reform, have actively joined in its implementation, and are mastering the economic methods of management under the conditions of full cost accounting, democratization and broad glasnost.

Finance Minister Report

18000086 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in
Russian 30 Oct 87 p 3

[Unattributed report: "On the State Budget of the RSFSR for 1988 and the Fulfillment of the RSFSR State Budget for 1986. [Abridged] Report by A. A. Bobrovnikov, RSFSR finance minister; deputy, [RSFSR Supreme Soviet]"

[Text] Comrade deputies! The RSFSR Council of Ministers submits the RSFSR State Budget for 1988 and the report on the fulfillment of the republic's state budget for 1986 for your examination and approval.

The Soviet people, guided by Lenin's teachings and the decisions of the 27th Party Congress and the January and June (1987) plenums of the CPSU Central Committee are continuing the cause of the October [Revolution] and are restructuring all aspects of the nation's public life in the present stage of development of socialist society.

An important role is assigned to the state budget, as the nation's basic financial plan, the principal instrument of distribution and redistribution of national income, in the acceleration of socioeconomic development and in increasing the effectiveness of social production.

In addition to positive trends in the development of the republic's economy there are also numerous bottlenecks and unresolved problems. The financial situation in a number of branches of the national economy is improving at a slow rate.

There are difficulties in fulfilling the budget in the current year. There is considerable lag in the fulfillment of the plan for state and budget revenues in Rostov, Vladimir, Ivanovo, Gorkiy, Vologda, Orel, Ryazan, and Tambov oblasts, in Krasnoyarsk Kray, and in the Tatar, Udmurt, and Chechen-Ingush autonomous republics.

The republic Ministry of Light Industry, Gosagroprom, Ministry of Housing and Civil Construction and the State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products were 466 million rubles short in their payments from profits to the RSFSR republic budget.

One-half of the enterprises belonging to the Ministry of Light Industry and one-fourth of the enterprises belonging to the Ministry of the Textile Industry failed to meet their contractual obligations. They had to pay large fines for failing to deliver almost a half billion rubles' worth of popular consumer goods to trade. On the whole, the indicated branches realized approximately 230 million rubles less in profit than they should have for the given period. This is an indication that the ministries of light industry and the textile industry are not making full use of the potential offered by full cost accounting and self-financing.

Enterprises belonging to the Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry, the Ministry of Communications, the Ministry of the Chemical Industry, and the Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances and a number of other union ministries are seriously lagging behind plan targets for the production of consumer goods.

Basic indicators and features of the RSFSR State Budget for 1988

The republic budget is compiled in accordance with indicators of the USSR State Budget, which was approved by the Eighth Session, Eleventh Convocation of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the State Plan for

Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR for 1988. Comments and proposals by deputies, by the Budget and Planning Commission, by other permanent commissions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and voters' mandates are taken into account in the compilation of the budget.

An important feature of the plan and budget for 1988 is that they are oriented toward the accelerated increase in the effectiveness of the republic's economy and toward securing the growth of financial resources and a stable financial condition in branches of the economy on that basis.

The republic budget's revenues and expenditures total 110.5 billion rubles—an increase of 6.6 percent compared with the budget approved by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet for 1987. There are qualitative changes in the structure of its revenues and expenditures.

Profit is playing a larger part in the formation of enterprises' financial resources. Profit for 1988 from all types of activity in the republic's economy as a whole is planned in the sum of 37.2 billion rubles—an increase of 7.9 percent compared with 1987. More than half of the profit remains at the disposal of enterprises for the development of production and for satisfying the social needs of work collectives.

In the light of the demand for the basic restructuring of the management of the economy, financial relations between the state budget and enterprises converted to full cost accounting and self-financing are now based on stable, long-term norms, which is an effective means of stimulating the increased effectiveness of production. In 1988, more than half of all payments from profits will be paid into the budget on the basis of stable norms.

Turnover tax plays a large part in state budget revenues. Republic turnover tax receipts in 1988 are planned to exceed 54 billion rubles. Almost 90 percent of this sum will go to the RSFSR State Budget.

Tax and voluntary payments from the population are planned in the amount of 11.5 billion rubles, which comprises 10.4 percent of all republic budget revenues. Financial relations between the state and the population are improving with respect to the development of the individual labor activity of citizens and cooperatives. One hundred thirty thousand patents and registration certificates have been awarded to the republic's population to date.

A characteristic feature of the republic's 1988 budget is the increased emphasis on its social orientation. Emphasis have been placed on overcoming the residual principle of resource allocation for the development of the social sphere. Spending in this area will increase substantially.

The scale of subsidy regulation of the results of financial-production activity is declining. Budget financing of planned losses will be reduced by 21 percent.

Financial support for branches of material production

In 1988, 5.5 billion rubles of own resources, budget allocations and credit resources will finance enterprises belonging to republic ministries of light, textile, local and fuel industry.

The budget's provision for change in the proportions of distribution of profits between enterprises and the state budget should reduce counterflows of financial resources and should raise the level of self-financing of a number of branches. Real possibilities are created for the more effective formation and maneuvering of own financial resources.

However, the performance of industrial enterprises as a whole indicates that the advantages offered by the new economic mechanism are as yet utilized to only a slight degree.

A considerable part of the republic's material, labor and financial resources is used to fulfill the Food Program. The allocation for the development of the agroindustrial complex in 1988 from all sources is 43 billion rubles, including 18.8 billion rubles from the budget.

At the same time, the restructuring process in RSFSR Gosagroprom is slow and little progress is being made in the production of true cost accounting.

RSFSR Gosagroprom, its organs at the local level, other ministries and departments belonging to the agroindustrial complex, and ispolkoms of Soviets of People's Deputies should accelerate the practical introduction of the economic anticost mechanism, should make full and more effective use of the increased production potential, and should concentrate manpower and resources in the most important sectors that ensure stable financial results.

An active investment policy is an effective instrument for carrying out the party's economic strategy. In 1988, in addition to economy branches' own resources and bank loans, the state budget will allocate 14.5 billion rubles for the financing of capital investments in the republic. But the substantial size of this funding is naturally not the most important thing. The most important thing today is that this funding be effectively used.

The qualitative modernization of fixed capital in the republic's material production sphere and the fulfillment of the ever larger program for the production of housing, municipal service, consumer service and sociocultural facilities also depend to a considerable degree on the performance of the contractor organizations of a number of [all-] union construction ministries. At the same time, as a result of the nonfulfillment of plans for contract

work during 9 months of 1987, construction and installation organizations of the USSR Ministry of Construction in the Urals and West Siberia regions of the USSR, USSR Ministry of Construction in the northern and western regions of the USSR, USSR Ministry of Construction in the southern regions of the USSR, and USSR Ministry of Construction in the eastern regions of the USSR failed to meet the deadline for commissioning fixed capital and for putting production capacities and a number of projects in the social sphere into operation.

There are serious complaints regarding the commissioning of production capacities and projects, regarding the improvement of the quality of construction and the financial and economic activity of construction organizations belonging to republic ministries. However, proper order has not yet been instituted regarding these matters.

The further intensification of material production is in large measure determined by the stability of the work of **transport and communications**. Financial investments in these republic branches from all sources will total 10.5 billion rubles in 1988.

The conversion of enterprises of the RSFSR Ministry of Motor Transport on 1 January 1987 will have a positive impact on their economic performance. At the same time, there are still many unutilized reserves in the branch.

Financing of measures to improve the people's well-being and to develop the social sphere

The plans for 1988 and the 12th Five-Year Plan as a whole call for raising the level of the people's well-being to a qualitatively new degree and for increasing the population's real income. They provide for the financial support of the accelerated development of trade and consumer services based on the restructuring of their economic and financial mechanism. The allocation for the development of these branches from all sources in 1988 is 8.4 billion rubles.

The RSFSR Ministry of Trade, the RSFSR Union of Consumers' Societies, and ispolkoms of local Soviets of People's Deputies must take a new approach to the organization of commercial, economic, and financial activity at all levels of trade. It is important to close all channels through which unpopular goods reach the trade network, thereby making it possible to save vast material, labor and financial resources.

Analysis of the activity of the RSFSR Ministry of Consumer Services has shown that notwithstanding the great financial aid that has been rendered this branch, as yet there has been no fundamental improvement in consumer services, and this affects the financial state of enterprises belonging to the consumer service sphere.

The party and the Soviet state have posed the task of significantly improving housing and municipal services and of making this a highly mechanized, reliably functioning branch. The allocation for these purposes is set at 11.6 billion rubles in 1988.

Implementation of the party's economic strategy will make it possible to realize key social tasks aimed at improving public education, strengthening people's health, and satisfying their cultural and intellectual needs. It should be emphasized in particular that while overall republic budget spending will rise by 6.6 percent, it is planned to allocate 54.4 billion rubles—10.6 percent more than in the current year—for the development of education, culture, health care, sports and social security.

Spending on sociocultural measures in the planned year will increase by 3.7 percent and amount to 49.3 percent of all budget expenditures.

Approximately 20 billion rubles, or 14.6 percent more than in 1987, are allocated for the financing of educational measures. This will make it possible to continue general education and vocational school reform measures, measures for restructuring higher and secondary specialized education, and to strengthen the material-technical base of educational institutions.

Budget allocations for the development of health in 1988 will amount to 11.1 billion rubles—an almost 15 percent increase compared with the plan for 1987. This is without precedent. In the interest of further improving medical care of the population, the network of health care institutions will be expanded, spending on patients' nutrition and on the acquisition of drugs and equipment will be increased, and the pay of medical personnel will be gradually raised.

The system of social security measures is designed to improve the well-being of the Soviet people. The corresponding allocation is 23.4 billion or 1.3 billion rubles more than the plan for the current year.

State budgets of autonomous republics and budgets of krais, oblasts, and the cities of Moscow and Leningrad

An important role in the basic restructuring of the economy is assigned to local Soviets of People's Deputies, which actively influence all spheres of the economy and culture on the territory subordinate to them and deal with important financial and budget problems.

The total state budgets of autonomous republics and the budgets of krais, oblasts, and of the cities of Moscow and Leningrad for the year 1988 are fixed in the sum of 39 billion rubles, with an increase of 12.6 percent of the plan approved by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet for the current year, which is greater than the growth rate of the

total RSFSR State Budget. The share of local budgets in the total republic budget for 1988 will increase by 3.2 points and will total 35.3 percent.

Projected local budget revenues from the profits of enterprises of union and republic subordination will be 1.1 billion rubles plus 5.6 billion rubles in turnover tax depending on the fulfillment of the retail trade plan by state and cooperative trade on their territory.

Raising the level of management—the basis for securing the fulfillment of the plan and the budget

The successful fulfillment of the plan for economic and social development and the state budget of the republic for 1988 depends in large measure on radical improvement in managerial, financial, and economic work both at the republic level—in RSFSR ministries and departments—as well as in the basic production link—at enterprises and in associations.

Loss-free operation of enterprises and organizations is an invariable demand of the new conditions of management. At the same time, the actual program for eliminating unprofitable operation and for increasing the profitability of production and services in the ministries of the construction materials industry, housing and civil construction, highways, land reclamation and water resources, and RSFSR Gosagroprom is being implemented slowly.

In accordance with the decisions of the June (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the RSFSR Council of Ministers has obligated ministries and departments of the RSFSR, councils of ministers of autonomous republics, and ispolkoms of Soviets of People's Deputies to concentrate their attention on the maximum utilization of the advantages of economic management techniques, on creating conditions for the effective activity of enterprises, and on their conversion to full cost accounting, self-support and self-financing. The formulation and implementation of a program for normalizing the financial situation of subordinate enterprises and organizations and the rendering of all-round practical assistance to farms finding themselves in a difficult financial situation.

The strategy for restructuring finances is set forth in the Law of the USSR on the State Enterprise (Association) which confers broad rights on enterprises and ensures conditions for their economic autonomy on the basis of full cost accounting.

Restructuring requires decisive change in the work techniques of the republic's economic organs: the State Planning Committee, Ministry of Finance, banks, the State Committee for Prices, the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, and the State Committee for Standards and the more precise coordination of their

activity so that they would act like enterprises' partners, and would be equally deeply interested in attaining high end national economic results.

On the fulfillment of the RSFSR State Budget for 1986

The report on the fulfillment of the RSFSR State Budget for 1986 in the sum of 105,585,900,000 rubles in revenues and 105,418,400,000 rubles in expenditures with an excess of 167.5 million rubles income over expenditures.

Comrade deputies! The decisions of the June (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, which approved the nation's plan and budget for the coming year, are directed toward the further dynamic development of the national economy. Active work by party, soviet and economic organs, by work by collectives of enterprises and organizations to implement these decisions will promote the successful fulfillment of the republic plan and budget for 1988 and the acceleration of its socioeconomic development.

Budget, Planning Committee Co-report

18000086 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 31 Oct 87 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Co-report by Deputy I. M. Cherpanov for the Planning and Budget and Other Permanent Commissions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] We are unanimous, comrade deputies in our opinion that the restructuring is gaining momentum. Plans for the economic and social development of the nation and each region are formulated and implemented under its influence. The development of a number of branches of the Russian Federation Economy is exceeding the targets of the five-year plan.

Permit me to report the results of the deputies' examination of the draft plan and budget of the RSFSR for 1988, the course of fulfillment of the plan and budget in the current year, and the report of the fulfillment of the budget for the past year. Permanent commissions of the republic Supreme Soviet held their sittings yesterday, following which reports of the RSFSR Council of Ministers on the questions under review were heard. This gave deputies greater opportunity to participate in the discussion of the plan and budget directly at the Supreme Soviet session.

Before the session, the basic indicators of the draft plan were sent to the councils of ministers of autonomous republics and to ispolkoms of kray and oblast and Moscow and Leningrad city Soviets of People's Deputies. In this stage, deputies of the Supreme Soviet together with the deputy aktiv of local soviets made numerous proposals on the draft plan on a democratic basis and in an atmosphere of broad glasnost.

The deputies noted that the content and structure of the plan and budget for the coming year are substantially different. They articulate the basic directions of development of the national economy and the state's order for the most important types of work, goods and services. At the same time, there remains a broad field for creative economic activity and for expanding socialist enterprises' direct ties. Thus, the restructuring of the management of the economy in accordance with the principles of the June (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee is clearly manifested in the plan and budget for 1988.

In the process of examining the plan, the deputies devoted special attention to the acceleration of scientific-technological progress—the basis of intensification of social production, that accompanies and promotes the basic restructuring of our economy. Without denigrating the work that has been done, the deputies expressed the opinion that the potential of modern science and technology is being used far too little in the interest of developing the republic's economy.

The potential of academy institutes and institutions of higher learning is not fully utilized. In 1987, no more than four percent of the work performed by the cost accounting scientific association of the RSFSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education is oriented toward the solution of urgent branch problems in the republic economy. Such criticism by deputies of the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education is heard not for the first time. We hope that Comrade Minister F. Obratsov and the ministry's collegium will finally draw the necessary conclusions. The time has also come for all branch republic ministries to take a step in the direction of science.

Concentration of the attention of scientific, planning and design organizations on the priority directions, the elimination of narrow specialization, and the development of new forms of integration of science and production would make it possible to eliminate many of the indicated problems.

Deputies took special pains to examine questions associated with the further development of the republic's agroindustrial complex. The volume of purchases of agricultural products specified in the state order [zakaz] for the coming year essentially corresponds to the targets of the five-year plan. This is the result of a large effort of the Soviets of People's Deputies and work collectives in the agroindustrial complex to implement the Food Program in the first 2 years of the five-year plan and was the result of the detailed critiquing of plan targets for the coming year. But the deputies feel that it is above all essential to concentrate on the critical analysis of the state of affairs in this section of the plan as well.

RSFSR Gosagroprom and the local soviets must concern themselves more with satisfying the needs of the working people on the basis of local production of food staples

both through the development of the social sector and the population's personal household plots, collective orchards and gardens, and subsidiary farms of enterprises.

The storage and processing of agricultural produce continues to be the most important section of the plan for the agroindustrial complex. Next year's plan calls for increasing the funding of the construction of storage facilities, for the creation of new capacities in the food, baking, and meat and dairy industry. However, there has not as yet been any sharp turn toward the needs of these branches. In the draft plan for 1988, targets for activating a number of capacities in the food and meat-dairy industry were from 15 to 30 percent lower than indicated in the five-year plan. A little more than 5 percent of the value of fixed capital is allocated for the reconstruction and technical retooling of enterprises. If production is retooled at such a rate, it will take us 20 years to solve one of the most urgent problems. This is entirely impermissible in the face of the formulation of the problem by the Central Committee of the Party.

On the whole, the implementation of our plans for the development of the agroindustrial complex requires new approaches to the economy and the organization of agricultural production and of all branches closely associated with it.

Permanent commissions of the republic Supreme Soviet thoroughly examined the social sections of the plan and budget for 1988. We are convinced that they were developed thoroughly and in sufficient depth. Capital investments in construction projects in the nonproductive sphere in the economy of republic subordination are to be increased by 19.4 percent. This is characteristic of the development of the social sphere in the entire republic.

Deputies detected a considerable number of weak points in the social development of work collectives and individual regions. Plans are not always reinforced by real action.

Deputies expressed real concern over the development of housing and municipal services. They are concerned about the high degree to which engineer networks are wearing out. They are being modernized at an extremely slow pace.

In the course of their examination of the draft plan, many deputies in krays and oblasts called attention to the lack of sufficient ceilings on contractor-performed work on projects of social significance. Together with this, they emphasized the need for the maximum use of ceilings and resources, for the intensive development of the production of local construction materials, the direct labor method of construction, and the transformation of every social construction project into a people's construction project.

Commissions of the Supreme Soviet constantly focus their attention on tasks associated with increasing the production and improving the quality of consumer goods and with the development of the service sphere. There are many shortcomings in this important sector of work. There are serious breakdowns in the fulfillment of the Comprehensive Program for Goods and Services. From January to September of this year, enterprises belonging to the Ministry of Light Industry, the Ministry of the Textile Industry and Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry of the RSFSR alone delivered 180 million rubles' worth of consumer goods less than scheduled. The shortage of commodity resources has had a negative impact on the fulfillment of the trade turnover plan, has led to an imbalance between the population's money incomes and expenditures, and to the disruption of the fulfillment of the cash plan.

Planning and budget and other permanent commissions have advised ministries and departments and local soviet organs to take energetic measures to increase production and expand the mix of consumer goods and paid services, to promote the creation of cooperatives in every way, and facilitate the development of individual labor activity.

As in the past, deputies thoroughly analyzed the course of fulfillment of the voters' mandates. After the discussion of the work of soviets with mandates at the session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the local Soviets of People's Deputies began concerning themselves with these questions more earnestly. The plan for the current year is carrying out 229 mandates given to deputies of the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Much but not everything is being done on the basis of voters' mandates. The irresponsibility of individual leaders in Gosagroprom, the RSFSR Union of Consumers' Societies, the RSFSR Ministry of the Fuel Industry, Ministry of the Textile Industry and Ministry of Consumer Services is also evident here. The needs of the working people for the construction of a consumer service center in Irkutsk, for a shopping center in Paranga workers' settlement in the Mari ASSR, or for a bakery in the Zaokskiy settlement in Tula Oblast are not being met. The Krasnoyarsk Krayispolkom and Kuybyshev, Orel and Tambov oblispolkoms are not taking all the necessary measures to secure the timely fulfillment of the voters' mandates.

In addition to raising the responsibility of ministries, departments, and ispolkoms of local soviets, it seems correct to conclude that we, the deputies, ourselves must show greater initiative and persistence in carrying out the mandates of our electors.

Comrade deputies, in the course of the radical restructuring of the management of the economy, republic ministries and departments, and local soviet organs must carry out large-scale tasks relating to the radical reform of the financial and credit mechanism. For the second

year, our republic is not fulfilling the revenue part of the budget. In the course of the examination of the plan and budget, permanent commissions reached corresponding conclusions. They take into account proposals and remarks expressed by deputies both in preparatory commissions and at sittings of permanent commissions on the first day of the session. Additional financial resources in the amount of 53.9 million rubles were found.

Taking these additions into account, we consider it possible to approve the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the RSFSR and State Budget of the RSFSR for 1988 with revenues and expenditures in the sum of 110,607,638,000 rubles. We propose adopting corresponding laws concerning the plan and the budget. It is also proposed to approve the report on the fulfillment of the RSFSR State Budget for 1986 in the sum submitted by the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Comrade deputies, we are making our decisions on the further development of the national economy at a notable time. A plenum of the party's central committee was recently held. The Eighth Session, Eleventh Convocation of the nation's Supreme Soviet is past. The Soviet people will very soon be celebrating the glorious 70th anniversary of the Great October. Permit me to state with confidence that all deputies of the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet will continue to be convinced, active fighters for restructuring and will spare no effort to increase the economic might of our Homeland, to promote the well-being of the Soviet people, and to strengthen peace throughout the entire world.

5013

Praise for Ousted Tajikistan Party Leader

18340403 [Editorial Report] Dushanbe TOJIKISTONI SOVETI in Tajik on 10 July 1987 carries on pages 3-4 a

2300-word article, "Controversy Over Humility," by Otakhon Latifi. The article opens with the statement that for a long time the author has wanted to discuss the life of Jabbor Rasulovich Rasulov, who was first secretary of the Central Committee of the Tajikistan CP for more than 20 years. However Latifi was not encouraged to do so and was given one reason or another. Latifi recalls the modest standard of living Rasulov maintained and how he became excited whenever he saw the hammer and sickle. In his term as first secretary, Rasulov was called upon to correct improper trends which existed at that time, such as exaggerated reports of economic performance. In all the positions he held he fought relentlessly against violations of the law. He was a man of integrity and was devoted to the party. Latifi praises Rasulov for recognizing the importance of keeping in contact with the people and for having a detailed knowledge of the conditions in every village in the republic. Rasulov was well informed about cotton cultivation and actively monitored conditions each year.

Not all the people around Rasulov shared his admirable qualities. Among those people were intriguers and climbers. Rasulov himself was simple and credulous; it was difficult to get him to change his mind. He was distressed by his problems. Eventually there was a party shake-up in Tajikistan; the first and second secretaries were removed.

Latifi concludes that Rasulov is a kindred spirit to the renewal begun in the party in April 1985. In a postscript to the article, the author invites readers and friends of Rasulov to write down their reminiscences of him and send them to the newspaper's editors for collection into a book.

Historians Plan New Examinations of Komintern Issues

18300021 Moscow VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS in
Russian No 10, Oct 87 pp 137-145

Article by L. G. Babichenko, candidate of historical sciences: "Study the History of the Komintern in Depth, from All Sides and Truthfully"]

[Text] Little studied and unsolved problems of the history of the Communist International were the subject of a discussion organized on the 8th of July by the Marxism-Leninism Institute under the CPSU Central Committee [IML pri TsK KPSS]. Scholars from a number of Moscow's scientific institutions shared their ideas on the state of research and current research tasks in this area, on overcoming stagnant trends, and on the eradication of deeply rooted dogmas and stereotypes. Among the speakers at the meeting were **G. M. Adibekov**, **F. I. Firsov** and **K. K. Shirinya**, doctors of historical sciences (IML pri TsK KPSS); **A. A. Galkin**, doctor of historical sciences (Social Sciences Institute under the CPSU Central Committee [ION pri TsK KPSS]); Professor **I. M. Krivoguz**, doctor of historical sciences (Academy of the National Economy under the USSR Council of Ministers); **I. N. Undasynov** and **Z. P. Yakhimovich**, doctors of historical sciences (International Labor Movement Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences [IMRD AN SSSR]); **Ya. S. Drabkin**, doctor of historical sciences (General History Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences); **A. M. Grigoryev**, doctor of historical sciences (Institute of Scientific Information on the Social Sciences, USSR Academy of Sciences); **L. Ya. Gabianskiy**, candidate of historical sciences (Slavic and Balkan Studies Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences).

The discussion was opened by Professor **M. P. Mchedlov**, doctor of philosophical sciences; deputy director, IML pri TsK KPSS, who urged specialists in the history of the international communist movement to concentrate their efforts on insufficiently investigated problems in the history, strategy of the Communist International. Today, he emphasized, under the new, favorable conditions presented for the renewal of our society by the decisions of the 27th Party Congress and the January and June (1987) plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, at a time when many obstacles to broad scientific inquiry have been removed, Soviet scholars, including associates of the Komintern History Sector of the IML pri TsK KPSS, have a real opportunity to conduct their research entirely in accordance with the historical method principle, with due regard to the lessons of the truth, and to reexamine a number of previous assessments of the activity of both the Komintern and its leaders and the international communist movement and its individual detachments.

Many of the Komintern's theoretical elaborations regarding the unified labor and antifascist popular front, the problem of blocs, attitudes toward the middle class, and the struggle against militarism and war are still timely for today's communist and labor movement. Many aspects of Komintern activity, which are studied both by Marxist historiography in the fraternal socialist countries and by bourgeois and social reformist historians, require a new approach and careful interpretation. The degree of historiographic elaboration of problems of the Komintern is clearly insufficient in our country.

M. P. Mchedlov took note of a number of attainments of the IML pri TsK KPSS and other of our country's scientific institutions in studying the Komintern's history, which have been expressed in the publication of a number of fundamental works and in documentary publications and stressed the need to give maximum consideration to cumulative positive experience. The results of previous research, their careful analysis and critical evaluation will help us to reach a higher level in the creative elaboration of the theoretical legacy of the Komintern today

K. K. Shirin stated that the active study of problems relating to the activity of the Komintern began in our country in the late '50's, following the 20th CPSU Congress. During this time, the IML compiled a plan for applied research. A large inspirational role in the work was played by **P. Togliatti's** article dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the formation of this international communist organization.

In past years, the science of history has thoroughly studied the role of **V. I. Lenin** in the creation of the Komintern, in the development of its strategy and tactics, and has revealed the enormous assistance that **Vladimir Ilich** rendered to communist parties.¹ A certain amount of success has been scored in the study of the documents of congresses 1-4 of the Communist International and their importance for the development and reinforcement of the world communist movement has been shown.² The monograph *Kommunisticheskiy International. Kratkiy istoricheskiy ocherk* [The Communist International. A Concise Outline History] analyzed the basic strategic stages in the activity of that organization. Much attention has been devoted to the elaboration of the problems of the unified labor and antifascist popular front and to the theory of people's democratic revolution. Certain successes have been scored in research on the Komintern's strategy and tactics on the national-colonial question³ and in disclosing the role of **G. Dimitroff** in leading the world communist movement.⁴

In the activity of the Komintern, **K. K. Shirinya** noted, there were difficulties and serious errors. In the process of preparing the previously mentioned Concise Outline, a number of responses were received from people who were previously officials in that organizations. **Palm Datt**, in particular, stated that the evaluation of the positive aspects of the Komintern's activity here is for

the first time combined with the equally candid recognition of negative aspects. Indeed, the collective of authors tried to present the experience of the Komintern in all its diversity, to take into account not only accomplishments and merits, but also to show errors and other shortcomings; this met with a hostile reception from certain associates of the IML. In the concluding stage of preparations of the manuscript there were heated discussions of it at higher levels as well. The authors had to delete from the book a number of points characterizing the influence of Stalin's cult of personality on the Komintern's activity, but nevertheless succeeded in preserving the general approach to the problem. The participation of IML associates in the preparation of a multivolume work on the history of the international labor movement was an important stage in the further study of this organization's history.⁵

A. A. Galkin and Ya. S. Drabkin spoke of the serious contribution made by the Komintern History Sector of the IML to the elaboration of scientific problems in the history of the international communist movement. The former noted that the publication of the book by B. M. Leybzon and K. K. Shirnya⁶ was a new stage in the movement forward and stimulated further research on a broad spectrum of problems in the history of the Komintern. I. M. Krivoguz characterized the '60's and '70's as a period in which a higher level of research was attained and the Komintern's historical experience was conceptualized in general.

Nevertheless, the speakers stated, much that has already been done no longer accords with current demands. There is a need for new approaches, for tireless search, for the consistent application of the method of dialectical materialism to the analysis of complex historical processes. Above all, there is a need:

To overcome scholasticism and dogmatism in scientific work, to cast off obsolete stereotypes

These phenomena, which are still characteristic of the study of the history of the Komintern, are manifested in the suppression of many facts, in avoiding or playing down acute issues, in attempts to judge certain aspects of Komintern activity in terms of today, in the replacement of specific conclusions with general judgments, in the depersonalization of the history of the Komintern. The consequence of all this has been general stagnation in the given area of science.

I. M. Krivoguz emphasized the need to eliminate tendentiousness from work with sources and to reject the formula "history is policy oriented toward the past." Misconstrued party spirit [partiynost] and short-lived considerations are detrimental to objective research. Only after overcoming all this is it possible to reach a higher level in the study of many serious problems in the history of the international communist movement.

In the opinion of Z. P. Yakhimovich, Soviet historiography has not analyzed in sufficient depth and completeness the Komintern's leftist errors and has elements of dogmatization of Marxism-Leninism, which is manifested in simplistic views of the revolutionary process, the formal application of theoretical principles regarding the general crisis, decline, and fall of capitalism. Thus, the experience of U.S. imperialism in the '20's convincingly attested to the fact that its appearance changed under the influence of the Great October [Revolution] and it began using new means of bolstering its position. But the Komintern stubbornly considered only trends that were supposedly leading to the early disintegration and demise of capitalism. A number of factors promoting the stabilization of capitalism were to a certain degree occasioned by weaknesses in the communist movement and the insufficient development of the revolutionary process during those years.

Our literature, I. N. Undasynov stated, makes virtually no mention of the fact that the united labor front policy developed by the Komintern was in practice frequently directed toward weakening Social Democracy. After all, we know that the Communist International actually refused to enter into a strategic alliance with Social Democracy. G. Zinovyev and N. Bukharin spoke out against K. Radek, who insisted on the continuation of this policy. Only the tragic lessons connected with the ascendancy of fascism to power in a number of countries compelled the Komintern to return to this policy.

In I. N. Undasynov's opinion, the Komintern had problems implementing the united front policy primarily because it did not have a clear understanding of the ways in which capitalism would emerge from the structural crisis it had entered in the 20th century. Under the new conditions of its development, capitalism had three ways of emerging from the crisis: revolution, reform, and so-called counterrevolution. The Komintern, however, which only recognized the possibility of a revolutionary outcome, could not implement the united front policy and was unable to occupy a correct position vis-a-vis Social Democracy. Moreover, it had to clearly understand that the revolutionary way out of the crisis was an impossibility at that time. The result was that the Two-and-a-Half International joined the Second International and the leftist socialists joined Social Democracy. However, the leftist Social Democrats, and this must be borne in mind, have always urged all currents in the labor movement to unite.

But while agreeing with many positive evaluations of what has been accomplished in the study of the history of the Komintern, I. N. Undasynov noted the superficial analysis of this organization's activity that is presented in its outline history. The conception of the book is that the Komintern did everything right and only erred occasionally or failed to act in good time. The latest works of the IML Komintern History Sector are significantly deeper. Scientists, the speaker stated, are presently at the sources of study of problems relating to the

history of the Komintern. They are under the pressure of the heavy weight of ideas that do not accord with the modern stage of development of the social sciences.

Sketchiness in the works of Soviet historians has been manifested in the recognition of only the positive significance of the slogan of the "bolshevization" of the communist parties. According to D. Z. Manuil'skiy, the leadership of 50 communist parties was replaced in the course of "bolshevization" in the late '20's and early '30's.

Ya. S. Drabkin pointed to the negative effect of the term "Luxemburgism" in the "bolshevization" theses adopted by the 5th Plenum of the IKKI [Communist International Executive Committee]. It was used in the effort to cover up practically all theoretical errors of the communists of that time. It was argued that "Luxemburgism" supposedly shared features in common with Trotskyism. Various minor errors committed by R. Luxemburg were primarily and chiefly overemphasized in the ideological legacy of that distinguished revolutionary and prominent Marxist theorist. K. Tsetkin and certain other communists decisively protested against the condemnation of R. Luxemburg, against the sentiment of the time that the closer figures like R. Luxemburg were to the communist movement, the more was dangerous their influence. The next step in the attacks on R. Luxemburg was I. Stalin's letter (1931) to the editor of the journal *Proletarskaya revolyutsiya* attributing the authorship of the theory of permanent revolution to her. Soviet historians, the speaker emphasized, must study the creative legacy of R. Luxemburg in depth and sweep away the extraneous features of past years.

I. M. Krivoguz expressed doubt regarding the claim that scientists had supposedly thoroughly elaborated the problem "Lenin and the Komintern." They must also examine it from the following point of view: the extent to which the Komintern had implemented Lenin's ideas while Vladimir Ilich was still alive; they had to answer the question of whether he was always able to implement his ideas. After all, Lenin was sometimes in the minority there. There was a struggle in the Komintern for the affirmation of Lenin's views, but at the same time they were developing. The problem requires a new, more serious approach.

The Lenin period in the history of the Komintern, **Z. P. Yakhimovich** emphasized, was extremely fruitful in the elaboration of theoretical problems of the communist movement. At the same time, "leftists" headed by G. Zinovyev moved against a number of Lenin's ideas, in particular, against the concept of the united front, from the standpoint of the so-called "offensive theory." In keeping with this "theory," communist parties should always pursue offensive tactics regardless of the objective conditions.

There was a departure from Lenin's principles during the 5th and 6th congresses of the Komintern and, of course, in 1937 and later, which found concentrated expression

in the dissolution of the Polish Communist Party. In the history of the Komintern, there are acute topics that have a bearing on urgent issues in the communist movement of today. They must be carefully scrutinized and studied from all sides.

The policy of passing over things in silence, **A. A. Galkin** stated, inflicts great political harm on the communist movement. We also created "blank spaces" in the history of the Komintern ourselves and for this reason in a number of cases found ourselves defenseless before our ideological enemy. Violations of democratic principles and the vicious practice of IKKI intervention in the affairs of individual parties, for example, require critical examination. But everything here is not unambiguous. It must be considered that the Komintern was a world organization, which gave rise to both positive and negative aspects. In particular, the principles of organization of the VKP(b) [All-Union Communist Party (of Bolsheviks)] were often mechanically transferred to other parties. Our literature says almost nothing about the Komintern apparatus and the levers by which it influenced parties. On the other hand, much has been written about this in foreign countries. We should more widely reveal not only the positive aspects of the Komintern's influence on the education of cadres and the formation of communist parties but should also critically examine the consequences of its unwarranted intervention in their internal affairs.

Continuing the discussion of the need to study the levers by which the IKKI apparatus influenced communist parties, **S. I. Semenov** called attention to the activity of its regional bureaus, Laendersekretariats, and other structural units—a question that has not been elaborated and that is essentially closed to research. Our defects in this area make it possible for bourgeois ideologues and revisionists to distort the picture of the Komintern's relations with parties. There is an urgent need, for example, to describe the activity and relations of the Balkan and South American bureaus of IKKI. It should be considered that the officials of the Komintern, as an international organization, were frequently active in various countries and that they creatively used and transmitted their cumulative revolutionary experience. Thus, M. Borodin, after studying the experience of the Mexican revolution, tried to apply it in China. S. Minev made a large contribution to the activity of regional bureaus of IKKI. In the process of studying the activity of communist parties in various countries, the influence of the revolutionary experience of Komintern officials should be borne in mind.

F. I. Firsov also discussed the interrelations of the Komintern and its sections and examined them from the standpoint of consistency in the implementation of the principles of democratic centralism. He noted that we still do not have applied research regarding the causes of the errors and the distortion of these principles. It is known that the Komintern sometimes foisted unacceptable demands on the parties and dictated its will to them

on cadre matters. The decision of the Polish question at the 5th Congress is a vivid example of this. In a review of the Komintern Outline History, Polish comrades tactfully observed that the book had skirted this issue.

There is also need for the more precise, detailed disclosure of Stalin's influence on Komintern policy. His authoritarian intervention in the formulation of that organization's strategy and tactics led to negative consequences for the party. Documents adopted under Stalin's pressure should be appropriately evaluated. However we should not merely confine ourselves to the enumeration of errors because such decisions as, for example, the decree of the Presidium of IKKI dissolving the Polish Communist Party was a unique political coverup of Stalin's repressive policy.

In the last two decades, F. I. Firsov continued, the following situation developed: if the criticism of certain aspects of the Komintern's activity in other countries did not find analogous expression in Soviet literature and the assessments did not coincide with ours, this criticism was rejected and suppressed. That is what happened to Luigi Longo's book "Social Fascism in Spain" (the second volume of his memoirs)⁷, without which it is practically impossible to study the history of the Komintern. Different points of view were also expressed in the course of the discussion that took place in Yugoslavia in 1983. Professor D. Levkovich provided an evaluation of the role of the Komintern that in F. I. Firsov's view is very accurate. Many basic principles in D. Levkovich's report coincide with or come very close to the opinion of Soviet historians. However, Yugoslav scholars also expressed other points of view which were unquestionably influenced by the conflict between Stalin and Tito. Of course we should criticize works that are written from hostile positions that directly falsify history, but we must renounce the view of foreign historiography of the Komintern "through a gun-port" and must not continue to fail to note points of view that differ from ours.

Z. P. Yakhimovich supported this idea and noted that until recently scholars studying foreign literature on the history of the Komintern had difficulty publishing their research findings even in special bulletins. This applied to both negative and positive conclusions. Such a position cannot be called legitimate. Soviet readers must know how the history of the Komintern is depicted abroad. It is easier to make the transition from the historiographic interpretation of these problems to the solution of a number of complex questions.

A. M. Grigoryev called the attention of the meeting's participants to the increased activity of foreign, especially Chinese historiography, in recent years, in which the following are the most important problems: "The National and the International in the Komintern," "The Chinese Communist Party and the USSR," "The Chinese Communist Party and the Komintern." Chinese historians express their own judgments in this regard.

But while they were earlier predominantly given to anti-Soviet, anticommunist attacks, of late their assessments of Komintern activity have become more objective.

In the course of meetings between Soviet and Chinese scholars in recent years, the latter have positively received the conclusion that Komintern policy was the fruit of collective reason and the result of the generalized experience of many communist parties. The Komintern did not know in advance the answers to many of the problems that arose. Chinese scholars acknowledge its positive role in the creation of the Chinese Communist Party, in the revolution of 1924-25 up until 1927. They sharply object to attempts to depict Komintern policy as more farsighted and deliberate than it actually was. Chinese historians consider that the slogan of protecting the USSR, as the primary objective of Komintern policy, was not responsive to the national interests of the Chinese CP at that time. A. M. Grigoryev emphasized that Soviet historiography is confronted with the task of demonstrating both the pluses and minuses of the Komintern's eastern policy and with filling in the "blank spaces" regarding certain aspects of that policy.

Participants in the meeting noted the need for thorough study of the leading role of the VKP(b) in the Komintern and for new approaches to this problem. **K. K. Shirinya**, in particular, noted that much here remains to be clarified and critically reappraised. Essentially, we still know very little about the positive work our party performed in the Komintern. In the summer of 1925, for example, at the behest of the IKKI, a delegation of the RKP(b) [Russian Communist Party (of Bolsheviks)] conducted negotiations with a group of ultraleftists in the leadership of the German Communist Party—R. Fischer, A. Maslov, and others. N. Bukharin later briefed the Presidium of the IKKI on the negotiations. He criticized the GCP leadership which, contrary to the advice of the RKP(b) delegation and the agreement reached at the meeting, halted work in the trade unions and did not include representatives of the moderate wing of the GCP in 1923 in the GCP Central Committee, and established personal dictatorship in the party. The RKP(b) warned that if the GCP were to establish rigid relations of personal dictatorship within the party, its relations with mass organizations would inevitably be organized according to the same model thereby isolating the GCP from the masses. Therefore, N. Bukharin posed the question to the Presidium of the IKKI of replacing the ultraleft leadership of the GCP with people who would be able to implement the Leninist policy of maintaining close ties with the masses. There are, **K. K. Shirinya** noted, many other examples of our party's constructive assistance to communists of other countries. At the same time that we expose the errors of the Komintern and I. Stalin, we must not forget such positive moments. We must see the entire dialectical contradictoriness of the development of the international communist movement.

F. I. Firsov, addressing the same problem, emphasized that even though our party's leading role in the Komintern is common knowledge, scholars nevertheless have not as yet traced it on the basis of specific facts. In January 1921, for example, the GCP Central Committee, addressed an Open Letter to other labor organizations in Germany, that was prepared at the behest of IKKI representative K. Radek. He was also the author of the letter. We, however, remain silent about this fact even though in the literature there are pronouncements that K. Radek at that time was supposedly an opponent of the united front policy.

G. M. Adibekov spoke of scholars' inclination toward dogma and sketchiness in their approach to individual problems and their timidity in going beyond the framework of entrenched views. Analyzing the complex of issues relating to the problem "The Komintern and Mass Revolutionary Organizations of the Working People," he noted that, there is much that is passed over in silence, that is not spelled out in its entirety, and that there are many "blank spaces" in this area of the literature. Was the creation of all such organizations acting under the direction of the Komintern in the '20's and '30's justified? In the speaker's opinion, those such as the Profintern [Red Trade Union International], the Communist Youth International, and the International Women's Secretariat had a right to exist. The establishment of the Peasants' International and Sports International was questionable. The sectarian nature of their activity is not mentioned in the literature. Such organizations as International Workers' Aid and the International Organization for Aid to Fighters for the Revolution have made an important contribution to the development of proletarian internationalism. At the same time, they occasionally duplicated one another thereby complicating and weakening the international solidarity movement.

While works prepared by the IML have evaluated mass organizations, the evaluations have not always been exhaustive and precise. The institute's Komintern History Sector assumes that the study of the activity of the Komintern and mass organizations, especially during the period of the 5th and 6th congresses, will continue. Today the situation is entirely favorable to the careful analysis of the entire complex of problems of that period. We have a general idea of these problems and avenues are being developed for addressing those among them that have not yet been sufficiently discussed in the literature. It should be remembered that the errors that inhered in the Komintern's activity were also found in the Profintern: the same sketchiness in the evaluation of capitalism, putting the cart before the horse in evaluations of the prospects for revolution. Thus, unrealistic, unduly high demands were made on proletarian organizations, and labor leaders were sometimes equated with the masses. Partial demands were occasionally ignored or consigned to oblivion. Future scientific works should level sharper criticism at ultraleft slogans: "Trade unions—the school of capitalism," "Social Democracy—the moderate wing of fascism," and the like.

The Komintern, the speaker continued, related to mass revolutionary organizations as an additional means for overthrowing capitalist power. Their organizational independence was violated; their unquestioning submission to communist parties was demanded. This situation was highly detrimental both to the communist movement and to mass organizations, but lessons were not always drawn from failures and negative experience.

G. M. Adibekov said in conclusion that it is urgently necessary to reinterpret all Komintern policy vis-a-vis mass organizations, to dot all the i's. This is also possible for the modern international communist movement, for its policy of alliances, for ascertaining the causes of narrowness of the mass base of the communist parties, and for determining the reasons for the greater influence exerted on the masses by Social Democracy compared with them.

While accentuating attention on unresolved and little investigated problems, while critically examining the results of studying the Komintern's activity, participants in the meeting unanimously agreed that there is no basis for doubting the positive experience of that international organization of communists or the accomplishments of Soviet historiography in the study of the basic aspects of Komintern activity.

In the course of discussing the specific problems in the history of the Komintern, participants in the discussion invariably concluded that the narrowness of the source base is a serious cause of the inhibition of the preparation of new, deeper research. All speakers without exception emphasized the urgent need to give scholars broad access to archival materials.

K. K. Shirinya, in particular, noted that the IML pri TsK KPSS disposes over an extremely rich but still little studied archival collections. It is specifically in them that one can find answers to the many complex problems that were raised in the course of the present discussion and thereby raise scientific research to a higher level. **F. I. Firsov**, speaking of the difficulties that specialists experience because of their limited access to the archives, proposed publishing hitherto unpublished stenographic transcripts of a number of plenums of the IKKI and the 7th Congress of the Komintern. Here, Soviet historical science lags behind its foreign counterpart. Yugoslavia, for example, has published 12 volumes of transcripts of Komintern congresses. It is unfortunately our practice to publish documents in abridged rather than complete form. This was the case, in particular, with the publication of the materials of the 7th Congress, including reports by Komintern leaders. It must be the unalterable rule to publish only the complete texts of documents. **A. M. Grigoryev** also spoke about distorted documents in the publication process and named the last documentary publication undertaken by the Far Eastern Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences as a positive example of the latter.⁸

The inaccessibility of Komintern documents, noted A. A. Galkin, has a negative impact on the training of young scholars for this branch of historical science. Specialists become fewer and fewer and the prestige of the topic suffers. The narrowness of the source base forces us to turn to foreign sources and this is frequently fraught with the possibility of mistakes. This point was also discussed by Z. P. Yakhimovich, who pointed out that factual material is accumulating abroad as a result of the quite broad publication of archival documents on the history of the Komintern. Soviet researchers, however, are in a worse situation here. Chinese historians are planning to publish 300 volumes of documents on the history of the Komintern and the Chinese CP. We do not even have 30 volumes. Foreign researchers name the inaccessibility of Komintern archives as one of the obstacles to the study of the history of the Komintern. S. I. Semenov, who supported proposals on the broader publication of archival materials in our country, noted increased attention to Komintern problems in Latin America. Proceedings of congresses 1-4, many archival documents, including the Ember-Dro [transliterated from Russian] archives, and the transcript of the first conference (1929) of Latin American communist parties have been published in Spanish in recent years. Unfortunately, the next such conferences were reported very incompletely in the journal *Kommunisticheskiy International*. The materials of the conference that took place in 1934 were presented incorrectly in our historiography, including the *Komintern Outline History*.

Participants in the discussion emphasized that new approaches to a number of problems, the elimination of scholasticism and dogmatism, and the expansion of the source base must create a favorable possibility for:

The concentration of efforts on the study of priority directions, on the elimination of "blank spaces" from the history of the Komintern

K. K. Shirinya said that many basic problems in the history of the Komintern have not yet been resolved fully because they have not as yet been studied in sufficient depth, their study has not been entirely truthful, the events have not been thoroughly presented in their close interrelationship, and all the difficulties and errors that existed have not been reflected. One of the most important problems in his opinion is the Komintern's evaluation of contradictions and prospects of capitalism's development. While the Komintern has unquestionable points to its credit in its analysis of capitalism, it has also made serious theoretical mistakes. It mechanically transferred certain evaluations from the times of revolutionary enthusiasm to the period following 1923. Lenin's conclusions on the possibility of prolonged struggle between the two systems, on the defensive nature of class actions by the proletariat following defeats in revolutionary battles in Europe were consigned to oblivion. The optimistic, oversimplified evaluation of the collapse of capitalism dominated, its destructive aspects were

greatly emphasized, and stabilizing elements in its development were sketchily analyzed. N. Bukharin was probably the first to express the idea of capitalism's potential, its realization of such nationalization as would make it possible to increase its profits and to raise the wages of part of the working class, thereby temporarily decreasing the urgency of class contradictions. K. Tsetkin, A. Gramsci, and Ye. Varga spoke about the potential of capitalism, about the fact that its decline did not mean the total exhaustion of its possibilities. After the 5th Congress of the Komintern, N. Bukharin noted a certain increase in the stability of capitalism and proposed "a more cautious formulation of the decline of capitalism." At the 6th Congress, he opposed the inclusion of provisions regarding the limits of capitalist development and reproduction in the Komintern's program. Ye. Varga also pointed to the inaccurate evaluations of capitalism but at the same time frequently offered ultraleftist forecasts of its prospective development. G. Zinovyev, I. Stalin, L. Trotskiy, G. Remmele, and others, characterized the capitalist stabilization process as "rotten, and still weaker." Therefore, K. K. Shirinya emphasized, the study of the dynamics of development of capitalism during the period of the Komintern's activity is one of the researcher's paramount tasks.

No less urgent, the speaker continued, is the analysis of the Komintern's conception of world revolution. It suffered from sketchiness, from the underestimation of the significance of the general democratic process of development, from putting the cart before the horse. And at the same time it is impossible to deny the correctness of the Komintern's basic revolutionary orientation in the general historical context.

In bourgeois, Social Democratic historiography and sometimes even among communists there is speculation on weaknesses of the Komintern's concept of revolution. Italian communist A. Agosti writes that the Komintern's main error was that it did not see the possibility of structural change and therefore advises learning from modern "Eurocommunists." Such speculation must be refuted along with the views of participants in the discussion of the Komintern's problems, which took place in Yugoslavia in 1983, and which evaluated the Komintern experience in entirely negative terms, especially in the period following Lenin's death.

The Komintern's mistakes and miscalculations in evaluating the prospects for revolution stemmed from the fact that its leaders viewed the development of revolutionary events in the world by analogy with what happened in 1917-1921. The array of class forces here frequently becomes the standard, the yardstick of future revolutions in other countries. The fast tempo of development of events in Russia at that time was mechanically transferred to the new period, to states with a different socioeconomic structure. While the Komintern feared the loss of revolutionary optimism and goal but at the same time became divorced from reality, did not

sufficiently analyze the real situation, and did not always see and consider that the fact that the sources of the proletariat's revolutionary character change.

I. M. Krivogus concurred with **K. K. Shirinya's** opinion that research on the Komintern's conception of world revolution must become the priority direction of modern historiography and emphasized that this conception formed under the influence of the victory of the Great October [Revolution]. While this revolution took place in a backward state, its experience was superimposed on other countries, on the Komintern's entire activity. The influence of Russia's experience, understood sketchily, exerted pressure from the left. This was specifically the source of ultraleftism in the communist movement of those years. In order to carefully study the conception of world revolution, the speaker considered it essential to draw upon new sources and statistical data, and to use the quantitative method which can give another, more precise picture of historical events.

A. A. Galkin discussed the Komintern's reassessment of the revolutionary situation in the world. This reassessment was occasioned by revolutionary impatience and a simplistic understanding of the essence of capitalism. The Komintern's problems here touch on problems of the modern communist movement. The ills of this organization still make themselves known and cloud the relations between and within communist parties.

Continuing the exchange of opinions on problems associated with the Komintern's evaluation of the prospects for world revolution, **Ya. S. Drabkin** noted that while there was hope for world revolution in 1917-1921, the situation changed later. The Komintern admitted not only the reassessment of the revolutionary situation but was also late with its conclusions. In this regard, the speaker emphasized, it is important to investigate questions concerning the relationship between revolution and reform. At the same time, it must be considered that Komintern documents sometimes unjustifiably focus attention on the opposites of revolution and reform.

S. I. Semenov discussed questions associated with the Komintern's choice of the routes of world revolution. During those years it was frequently said that if capitalism stabilized in the developed capitalist countries, the emphasis should be placed on the East and Latin America. It was specifically here that the Komintern saw the weak link and expected the outbreak of revolution. The slogan was: "Follow our example. Do as they do in Russia." Such recommendations were made by **L. Trotsky** at the 4th and by **N. Bukharin** at the 6th congress of the Komintern. The Komintern seemed to be discovering Latin America. In this regard, there is obvious speculation in works by bourgeois historians published, in particular, in Peru and Costa Rica. They contain rebukes addressed to the Komintern. It is "accused" of exporting revolution, but at the same time the authors of these works try to prove that in our day there supposedly continue to exist "orientations" toward encouraging

Latin American communist parties to revolt. The speaker pointed to the importance of investigating the creative assimilation of Lenin's ideological legacy by communists on the American continent, the activity of the Komintern directed toward the use of this legacy applicable to the specifics of these countries, and the necessity for a new approach to the Komintern's assessment of the character of revolution in colonial and dependent countries.

In the unanimous opinion of participants in the discussion, the problem associated with the Komintern's assessment of Social Democracy and its tactic toward it must be a no less important direction of research.

The Komintern, **K. K. Shirinya** noted, was not aware of the entire contradictoriness of Social Democracy. In the process of formulating the policy of the united front in 1921, Lenin said that the masses must know of the possibility of trying all avenues so that they could be truly convinced of the impossibility of overcoming capitalism by Social Democratic means.⁹ Lenin considered it necessary to lend a competitive nature to relations with Social Democracy within the labor movement. The Komintern, however, mechanically transferred Lenin's assessment of Social Democracy of the World War I and Great October [Revolution] period (i. e., an extremely negative evaluation) to the '20's and '30's, when the Social Democracy situation had changed dramatically in connection with the emergence of fascism. And even though there were individual voices in Komintern stating that criticism of Social Democracy must be in the nature of clarification (according to Lenin's teaching), the dominant assessment of it was that it was the left wing of the bourgeoisie or even "social fascism."

The Komintern's assessment of Social Democracy, **F. I. Firsov** declared, was directly connected with its formulation of the tactics of the unified labor front. To the extent that its struggle against Social Democracy intensified, the process of formulating this front's tactics also became more complex. After Lenin's death, this struggle became still fiercer. Sectarianism was manifested and Lenin's principles were distorted in **G. Zinovyev's** approach to Social Democracy and to the problem of the united front. The task boiled down to the "exposure" of Social Democracy, which was placed on a par with fascism, while the tactic of the united front was understood merely as a maneuver serving that goal. As regards the problem of the united front, the cart was essentially placed before the horse. There must be thorough, comprehensive study of this important problem.

Discussing Komintern policy regarding Social Democracy, **Z. P. Yakhimovich** justified the need for formulating and studying the Komintern's implementation of this policy. There is also a need for researching the united labor front policy which was never implemented anywhere. Why, then, did the Komintern repeatedly return

to the examination of the same problems? In the speaker's opinion, this was to a certain degree due to the declarative nature of the decisions, as is evident from the documents.

The discussion's participants also noted that the existence of "blank spaces," of insufficiently studied problems is also characteristic of the period after the 7th Komintern Congress. At that time, the influence of Stalin's cult of personality was particularly strong and law enforcement agencies intervened in the activity of the Komintern and in the life of the communist parties. There is also need for a new approach to the study of the Komintern's position in 1939-1940. It is necessary, A. A. Galkin emphasized, to abandon general judgments and to frankly say that World War II did not start the way it was expected to. The Komintern proved to be entirely theoretically unprepared here. The array of forces had not been analyzed at the beginning of the war. Stalin's cult of personality also made itself known on this question. G. Dimitrov was compelled to speak and write the opposite of what he had defended in preceding years.

In his examination of insufficiently investigated problems of this period, F. I. Firsov discussed the topic "the Komintern and the Foreign Policy of the USSR." Bourgeois historiography depicts the Komintern as "Moscow's tool." We deny this statement. But there is also another question. At the 7th Congress of the Komintern, P. Togliatti warned that there must be no identity between USSR Foreign Policy and the Komintern. But we should also consider the fact that after the conclusion of the nonaggression treaty between the USSR and Germany, the term "fascism" even disappeared from the Komintern's open press. When World War II had already begun, the Komintern in its directives to communist parties, e. g., of Scandinavian countries occupied by Germany, continued to insist that Anglo-French imperialism was their main enemy.

L. Ya. Gabianskiy called attention to the fact that the very concept of the "functioning of the Komintern" changed during the war. In some parties, the decisions of the 7th Congress of the Komintern were in fact blocked. As regards communist parties in the Balkans, the role of the Komintern's central apparatus during the war years in developing the general positions of these parties grew even stronger, a fact that was expressed in the price determination of the situation and the communist parties' concrete tasks. Many of the IKKI's ties with European communist parties transpired at that time through Yugoslavia. The author noted the weak elaboration of the history of the activity of the Komintern during World War II and touched upon the work of the Informburo of communist parties—a rudiment of the Komintern—in the postwar years. The Informburo soon began operating in the same way as the Komintern apparatus because it was staffed with the same people. In the literature of socialist countries, the activity of the Informburo is directly linked to the Komintern.

The question raised by I. M. Krivoguz about the reasons for terminating the activity of the Komintern in 1943 and the doubt expressed by him regarding the activity of the Komintern apparatus in wartime evoked the objection of K. K. Shirinya. The dissolution of the Komintern, he observed, was essentially a change in the form of activity of the international communist movement. But this does not mean that the movement had dried up. To the contrary, it was on the rise. European communist parties, with the exception of the communist parties in Germany and Spain, had stepped up their work. The growth of partisan ranks and their influence intensified in the course of the antifascist struggle. At the same time, the relations of the Komintern with its sections in wartime were difficult and their effectiveness declined. However, after the defeat of fascist forces at Stalingrad, the parties became more active. Therefore, in K. K. Shirinya's opinion, it was more correct to say that the old form of interrelations became unacceptable, that it hindered the mobilization of antifascist forces. The communist movement did not wane.

The discussion was summed up by Professor L. M. Minayev, doctor of historical sciences; head, International Communist Movement History Department of the IML pri TsK KPSS.

The main result of our meeting, he said, is that there must be much more active elaboration of the most important directions of Komintern history.

The speaker then noted certain stereotypes which in his view characterized the activity of the Komintern: desire was taken for reality in the attempt to accelerate the revolutionary process; the view of the bourgeoisie as a class that is always wrong, that the proletariat does not always occupy correct positions; the Komintern took agitation and propaganda for theory and vice-versa; the degree of revolutionary maturity of the masses was clearly overestimated. The results of earlier research must be critically evaluated; everything that hinders the qualitatively new, dialectical approach, the new methods of analyzing the revolutionary process of the '20's through the '40's must be eliminated; study of the multifaceted experience of the Komintern must be used for all-round research on the problems of the modern communist movement.

The discussion helped to elicit various opinions on the given problems, on the search for ways of studying urgent problems in the history of the Komintern, helped to determine which of them have been faintly researched or not researched at all, and to pose a number of new problems. Points of departure are indicated for examining individual aspects in the activity of the Komintern; impetus was given for their creative elaboration.

Participants in the discussion were filled with concern for raising research to a new, higher level; made a

number of interesting proposals on activating the scientific process, on raising the role of the Marxism-Leninism Institute under the CPSU Central Committee in the restructuring of the social sciences in accordance with the demands of the modern stage in the development of Soviet society.

Footnotes

1. See *O deyatelnosti V. I. Lenina v 1917-1922 gg.* [On the Activity of V. I. Lenin in 1917-1922], Moscow, 1958; *Lenin i mezhdunarodnoye rabocheye dvizheniye* [Lenin and the International Labor Movement], Moscow, 1969; *V. I. Lenin—velikiy teoretik* [V. I. Lenin—the Great Theorist], Moscow, 1970; *V. I. Lenin i Kommunisticheskii Internatsional* [V. I. Lenin and the Communist International], Moscow, 1970; *V. I. Lenin i mezhdunarodnoye kommunisticheskoye dvizheniye* [V. I. Lenin and the International Communist Movement], Moscow, 1970; *Lenin v borbe za revolyutsionnyy Internatsional* [Lenin in the Struggle for the Revolutionary International], Moscow, 1970; V. V. Aleksandrov, *Lenin i Komintern* [Lenin and the Komintern], Moscow, 1972; F. I. Firsov, *Lenin, Komintern i stanovleniye kommunisticheskikh partiy* [Lenin, Komintern and the Formation of Communist Parties], Moscow, 1985.

2. See *Vtoroy kongress Kominterna* [The Second Congress of the Komintern], Moscow, 1972; *Tretiy kongress Kominterna* [The Third Congress of the Komintern], Moscow, 1975; *Chetvertyy kongress Kominterna* [The Fourth Congress of the Komintern], Moscow, 1980; *Pervyy kongress Kominterna* [The First Congress of the Komintern], Moscow, 1986.

3. See G. Z. Sorkin, *Probuzhdeniye ugnennykh* [The Awakening of the Oppressed], Moscow, 1968; *Komintern i Vostok* [The Komintern and the East], Moscow, 1969; *Lenin i natsionalno-osvoboditelnoye dvizheniye v stranakh Vostoka* [Lenin and the National Liberation Movement in Eastern Countries], Moscow, 1970; *Komintern i Vostok. Kritika kritiki* [The Komintern and the East. Criticism of Criticism], Moscow, 1978; A. B. Reznikov, *Strategiya i taktika Kommunisticheskogo Internatsionala po natsionalno-kolonialnomu voprosu* [Strategy and Tactics of the Communist International on the National and Colonial Question], Moscow, 1978; P. M. Shastitko, *Leninskaya teoriya natsionalno-kolonialnogo voprosa* [Leninist Theory on the National and Colonial Question], Moscow, 1979.

4. See Georgiy Dimitrov—vydayushchiysya deyatel kommunisticheskogo dvizheniya [Georgiy Dimitrov—Distinguished Figure in the Communist Movement], Moscow, 1972; Georgiy Dimitrov—vydayushchiysya revolyutsioner-leninets [Georgiy Dimitrov—Distinguished Revolutionary and Leninist], Moscow, 1974; Georgiy Dimitrov—vydayushchiysya revolyutsioner i teoretik [Georgiy

Dimitrov—Distinguished Revolutionary and Theorist], Moscow, 1982; *Zhizn, otdannaya borbe za sotsializm* [A Life Devoted to the Struggle for Socialism], Moscow, 1983.

5. The reference is to the preparation of chapters on the history of the Komintern for volumes 4 and 5 of the 7-volume publication *Mezhdunarodnoye rabocheye dvizheniye. Voprosy istorii i teorii* [The International Labor Movement. Problems of History and Theory], Moscow, 1976-1985.

6. See B. M. Leybzson and K. K. Shirinya, *Povorot v politike Kominterna* [The Turning Point in Komintern Policy], Moscow, 1965.

7. See L. Longo and C. Salinari, *Dal socialfascismo alla guerra di Spagna: Ricordi e riflessioni di un militante comunista*, Milan, Teti, 1976.

8. See *Kommunisticheskii Internatsional i kitayskaya revolyutsiya. Dokumenty i materialy* [The Communist International and the Chinese Revolution], Moscow, 1986.

9. See *Deyatelnost Iсполnitelnogo Komiteta i Prezidiuma I. K. Kommunisticheskogo Internatsionala* [Activity of the Executive Committee and Presidium of the Communist International], Petrograd, 1922, p 336.

5013

Career, Purge of Government Official Yan Rudzutak Detailed

18300031a Moscow OGONEK in Russian No 36, 5-12
Sep 87 pp 10-11

[Article by Igor Donkov and Aleksandr Nikonov: "Yan Rudzutak"]

[Text] 1917-1987. Yan Ernestovich Rudzutak, an active fighter for the victory of the October Revolution, steadfast Bolshevik, and major state figure, lived a short life. But he had sufficient time to do much for the inception and consolidation of socialism and to leave fond memories in the party and among the nation.

According to personal testimony given by military court chairman General Bernatskiy, the persons who had been arrested were kicked and beaten with rubber-coated sticks. All 22 arrested Social Democrats who had been taken to Vindava Prison, according to a medical finding, had "considerable signs of having been beaten." The prisoners remained silent.

The district prison in Mitava was famous for its rough conditions. That was precisely the prison where it was decided to send 20-year-old Jan Rudzutak. The young man was in the hands of the so-called volunteer noble police force that had helped the authorities to fight the revolutionaries. Whereas the court made at least some

attempt to substantiate the accusations, the volunteer police force did not need even the appearance of legality. Its rule was to murder people who were "attempting to escape." The detachment marshal, chief of the Vindava District police force, Baron Ropp first sent Yan to a "torture house" that was located in a forest area on his estate...

There the enemies of the revolution formed with their own hands the character of the professional revolutionary and representative of the brilliant galaxy of Leninists, Yan Ernestovich Rudzutak. The years of his life were 1887-1938...

Yan was born in a family of a Latvian farm laborer. He was a shepherd for a rich farm owner. For two winters he went to a parish school. After his very first conflicts with the owner, 16-year-old Yan quit work and left the area — without a passport or money, and despite his father's wishes.

Riga did nothing to welcome the young rebel — he found neither a job nor acquaintances. He roamed around the city streets and found random jobs: he paved streets, helped an orchard grower, was a porter in a theater... Life was not easy for him, but he tried to get an education — that is how the main attribute of the talented individual manifested itself. Throughout his life Yan Ernestovich had a love of the theater and of art, which he encountered for the first time not as a member of the audience, but as seen from the stage entrance, from behind the scenes, where he dragged around boxes filled with stage props and installed the sets.

The day when Yan spoke at the Otto Erbe Plant largely determined his fate. In the spring of 1905 the Bolsheviks had set up the operation of a print shop with Latvian type and for the first time waged an open campaign aimed at the organizing of trade unions. A participant in all these events was Yan Rudzutak, a young agitator. He learned how to speak, he argued, and he distributed leaflets. During the complicated period of ideological demarcations, Yan consciously and firmly followed the Leninists. That period in our party's history was very complicated. The retreat of the revolution, governmental terror... Being a Bolshevik threatened a person not simply with prison, but with death...

In January 1907, on an assignment from the Central Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Latvian territory, Yan Rudzutak restored the Vindava party organization that had been devastated by the gendarmes and he headed that organization. The police were absolutely incapable of arresting either the active Libikh or the mysterious Pumpur: those were the names behind which Yan Rudzutak hid! Although the secret agents probably encountered many times on the streets of Vindava a young person wearing the uniform of a student at Riga Nautical School. Nor did the police know that, in the guise of commercial freight shipments for

Kronberg and Rass, the city was receiving bales containing weapons and illegal literature, and envelopes bearing the notation "E.V.P." contained, in the guise of requests for cash-office reports, enciphered instructions from the Central Committee of the SDKL [Social Democratic Party of the Latvian Territory].

Of course, one cannot prepare a revolution while remaining invisible to the working masses. A revolutionary's life is a risk. Yan, an expert in carrying out secret illegal operations, took risks constantly. An agent provocateur put the gendarmes on his trail. The operation to capture "the very dangerous political criminal," as Rudzutak was called, was headed by General Astafyev.

Yan's skills at operating secretly left no evidence for the investigators. The fact that the defendant was a minor reduced his sentence: 10 years of hard labor. Yan was transferred from the Riga Central Prison to Butyrki Prison, where he was met by the phrase: "People never leave Butyrki alive"...

But he left it — after 10 years of solitary confinement: he was freed by the February Revolution. In Butyrki "solitary" Jan learned three foreign languages. Yearning for practical action, he got his first party assignment immediately after getting out of prison: the assignment of carrying out work among the Moscow textile workers. He lived a very strenuous life during those eight months until October. Active work in the Moscow Soviet of Workers Deputies, in the All-Russian Central Council of the textile workers union that he headed, frequent speeches and discussions at factories — getting only three or four hours of sleep a day... As early as September 1917, speaking at the All-Russian Conference of the textile workers trade union, he said, "We shall perish if we do not take decisive steps against the bourgeoisie. Just as we need air to breathe, we need our own controlling workers' apparatus! But the bourgeoisie will not yield its positions without a fight. What is beginning now is a life or death struggle against the propertied class."

October 1917. Yan has become one of the active fighters for the victory of the revolution in Moscow. Soon his activity took on a nationwide scale. During the first years of the young Soviet state, Yan Ernestovich worked as the chairman of the Moscow Sovnarkhoz [National-Economic Council], was a member of the Presidium of the VSNKh [All-Russian Council of the National Economy], Tsentrtekstil chairman, and general secretary of the AUCCTU, and headed the Main Administration of Water Transport.

The first meeting with V. I. Lenin occurred on 23 May 1918 in the Kremlin at a session of the VSNKh presidium. The warmest business relations were established between them. For more than five years Yan Ernestovich worked under the direct leadership of Vladimir Ilich Lenin, receiving instructions and advice from him and learning how to resolve state questions. Vladimir Ilich repeatedly advised Rudzutak, exchanged memoranda

and letters with him, and, of course, called him on the telephone and sent him urgent papers with notations: "To Comrade Rudzutak (from Lenin)," "To Rudzutak," "To Rudzutak: what has been done?"; and on several of them the words "Personal. Secret. To Comrade Rudzutak (from Lenin)." Unfortunately, many of these letters have not been found. Lenin would ask, when resolving important questions, "Have you spoken to Rudzutak?" He would ask his secretaries, "Please ask Rudzutak to communicate the details to me by cipher," "Can't you speed up Rudzutak's arrival?" On Yan Ernestovich's answers Lenin usually wrote "From Rudzutak" and left them among the most urgent papers.

Yan Rudzutak's official status changed kaleidoscopically. Most often he worked in several positions simultaneously. Vladimir Ilich trusted him completely and saw in him a like-minded person, steadfast revolutionary, and very experienced economic manager. Lenin confidentially gave Yan Ernestovich many important assignments, including those of an operational nature, which required organizational expertise, the ability to excite people's interest, and personal selflessness. In May 1919 Glavvod [Main Administration of Water Management] Yan Rudzutak went to Astrakhan with a mandate from Lenin in order to arrange there the shipment of necessary freight, including bread caravans.

Lenin's school! Vladimir Ilich's trust was the best support for Yan Rudzutak. And there was a rather large number of complicated questions — in trade union work, at the VSNKh apparatus, at the Genoa Conference, on the job in Central Asia, and when Yan Rudzutak was RKP(b) secretary.

His daily work required inhuman tension. More and more frequently he became aware of the consequences of the time spent in the cramped cells of tsarist prisons, the "perpetual" wounds from the shackles, and the exceptional physical overloads required by the first days of the Soviet authority. Major therapy, prolonged recuperation — no, Yan Ernestovich considered that to be an inadmissible luxury. He did not spare either his efforts or his health. It was only Vladimir Ilich's personal intervention that allowed the doctors to send Yan Rudzutak abroad for treatment. V. I. Lenin's 12-volume *Biokhronika* [Biochronicle] absorbed dozens of reminders and strict warnings about the need for urgent treatment: "I absolutely insist....," Vladimir Ilich wrote.

They met frequently. Obviously, they felt a large amount of personal satisfaction from the meetings. During the hours of rare relaxation they were drawn to one another. And of all kinds of relaxation, hunting was their favorite! Observant and attentive, Yan Ernestovich left behind intimate reminiscences about those meetings. Here is an episode that was related by Yan Rudzutak after one of these encounters with nature:

"A winter night. A stop for the night at a peasant hut. Ilich stubbornly refuses a glass of tea until all the others present have received their own share. His tin box with sugar is passed around from hand to hand... He starts up a conversation with the host about how life is treating them, what things are doing poorly, how the agencies and individual agents of authority have been offending them, and what the peasants thought should be done to eliminate the shortcomings. He was able not only to teach, but also to learn. And frequently, despite the winter cold, listening to what was being said by that great but at the same time simply and close person, it would seem that the board walls of the hut, the perpetual darkness, had been pierced by a shaft of spring sunlight and rivulets of bubbling, invigorating spring water had started flowing from person to person."

Vladimir Ilich supported Yan Rudzutak's propositions concerning the production tasks of the trade unions. At the height of a discussion about trade unions V. I. Lenin remarked in one of his speeches, "The last thing that I wanted to tell you, and for this I should have called myself a fool yesterday, is that I overlooked Comrade Rudzutak's propositions... This is a platform. It is a hundred times better than the one that was written by Comrade Trotskiy after thinking about it many times, and than the one written by Comrade Bukharin... after not thinking about it at all. All of us Chekists who have not worked for many years in the trade union movement should learn from Comrade Rudzutak..."

Pointing to the importance and the innovative spirit of Rudzutak's propositions, Vladimir Ilich wrote, "I personally feel that the crux of the entire discussion on 30 December was the announcement of Rudzutak's propositions... everything practical and substantial had been stated, adopted, and resolved by the trade unions, and, moreover, it was **before the question was posed at the Cheka.**" "Everything sensible and practical," V. I. Lenin felt, "went into Rudzutak's propositions, and in comparison with the others he had stated everything "not only more simply and more understandably, but also in a theoretically more correct manner... more reliably and more completely." It was precisely the RKP Central Committee, Vladimir Ilich remarked, that ought to be soundly castigated... "because it 'overlooked' Rudzutak's propositions and because of this error on its part had allowed the most empty discussion to develop"; the error had to be corrected. Lenin called upon the party members to "work together harmoniously *on the basis of Rudzutak's propositions.*"

Soon after the trade union discussion, Yan Ernestovich was elected general secretary of the AUCCTU.

In January 1922 the Central Committee Politburo, on Lenin's recommendation, included Yan Rudzutak as a member of the Soviet delegation to the international Genoa Conference. That conference was resolving the question of the payment of the prewar tsarist debts. The

delegation was armed with Lenin's instructions. It happened that People's Commissar G. V. Chicherin deviated from the instructions that had been received and promised Lloyd George that, if certain conditions were met, the former property holders in Russia would be granted the right to use their enterprises or to receive compensation for them. On the spot in Genoa it proved to be impossible to achieve any unity of views and Rudzutak was forced to get in touch with Vladimir Ilich. "I consider Rudzutak's opinion, as expressed in his 22 April telegram," V. I. Lenin wrote to the Central Committee Politburo, "completely correct." The following answer, as dictated by Lenin, was sent to Genoa: "Do not deviate from the Central Committee's directives."

Rudzutak also had happy moments linked with this diplomatic mission. For example, when he went up to the podium of the VTsIK [All-Russian Central Executive Committee] to report on the conference results, one could hear through the thunderous applause the facetious shout, "Why aren't you wearing tails, like a diplomatic is supposed to?" Yan Ernestovich answered jocularly, "All the tails have been hocked to pay off the war debts."

Yan Rudzutak made a large contribution to reinforcing the Soviet state system and the friendship among the peoples of our country. For a number of years his activities were closely linked with the Central Asian republics. He went there during the civil war years as the chairman of the VTsIK Turkkomissiya [Turkestan Commission] and the RKP(b) Turkbyuro [Turkestan Bureau], and then headed the RKP(b) Central Committee's Sredazbyuro [Central Asian Bureau].

It was here that one saw the complete revelation of the best qualities of the "very well-balanced" Yan Ernestovich Rudzutak, as Lenin described him. He warned against excessive infatuation with nationalization and socialization, and said that local peculiarities should be taken into consideration. In November 1919 in Tashkent he emphasized in his speech that "here in Turkestan we must take a very cautious approach. We cannot convert yesterday's owner into a communist. We must act here not with orders, but with persuasion, attempting to prove that our method is best."

In March 1920 Yan Rudzutak was appointed chairman of the Sovnarkhom [Council of the National Economy] of the Turkestan republic. "Comrade Rudzutak is the most desirable person in this respect," the recommendation of the Turkestan TsIK [Central Executive Committee] emphasized. Under his leadership, steps were developed to return the land to the working peasants, and decrees were worked out, which played an important role in attracting the working masses of the indigenous population onto the side of the Soviet authority and reinforcing the union between the working class and the peasantry.

On 25 June 1921 the Politburo called Yan Rudzutak back to Moscow to receive a report on the work that had been done. However, serious illness detained his departure. Lenin insisted on his receiving treatment locally. But the situation could not wait for that. So, on 5 August Vladimir Ilich told Dzerzhinskiy, "I've been told that Rudzutak will be arriving by 15 August, but I think we ought to speed up his arrival."

In 1922-1924 Yan Ernestovich was the chairman of the RKP(b) Central Committee's Sredazbyuro. After taking over the new job, Yan Rudzutak had frequent meetings with Vladimir Ilich. For example, on 23 September 1922 he had a two and a half hour conversation with the convalescing leader. Lenin's recommendations and ideas formed the basis of the report to the 7th Conference of the Turkestan Communist Party.

The 12th RKP(b) Congress in 1923 elected faithful Leninist Yan Rudzutak secretary of the RKP(b) Central Committee, while retaining him in his job in Central Asia.

In carrying out national-state demarcation and in resolving the national question in Central Asia, Yan Ernestovich saw great prospects. The results of the work of the commission of the RKP(b) Central Committee's Sredazbyuro were included in the draft of a resolution of the Politburo of the RKP(b) Central Committee, and on 12 June 1924 the Politburo adopted a decision concerning the national-state demarcation of the Central Asian republics.

Lenin's death greatly shook Yan Ernestovich. Together with other close associates of Ilich, he carried the coffin with the leader's body into the Mausoleum, which at that time was still made of wood. Speaking at a political meeting during those days of mourning, his voice was agitated as he said, "He was a great man, a beloved leader, a capable person who was uncompromising in his hatred of class enemies, a man who did not know the meaning of the word 'retreat.' The brilliant clarity of his ideas, the clarity of the tasks that he assigned to the party, the brilliant simplicity of his formulations and the iron resoluteness in carrying out the line that had been decided on distinguished Ilich. No one will ever replace him..."

In October 1924 Yan Ernestovich became the People's Commissar of Means of Communication. During the next six years of work he did much to develop the Soviet transportation management and to modernize its rolling stock. He personally tested the first Soviet-built diesel locomotive! Simultaneously he engaged in water transport, the building of ocean-going and river ships, highways... Yan Rudzutak actively participated in developing the Soviet state's economic policy and in resolving its specific problems. Up until 1937 he was deputy chairman of Sovnarkom, and then showed himself to be a very capable economist. He headed a state commission to organize the long-term financing of industry, and the

Committee for the Chemicalization of the USSR National Economy, under SNK [Sovnarkom]; he devoted a tremendous amount of attention to reinforcing the ties that science had with the practical aspects of socialist building.

Yan Rudzutak gave the following answer to those who said that the industrialization should be carried out at the expense of the peasantry: "We feel that those technical, material means and that organizational spirit among the working class that we have at the present moment are sufficient to assure that, on the basis of these elements, we will be able to build a socialist society in our state..." In 1929 Yan Rudzutak posed the question of "satisfying within the shortest period of time the consumer needs of the broad masses of the population." He viewed that task as a strategic one. Thus, Yan Ernestovich directed his contemporaries' attention to a factor that we today call the "human factor."

For a number of years Yan Ernestovich worked as the chairman of the VKP(b) Central Control Commission, and also as the people's commissar of the USSR Workers and Peasants Inspectorate. A highly educated, well-principled person aware of his high revolutionary duty, he distinguished himself in this assignment, showing himself to be a steadfast fighter for the party's general course and also an implacable enemy of all the opponents of Leninism.

Being by nature, as we would now call him, a "man of action," Yan Rudzutak was able to see behind the day-by-day concerns the prospects for the country's development and he always supported everything that was advanced.

Yan Rudzutak fought decisively for the introduction of Leninist style into the practice of economic work: "Our chief task lies not so much in exposing situations, as it does in preventing errors, in helping to correct the situation. This is basic. We must make evaluations and judgments about our work on the basis of those results that we obtain at the factories, plants, railroads, sovkhozes, and kolkhozes. Otherwise we will be chatterboxes, rather than communist fighters." How apropos those words sound today!

The 17th party congress elected Ya. E. Rudzutak as a candidate member of the VKP(b) Central Committee's Politburo.

Restrained in his manner of speaking and in his emotions, and with an appearance that was even gloomy, he loved and deeply understood people and art. Once A. V. Lunacharskiy jokingly said, "Yan, you're taking my bread away from me." Yan Ernestovich loved to go to the theater: the Malyy Theater, the Theater of the Revolution, the former Korsh Theater, and others. He never missed an interesting symphonic concert. He collected phonograph records, which people from the radio committee would frequently ask him to lend to them so

that they could be broadcast over the air. Frequent guests at his home were V. Kachalov, I. Moskvina, and M. Blyumental-Tamarina. He placed a high evaluation on the creativity of I. Kozlovskiy, S. Lemeshev, M. Reyzen, and V. Barsova. Since he had a good knowledge of painting, he was acquainted with many artists: V. Meshkov, P. Shukhmin, and others. He was an ardent movie fan. At one time his jobs included that of chairman of Goskinokomitet [State Committee for Cinematography], and V. Pudovkin and S. Eyzenshteyn found in him a real talent as a cinematographer.

Yan Ernestovich's life was tragically interrupted when he was at the height of his creative powers. It was only 50 years old... Outwardly, everything occurred unexpectedly and insidiously. On 24 May 1937 the newspapers published a congratulatory telegram from the party and government leaders to the conquerors of the North Pole. Yan Ernestovich noticed that his name was not among those who had signed the telegram! But he had been asked for his signature... Could it be that the journalists had made a mess of things again?... But there had been no "mistake." Recently Ya. Rudzutak had been losing friends and associates practically every day — they had been slandered and fired from their jobs, and had been evicted from the party. He had made attempts to intercede for some of them and had asked to have an attentive analysis of other people's "file." This had not helped much. So now it was his turn... His intuition had not deceived him. On that very same May day Yan Ernestovich was arrested at his dacha on Nikolina Gora. The accusation was stereotypical and absurd: "espionage for Germany." There was no court trial, no investigation. No one asked for explanations. There were no confrontations, especially with party leaders. And yet he had worked so many years hand in hand with them... For more than a year, a period filled with mental and physical sufferings, he did not confess his "blame." Yan Rudzutak categorically denied all the accusations. On 29 July 1938 Yan Ernestovich was executed by firing squad.

What had happened? Today we have learned a lot.

For a long time Stalin had disliked Yan Ernestovich — we do not know whether it was because he could not forgive him his closeness to Lenin, or whether he did not believe in his personal devotion, or whether, perhaps, he constantly sensed in him an opposing force, saw a competitor, an enemy of his actions and goals. He was a dangerous person! Lenin had called Rudzutak a "very well-balanced" person who "does not know how to talk loudly, impressively, eloquently." Lenin always supported him, listened carefully to his opinion, gave him the most important assignments... Stalin remembered Yan Ernestovich's objections to the reorganization that Stalin had proposed for the TsKK-RKI [Central Control Commission, Workers and Peasants Inspectorate] agencies despite Lenin's advice. He remembered that Rudzutak, a faithful student of Lenin's, a person who was pure and honest, well-principled and unusually consistent in his convictions and actions, a person who had

gone through the work school under the leadership of V. I. Lenin, was for Stalin unreliable in the situation that had developed in the country by the mid-1930's... He was not only unreliable, but also dangerous... Rudzutak was yet another victim of Stalin's, another victim of a person who could not tolerate people who were outstanding, large-scale, independent of mind, or with authority among the people. But, most important, he could not tolerate those who were true to the Leninist style of party life.

Paradoxically, against the background of the success of socialism in the country one felt the spirit of betrayals, investigation, and the search for "saboteurs." Stalin cynically explained the repressions that were being carried out by the need to purify the party and the country of "spies, murderers, saboteurs," and that would allegedly enable the Soviet system to become indisputably stronger. "In 1937," he said in March 1939 at the 18th VKP(b) Congress, "Tukhachevskiy, Yakir, Uborevich, and other monsters were sentenced to death by firing squad. This was followed by the election to the USSR Supreme Soviet. The election gave the Soviet authority 98.6 percent of all those who participated in the voting. Early in 1938 Rozengolts, Rykov, Bukharin, and other monsters were sentenced to death by firing squad. This was following by the election to the Supreme Soviets of the union republics. The election gave the Soviet authority 99.4 percent of all those who participated in the voting. One might ask where the signs of 'demoralization' are here, and why that 'demoralization' did not have any effect upon the election results."

That is Stalin's kind of arithmetic.

After the April 1985 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, a course was taken toward the democratization of life, toward *glasnost*. Our country's history needs the elimination of distortions, of "unexplored areas." It is necessary to rid history of dogmas and scholasticism, of canonized heroes. This is the time to carry out a direct, frank discussion about party matters and about the difficult path that has been traveled by the Soviet country, the glorious 70th anniversary of which we shall soon be celebrating.

We were all born by October. And it is important for history to work for today's needs, for creative purposes.

Yan Ernestovich Rudzutak will remain in the nation's memory. He possesses traits that we want to see in the leaders and representatives of our generation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda", "Ogonek", 1987.

5075

Author on 23-Year Effort to Write, Publish Litvinov Biography

18300029a Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Sep 87 p 3

[Unsigned article: "Narkom [People's Commissar] Litvinov"]

[Text] Author Z. Shteynis, who has written numerous articles on the fate of Russian revolutionaries, offers his new book *Maksim Maksimovich Litvinov: revolyutsioner, diplomat, chelovek* [Maksim Maksimovich Litvinov: Revolutionary, Diplomat, Person], which, after being "in mothballs" for 20 years, is being prepared for publication at the Publishing House of Political Literature, and he acquaints the reader with the life and work of Litvinov — comrade in arms to V. I. Lenin, and people's commissar of foreign affairs from 1930 through 1939. The following material provided to our newspaper by APN [Novosti News Agency].

Chapter One

In the fate of this book I would isolate three unusual chapters. The first encompasses the 17 years when I was collecting the documents and reminiscences pertaining to the life of M. M. Litvinov. It is simply impossible to list all the persons with whom I spoke — there were 96 of them. I would like, however, to mention Ivan Mayskiy, Semen Aralov, Boris Shteyn, Yevgeniy Rubinin, and Aleksandr Troyanovskiy — Soviet ambassadors. The persons with whom I spoke included not only famous figures, but also advisors, book reviewers, and secretaries who carried in their memory invaluable pages and lines of our history.

In 1964 I requested Litvinov's family to acquaint me with the family archives. Work with those archives was the most interesting phase of the research. That work lasted for many years, during which many hundreds of forgotten documents and old newspapers passed through my hands. I also drank tea with Ayvi [Ivy] Litvinova, the diplomat's widow, and his children — Tatyana and Mikhail.

For some reason my attention was attracted by the doors up into the attic, where, my archivist experience suggested to me, one can always find something interesting. After getting my hosts' permission to look inside, I happened to find a basket. Lying at the bottom of the basket was neither more nor less than Litvinov's "personnel folder," which contained, among other things, his passport as secretary of the Bolshevik colony in London and the only extant copy of the book *Bolshevistskaya revolyutsiya* [Bolshevik Revolution], which had been written and published by Litvinov in 1918 in London. The 1917-1918 English newspaper clippings that were found there included a *Times* report about a prisoner at Brixton Prison, Maksim Litvinov...

He was arrested in 1918 and put in the very same cell that had been occupied for several months previously by yet another outstanding representative of the galaxy of the first Soviet diplomats, Georgiy Chicherin (he was thrown into a torture chamber for carrying out antiwar propaganda in England). But Litvinov, who had not been officially recognized as an ambassador of Soviet Russia, was thrown into prison because, at meetings of British workers, he had told them about the first socialist revolution and the first workers' state. True, the door of Litvinov's cell (an ambassador is an ambassador, even if he is not recognized) bore a sign: "Guest of His Majesty"...

Chapter Two

This is only one of the episodes that were made part of the book manuscript, the work on which was completed in 1966. It was then that the second period of its complicated biography began. I got inquiries from publishing houses, including foreign ones. Soviet literary and historical journals printed chapters from the book. But the book itself was not published.

I turned for assistance to Anastas Ivanovich Mikoyan and asked him to write the preface. I do not know how difficult it was for him to make this decision, but on 17 April 1968 he gave me the preface.

But even the support from such an important person did not help: my manuscript remained on the shelf. On the initiative of Aleksandr Tvardovskiy, who was at that time the editor of *Novyy mir* magazine, in 1970 that magazine published an article with an analysis of the previously printed chapters. The article ended with the question, "When will this book finally be published?"

The question remained rhetorical for 17 more years.

On 28 October 1986 I sent a letter to Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, in which I described the book's 20-year history. On 26 February 1987 an MID [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] employee brought the manuscript to my home, together with the recommendation of the ministry's Administration of Diplomatic History that the book be published. The recommendation stated, in particular, "The tragic moments in M. M. Litvinov's life should not be obscured or smoothed over."

There were many such tragic "moments." Bolshevik Party member since 1898, friend of Lenin, and a person who, so to speak, had made a revolution with his own hands, Litvinov, saw and understood what was happening during the years of the Stalin personality cult. By all the methods that were accessible to him, he saved his party comrades, but he himself found himself on the brink of the precipice. One of the tasks of my book is to reveal the fate of the Leninist Bolshevik.

Chapter Three, Unfinished

I discussed the history of the manuscript on the pages of *Moskovskiy novosti* newspaper, in the article "A Long Path." After the article was published, the editorial office and I got a large number of responses. People expressed their satisfaction in learning that a book about the outstanding Soviet diplomat, whom one of the readers who telephoned called "the herald of peace among nations," would finally be published.

I will admit that I still harbored one secret hope: the publishing of the article would suddenly cause yet unknown documents of Litvinov's to appear. And so, suddenly, there was a telephone call from a lady living in Moscow who had kept a unique collection of Litvinov's epistolary heritage. Her mother, Rakhel Dudovskaya, during the years of the first Russian revolution, had worked closely with Litvinov and had helped him in his underground activities. That was the origin of these archives, from which I received 78 Litvinov letters pertaining to the years 1905-1908.

Here is one of them (which is being published for the first time):

"From Vienna to Genoa. 11 October 1908.

"Today I received your postcard from Rome, and according to my computations you must have already been in Paris. Obviously you must really be using your time wisely and hurrying. I'm proceeding full speed ahead to the Karlsruhe that I am longing for, keeping as short as possible my stops in Bern and Berlin. I plan to return from Berlin on the 17th or 18th. If you have time to write to me before the 16th, I will still have time to receive it in Berlin. I have already told you my address... Maks."

This is the brief history behind that letter. Early in 1906, on a quiet street in Paris, a certain Russian emigre opened up an office. The completely respectable appearance of a representative of a well-established firm, and his excellent knowledge of languages, enabled Litvinov — who was that "certain Russian emigre" — to become accepted at the boards of directors of the major weapons plants and to place production orders in the European capitals. Litvinov engaged in arms purchases on instructions from the Central Committee of his party — the Russian Social Democrats Party — for the armed uprising that was beginning in the Caucasus against the tsarist regime.

The opening of the office did not remain unnoticed by the tsarist secret police. At first its agents sent an enciphered telegram to Saint Petersburg. The telegraph reported that the office belonged to a certain Felkov, who might possibly be none other than the famous Russian revolutionary Maks Vallakh (Litvinov's real

name). Litvinov was subjected to round-the-clock surveillance, which was headed by Garting, the chief of station of the tsarist secret police in Western Europe...

The most interesting letters from the archives that were put at my disposal will be included in the first edition of the book, although they were already included in the work when I received them. I hope that there will be subsequent editions that are supplemented by new documents. The research is continuing.

5075

Distinction Between Terrorism, Political Assassination Explained

18300029b Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 87 p 2

[Article by Ye. Losoto, under rubric "Our Spiritual Values": "Precursors"]

[Text] On the eve of the 70th anniversary of October we turn to our revolutionary history. Our story is about people who, by their heroic struggle, brought the nation's victory closer.

Our subject is the true national pride of the Great Russians.

In this question there are currently so many points of view that one might think that the words "homeland," "patriotism," and "national pride" were only recently invented and that no one knows what is put into them, what their content is.

A few people intensively propose that people should be proud only of the preserved attributes of Russian backwardness, of the patriarchal system: those are the things which, in their opinion, are really "Rus"! A few others like the idea of a bell tower. A bell tower, in their opinion, best symbolizes the Victory over fascist Germany.

Thanks to *glasnost*, various trends have appeared. Any of them includes itself among the advanced ones and makes stentorian declarations concerning this, stating firmly that it is guarding the national relics and historic succession.

Under these conditions, Lenin's article "The National Pride of the Great Russians" reads as though it were written only yesterday.

This is how it begins: "How much people talk, interpret, and shout today about nationality, about the homeland!... One cannot figure out where the hired extoller of Nikolay Romanov's executor ends, and where the ordinary philistine begins, the philistine who, because of his obtuseness or his lack of character, 'floats along with the current.'"

Lenin writes that we are proud of the fact that the environment of the Great Russians "...gave us Radishchev, the Decembrists, and the Raznochintsy [non-noble intellectuals] of the 1870's, that the Great Russian working class created in 1905 a mighty revolutionary party of the masses, and that the Great Russian *muzhik* began at that time to become a democrat, and began to overthrow the priest and the landlord."

In this manner we proved the capability of giving to mankind "...great models of the struggle for freedom and socialism, rather than only great pogroms, rows of gallows, torture chambers, great hunger strikes and great subservience to the priests, the tsars, the landlords, and the capitalists."

As you can see, Lenin's view concentrated on the liberating, revolutionary values, on that which tore Russia out of its enslaved past and made it a leading world country in the social practice of the twentieth century. This is what is also the chief object of our national pride. This should also be our point of departure in conducting the "idea of historic succession."

The attitude to people who have fought for freedom has always been different. The philistine never did accept any revolutionary ideas or revolutionary changes. His ideal is a calm vegetative life. And also security for his wallet.

In public opinion there is rather widespread a distrustful, as well as negative, attitude toward second-wave revolutionaries. A good word about them can cause a protest.

I would like to cite examples from letters to the editor. Those letters were responses to previous articles in which, in one way or another, I touched upon the terroristic actions of the members of Narodnaya Volya [The People's Will].

Yu. Okunev, Leningrad, writes: "I would like to express my definite disagreement with the concept of the article 'Liberty.' Terrorism in all its types and forms was censured by democratic mankind as a whole, primarily by the Soviet Union and the CPSU. Therefore the article's apotheosis of terrorism and political assassination, especially in the tactless reference to Lenin, evokes indignation. It is calumny against the Russian nation. The nation censured the assassination of Aleksandr II. Terrorism was stigmatized by Tolstoy and Dostoyevskiy."

B. Golubev, Kemorovo, writes: "Lenin loved and treasured all of them, but never approved their suicidal tactics of individual terror, tactics that were senseless and simply useless, and even when the tsar executed his brother, he said, 'We'll take another path.'"

N. Kopylov, Moscow, writes: "Recently terrorists seized a plane in Pakistan, and once again the USSR stated in a definite manner that it does not support terrorism in any

form. As long as a hundred years ago Lenin said that we will take another path. Now, suddenly we read in an article about Chernyshevskiy a laudatory word about terrorists! Any terrorist would subscribe to your formula."

The confusion in the readers' mind between the members of the Narodnaya Volya and aircraft hijackers or other particularly dangerous criminals is, in and of itself, significant. It demonstrates how a particular external, secondary detail can be taken as the basic criterion for evaluating something.

And this is somewhat understandable, because it is immaterial what basis should be taken for making an evaluation, or what should be done if the true basis, say, has disappeared, has gone up in smoke.

Since we began to analyze less and less frequently various phenomena from the class-historical point of view, white has ceased being white, and black and ceased being black. Everything around us has become "complicated," "ambiguous," etc. Something that became fashionable in literature and commentaries on public issues was "doubt" about the existence of white and black, and it began to be good style to writhe like a snake between mutually exclusive positions. This could not help but have an effect on the state of public opinion.

Therefore I remind the reader that every negation is defined by that which it negates.

The opponent of the members of Narodnaya Volya is autocracy, tsarism. You will agree that the only thing that the exploding of a bomb in a Paris department store has in common with the events of 1 March 1881 is that a bomb was used in both places. But there the similarity ends.

Engels says: "the method of combat used by the Russian revolutionaries was dictated to them by the forced circumstances, by the actions taken by their opponents themselves." Then Engels reflects on the gentlemen "who, without any need, scholastically parody that struggle in Western Europe" — these people are "not followers or allies of the Russian revolution, but are its most vicious enemies."

Consequently, "parodists" are nothing new in the world. They appeared whenever an heroic phenomenon appeared, and then they turned themselves into a caricature of it. But let's not confuse a caricature with a real phenomenon!

In the history of revolution, the Narodnaya Volya movement is without a counterpart. There was never a party that engaged an enemy, in the literal sense, in a life and death struggle. The entire party was united by the gust of emotions, by the terrible hatred of tsarism. The entire party either perished or was thrown into prison cells. But

it never expected anything else for itself. The combat methods used by the members of Narodnaya Volya were such that their victory could be used to advantage only by other people.

The anthem of the revolutionary youth of the '80s was:

The blessed time will come
When from our bones
A stern avenger will arise,
And he will be stronger than we are.

Nothing remained other than how to heap the bones for the future. There was no other way. It was impossible for them to take another path. In order to take another path they needed a mature proletariat, which did not exist in Russia, and they also needed a revolutionary situation. Therefore the idea of self-sacrifice was the leading idea of the second revolutionary wave.

I often get the feeling that we have not yet made our way completely out of the nineteenth century. When you leaf through the pages of the literature of the past century, you encounter an astonishing similarity that the opinions of people who were by no means the advanced people of that time have with the opinion of many of our contemporaries. If you disregard the peculiarities of style, the essential similarity of the evaluations becomes even more obvious.

Take, for example, what the official publications wrote about the members of Narodnaya Volya in March 1881.

Let's begin with the liberals. Obviously, they rejected revolutionary methods of overthrowing tsarism. The liberals would have preferred a constitutional monarchy: so that everything would have done in the Western style — that was the ceiling of the liberal dreams.

Golos, 2 March: "Diabolical forces have perpetrated their dark villainous deed."

Molva, same date: "The purple-robed martyr has perished."

Russkiye vedomosti, 2 March: "The diabolical intent carried out its diabolical deed."

Let us leave the liberals and see what the obvious reactionaries said.

Sovremennyye izvestiya, 3 March: "The liberator tsar is in the bonds of death. Cry, orphaned Russian land! Cry, profaned Russian nation!"

Rus, 4 March: "The tsar has been assassinated. The Russian tsar, in his own country of Russia, in his own capital, bestially, barbarically, within everyone's sight — and by a Russian hand... Something unprecedented, something unheard of is happening in holy Rus!..."

Whether or not the reader wants this to happen, associations with the present-day frame of mind of certain "preservers of historical memory" inevitably arise...

And this is how the revolutionaries reacted:

P. Kropotkin: "The event of 1 March was a tremendous step forward to the future revolution in Russia, and those who prepared and carried out this deed, who sealed this exploit with their blood, did not sacrifice themselves in vain."

Kropotkin made a poster that was posted all over Geneva: "It is known that even during the Middle Ages a person's life was spared if the hangman's rope broke." In this way Kropotkin informed Europe about the habits of the new Aleksandr: Narodnaya Volya member Mikhaylov was hanged three times because the rope broke because of his large weight.

All of this brought back strong memories of the execution of the Decembrists: the ropes on their gallows also broke, and they also had to be hanged with new rope. The members of Narodnaya Volya continued the traditions of the Decembrists, and Aleksandr III continued the traditions of Nikolay I. "The idea of historical succession..."

In one way or another the question of assassinating the tsar alarmed everyone at that time. Yes, Tolstoy and Dostoyevskiy issued the appeal for something else: Tolstoy called for "self-improvement," and Dostoyevskiy for "patience." Unfortunately this is true. Subsequently Gorkiy will justifiably call these appeals shamefully ugly and close to vicious mockery.

The entire second revolutionary wave consists of brief vital lines that occur only during wartime. But it was a liberating war.

Pisarev, for example, a young, growing author and democrat who did not live to be 30 years of age, drowned at the Riga beach. He was a good swimmer, but his recent prison confinement had its effect. The policeman who had been assigned to him "for outside surveillance" (one must assume that this was as distinct from the "inside surveillance," to which another gendarme, who had an education in literature, was assigned), saw this, but did not move from where he was standing and did not call anyone.

If Shchedrin and Nekrasov had lived a complete life, the situation would have been calamitous. It is only thanks to the fact that they lived to the maturity of their talent that have the opportunity to oppose to the homily "be patient!" an opinion that is equal in artistic force but that is completely different.

The parable of the two great sinners from a poem by Nekrasov.

A robber repented his sins and became a recluse, but he was punished for what he had done: he had to saw through a tree with a knife.

Landowner Glukhovskiy told the former robber:

Old man, you ought to live the way I do:
No matter how many serfs I kill,
Torture, torment, and hang,
You can just see how well I sleep!
The enraged recluse murdered
the landowner with his knife.
As soon as the bloodied landowner
Fell face-down onto the saddle,
The huge tree came crashing down.
The echo shook the entire forest.
The tree came crashing down and
The burden of sins rolled off the monk!...

That is, Nekrasov described the execution of the despotic villain as a sacred deed.

After 1 March 1881 the new tsar lived his life as though he was under siege. Pobedonostsev instructed him, "Every night, before you go to bed, you must definitely make an inspection to see that the telephone lines are still intact. They can be cut easily.

"You must make an inspection every night, looking under the furniture to see that everything is in order," etc.

Pobedonostsev concerning magazines: "they are gossips," "we are suffering from gossips." "Freedom was finally given to the press, that most terrible gossip, which carries to all corners of the vast Russian land hostile criticism and reprimand directed at the authority..." This was the chief "ideologist" of the new reign. (Probably the only person who will surpass him is Rasputin, the favorite of the last tsarina.)

The attempt was also made to assassinate the new Aleksandr. The attempt was unsuccessful. The second 1 March in the history of Russia (this was in 1887) ended in failure. A group of Russian terrorists led by A. Ulyanov only lay down their bones for the future. The tsar's life remained intact.

Let us recall now how we began this article — with the national pride of the Great Russians. Lenin wrote, "The interest of the national pride (not in the serf's understanding) of the Great Russians coincides with the **socialist** interest of the Great Russian (and all other) proletarians."

Could we have assumed that trends would arise in our country which would pull us backward, and that there would even be those who would rest upon clerical values? However, that actually occurred. And not only because painful questions had come to a head, questions which have not yet been resolved, or because many

people know too little about the values of the liberation movement! Our hero (not "saint," but a real folk hero) Stepan Razin was buried on the territory of what is now the Mining Institute. There is not even a memorial plaque there! There is no monument in Moscow either to Razin or to Pugachev, although they were executed in Moscow. But no one knows about this. As for the churches that were destroyed or that have fallen down in ruins, you can't even count the number of stories, true and false!

In my opinion, it is necessary to do everything possible to shift the emphases, to shift the center of gravity to **our** values, to the values of the liberation movement.

In addition, it is necessary to remember (as applicable to any values that we are discussing) that the restoration of forms leads to a restoration of content. You cannot have one without the other.

We talk frequently about educating people in the revolutionary traditions. Those words would sound much stronger if the person saw around him the traces of revolutionary history.

It would be interesting to know whether there is at least a memorial plaque indicating the spot where the blockhead sat while performing his "outside surveillance," that blockhead who has gone down in history without his own name and is famous only because he did not lift a finger when he saw Pisarev drowning.

For one year less than a century, the Black Sea coast, near the waterfall in Novyy Afon, has been beautified by a stone plaque that reads:

This place
Was destined to be visited by
Aleksandr III Aleksandrovich

Then it states when he visited it, with whom, etc.

I certainly am not suggesting that that plaque ought to be chiseled off the cliff. But when a person sees only that kind of references to the past, he gets a distorted idea of how our history formed.

Soon after the fall of tsarism, Larisa Reisner visited the Winter Palace and noticed that the walls still bore the vulgar lithographs that were the favorite kind of art preferred by the ruling pair. What taste! With all the opportunities that they had, they chose that trash that we currently call "mass art"!

Currently we publish much that is "curious"... But couldn't we publish something of this sort that is not "artistic," but "documentary"? For example, *Rech'i i mysli gosudarya imperatora* [Speeches and Thoughts of His Majesty the Emperor]. Desiring to gain favor with Nikolay II, a publisher once published this little book, but it proved to be so scandalous that it was immediately

confiscated. But there probably is still a copy of it extant somewhere. Why not, then, show it to our people? This could be done in order to make the book available to everyone who wanted to get a copy, especially those who suspect that there are those who want to remove all knowledge of "Russian culture" from the people's memory. At the same time one could publish the tsar's telegrams, which sound so nice even to the beggar who lacks the money to pay for a normal sentence. "Happy saint's day, Niki." "Love and kisses, Niki." "Fond thanks. Love and kisses. Alis. Niki." "We are sorry that your aunt died while you were away. Love."

Lenin made no obeisances about the house of the Romanovs: other countries, he said, "...do not have such dimwits as Nikolay and Rasputin."

And now you and I will have to figure out what is meant by the phrase "We shall travel another path," which the authors of the letters borrowed from the painting of the same name, which depicts the young Lenin standing beside his weeping mother. And we will have to decide whether it is possible, by relying on the name of the painting, to deny the second revolutionary wave as having used improper means.

Class violence in the course of revolution is a necessity. History shows us that not a single upper class yields to entreaties to "be nice" and give back what it has stolen and to stop exploiting the lower classes.

Class violence is a revolutionary means. To deny that means to deny revolution in general. It means standing on the side of counterrevolution. (Obviously, at such time you can consider yourself to be anything you want — whether a "humanitarian" or the Pope — but this does not change the situation.) Lenin in April 1918, when the Mensheviks and the rightist Social Revolutionaries were shouting about the brutalities of the Bolsheviks, answered them by saying, "...yes, we do not deny the violence that is being carried out by us over the exploiters."

Did the Social Democrats reject terror? "From the point of view of principle, we never rejected and cannot reject terror. It is one military action which can be completely suitable and even necessary at a certain moment in the engagement, when the troops are in a certain condition, and under certain conditions."

That is, it is a question of tactics, and nothing more than that. The members of Narodnaya Volya did not have any choice. They did not have another path. The Social Democrats had a more successful path, since the proletariat had already matured, and "...without a working nation all bombs are ineffective, and are known ahead of time to be ineffective."

"Fortunately, those days have passed when, because of the lack of a revolutionary nation, the revolution was 'made' by revolutionary terrorists acting as individuals. The bomb has ceased to be the weapon of a solitary 'bomber.' It is becoming a necessary item in the people's armament."

I would like to emphasize: "because of the lack of a revolutionary nation." Therein is the crux of the matter.

Once again: "Fortunately for Russia, the time has passed when there was no one to 'go to the people' than the heroic solitary Narodniki... Russia moved ahead away from those sad times. The revolutionary proletariat in the fifth year [1905] found itself another 'path to the people,' another means of drawing the masses into the movement."

"That means was the revolutionary strike, a stubborn strike that shifted from place to place, from one end of the country to another..."

I think that it is sufficient for the words about the other path to be perceived correspondingly to their real sense.

Lenin felt that the members of Narodnaya Volya were the precursors of the Bolsheviks. However, the members of Narodnaya Volya themselves were not so sure that the Social Democrats were real revolutionaries.

In Minusinsk, where Lenin spent his exile, there were also old men who had been members of Narodnaya Volya: Kon, Tyrkov, and others. They kept to themselves.

A memorandum written by Lenin in 1920 reads: "I propose providing citizen Tyrkov, one of the last Mohicans of the heroic group of members of Narodnaya Volya, a participant in the March trial dealing with the assassination of Aleksandr II — citizen Tyrkov is currently in his extremely advanced years — with two or three *desyatinas* of land on his former estate and two cows for his family."

This is where I cross the final "t." This small everyday memorandum contains both effective aid to an individual and the history of the revolutionary movement.

5075

Inadequate Study of Tajik History Decried

18340404 [Editorial Report] Dushanbe TOJIKISTONI SOVETI in Tajik on 18 August 1987 carries on page 3, under the rubric "Problem and Consideration," a 1500-word article, "Knowledge of History Is Self-Knowledge," by Abdullo Mirboboyev, a candidate in history and scholarly fellow of the A. Donish Institute of History of the Tajikistan Academy of Sciences. The article opens with the statement that "Today the teaching of history in the republic's schools is done in such a way that students

know the history of Greece and Egypt, Rome and China better than the history of Tajikistan." There has not yet been any substantial restructuring of the study of Tajik history at the Ahmad Donish Institute of History of the Tajikistan Academy of Sciences.

From the start of the Soviet era to the present, the distinctive feature of the study of Tajik history is that it has been done in Russian. The teachers of "all the contemporary Tajik historians" are basically scholars in Moscow and Leningrad. Little has been published for Tajik readers and, until recently, the quality of what was published was poor. (The two outstanding exceptions are B.Gh. Ghafurov, "Concise History of the Tajik People," and M.M. Dyakonov, "Ancient Civilization of Tajikistan.") In recent years the situation has improved, especially since the publication, first in Russian, then in Tajik, of Ghafurov's "The Tajiks" (TOJIKON), which greatly influenced people's consciousness. Tajiks' interest in the past increased, especially among the young. This was demonstrated by the welcome Tajik readers gave master S. Ulughzoda's "Soghdian Tale."

However "our" historians were not influenced by this heightened interest in the past. Scholars at the Ahmad Donish Institute have published only a handful of books in Tajik in the past 30-40 years; some of those would only interest professional historians. Some historians work on old topics and use old methods of inquiry, which do not meet the demands of contemporary historical and sociological scholarship. For example, the study of village life has become an important subject in recent years. However it is not studied in terms of village reality but on the basis of newspapers, journals, archival documents, and other written sources.

There are many unresolved problems in Tajik historical scholarship. This is where restructuring ought to begin, especially as regards the quality of historians. There are now 31 holders of the doctorate in history working in scholarly institutes and universities [in Tajikistan]. Eighteen of them specialize in party and contemporary history, 8 in the second half of the 19th and early 20th century, 2 in ethnography, 1 in ancient Greece, 1 in the early Middle Ages, and 1 in archeology. Two of them deal with subjects outside Tajikistan. There are 57 holders of the candidate's degree in history at Tajikistan State University and the Ahmad Donish Institute. More than 40 of them specialize in contemporary Tajik history. Only 18 work on various topics in Tajik history from the stone age to the October Revolution. No one specializes in research on the Middle Ages. Yet there has been controversy which has caught the attention of the center over the origins of the Tajik people and culture.

Of the 180 people employed at the Ahmad Donish Institute, only 80-85 are engaged in scholarly activities. The institute which studies earthquakes employs more than 700 people. This year even the small funding

allocated for organizing archeological personnel was cut. The existence of archeology is now in danger. Economizing in archeology is a blow to the ancient roots of the people's culture.

To improve the situation the number of scholars at the Ahmad Donish Institute should be increased several fold and the institute's structure should be strengthened. New departments should be opened at the institute. New, topical subjects on history and culture should be introduced.

According to Mirboboyev, Master Sotim Ulughzoda expressed the opinion that knowledge of the stories of one's own people and the wisdom of one's ancestors is a great help in moral education. However, Mirboboyev says that some leading figures in the Ministry of Education have rejected this truth for many years. Nowadays people talk about young people's insularity, craving for possessions, drug use, lack of interest in moral values,

and lack of interest in the cultures of other peoples. The teaching of history is an important issue in this regard. In recent years in Tajikistan a generation has grown up which is ignorant of the history of its own and other peoples.

For many years teachers and scholars have proposed that the history of Tajikistan be taught as a separate subject in Tajikistan's schools. Nothing has come of this. The new education program for teaching history in the republic's schools allocates an "insignificant" number of hours to the study of Tajikistan's history. The teaching of Tajikistan's history also is not good in higher and specialized middle schools and is not taught as a separate subject. No one has considered the experience of other union republics in this matter. The textbook "History of the Tajik SSR" exists in name only. Mirboboyev asks why Tajik historians make no effort to write a good textbook.

Aytmatov Gives Letters, Comments on Bilingualism

18000049 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 24 Sept 87 p 3

[Commentary on readers' letters by Chingiz Aytmatov: "Letters on Internationalism: Chingiz Aytmatov: My Commentary"]

[Excerpts] Dear Editors!

Here are a few letters from my readers' mail. I think that these letters, which touch in such a direct manner on one of the most vitally important aspects of present-day reality—the subject of internationalism, will find a lively response in the minds and hearts of people.

It goes without saying, every letter speaks for itself and all the same I would like to make use of the opportunity to comment a little in this connection.

Above all, these letters once again indicate that the national question in its present-day state, is a question not so much of obvious proclamations and loud slogans, to which we gave preference during the past years to the detriment of the search for constructive ways of improving multi-national integration, as a question of the most vital practice, a question of urgent social tasks that require modern concrete solutions.

I had the opportunity to express my attitude toward these problems in a lengthy interview with *Ogonek* this year (No 28), a journal which, since the coming of restructuring, has become exceptionally popular in the country, where, referring to aspects of the international formation of the individual, I tried to focus special attention on the conception of bilingualism as the most important linguistic task in the present-day republics.

Such letters strengthen me in my conviction that the path of bilingualism is the main road and, moreover, the only correct road advanced by the very reality of our life, where the Russian language, which for all of us has become a means of everyday vital functions and a world-linking bridge, in the conditions of bilingualism acts in the role of consolidator and guarantor of the national language co-functioning with it in one or another cultural region. This is an extremely complex process of cultural interaction, which is not spontaneous but is regulated and directed, and therefore contains the possibility of the harmonious combination of national interests, and in this lies its phenomenal nature for the 20th century; it is possible that in this is contained one of the still undiscovered advantages of socialism. In any case, this unusual phenomenon underscores the potential and merit of the Soviet experience, which has granted equal possibilities of participation in it to all social strata and ethnic groups. Bilingualism is an especially general and international matter.

Is this not what the remarkable letter of Anatoliy Kuzmich Tukhin is all about. Read it carefully. Those are the kinds of relations we must cultivate among us, living on one earth, working hand in hand. He is not at all indifferent to the problem of mastering the native speech of the Kirghiz urban youth. But what is the historical significance of the Tukhin letter—what times and what fates are revived in the mind, you see, internationalism has always been a matter of reason and the best rules of the national community. Not yet knowing the meaning of this term, our illiterate ancestors lived by the laws of internationalism. And how the content of socialist internationalism was enriched since that time, you see with this is connected our entire vital activity in all spheres—in the economy, culture, science, in social and political construction. Such facts once again underscore the necessity of serious scientific generalizations on a new level of international experience, taking into account the significance of a practice that is becoming increasingly enlivened and the prospects of bilingualism.

Perhaps I am digressing, but I cannot but say, in concluding, the letter of Anatoliy Kuzmich—here it is, the real nature of the Russian man: His democratism, his magnanimity, and, if it can be expressed this way, his world capacity, this is how I interpret the Kirghiz word "aykeldyuk".

The letter of Dzhumash Ibrayevich Koychumanov, a veteran and an exemplary figure in public education of the republic, is on a somewhat different plane. The letter has the character of an article. And this is not surprising. He has something to say, he is a specialist, who for many years has been working at the career of school and scientific pedagogy. If the departments of public education, beginning from the Ministry of Education, of the oblast, rayon and city institutions would only take the trouble to extract from these valuable discussions any practical sense for themselves! You see, there are more problems of school education in the republic than a person has hair on his head. But no, the restructuring is not being felt—the bureaucratic thinking of many years, departmental seniority systems and instructions, which lessen responsibility and justify stagnation, are still strongly embedded, like the corners of an old door. Quite recently, when I was in Latvia, I had the occasion to visit one rural school, a sovkhoz school, incidentally, a bilingual one—I do not intend to talk about this, what kind of school, what kind of equipment—it is useless, since our backwardness in this, even in Frunze itself, is so striking, as between the past and the present centuries. And correspondingly—the figure of the teacher, his knowledge, his methods of instruction, and his relations with his students—for us, very likely, a utopia up to now.

And all the same it is necessary to think, to search for ways and means for a revolution conducive to renovation of school affairs—how to organize the studies so as for every student to be trained at the level of the personality of the 21st century. I am not saying this for the sake of being witty. This is demanded by the world

development of knowledge, the supertechnologization of work and life, this is demanded by history, if we do not want to inflict irreparable harm to the fortunes of socialism. I did not mention, and there is no exaggeration here—the further perfection of socialism depends on the school, above all on the school, this is how the question of its absolute significance stands at present.

And again we must bear in mind in so doing that we are a multinational society and in connection with this we have our superproblems and supertasks. For this reason it is so important to accent attention to the letters from the provinces, for example, the letter of the school figure. How many practical and at times crying questions there are in it. And here it is not difficult to imagine what a lot of untouched territory for initiatives and special programs opens up for radio and television. Without this, the school cannot be raised to the modern level. But our republic "TV", in particular its Kirghiz broadcast, is not even thinking about this. . . .

Along with this and interrelated, though not directly but relatively, among all the problems of international education I would like to emphasize one ethnopsychological problem of a special quality. For us now this is very important to interpret it correctly, extremely important, as never before. The question is the category of "national consciousness". Quite recently, apropos of this, it can be said, an Italian television film crew visited Frunze, and following it—diplomats of the French and West German embassies. What interested them in our discussions was, first of all, precisely this: What is the role of national consciousness of the Central Asian peoples in the period of restructuring and glasnost, and does this factor not display a certain "dissonance" in the overall system of the spiritual and international values of Soviet society as a whole that have taken shape. The interviewers, very likely, somewhere in themselves concealed an, even if unclear, hope for the possibility of an "intranational" point of view, which could confirm certain conclusions on this account of some Sovietologists and futurologists in the West.

The question is sufficiently serious and is not accidentally being made topical from the outside, and in this connection, it seems to me, it is necessary to clarify and to substantiate broadly and thoroughly, proceeding from history and the practice of the international community in the Soviet era, the conception of the national consciousness of the peoples that have passed the stage of capitalism and are now developing in the conditions of bilingual cultures. This pertains, first of all, to the Kirghiz socialist nation.

Science is not my competence, I may be mistaken, but I believe it to be my duty to set forth my internal vision, which reduces itself to the fact that our present-day national consciousness is a new socio-ethnic component in history, a special ethno-historical-psychological datum that has taken shape and has been formed under the enormous influence of Russian culture and the entire

extent of the spiritual and intellectual experience of the Russian people. In this [lies] the synthesis and the phenomenal nature—the influence of Russian culture led to new thinking and to new self-understanding on a national scale. No matter where we turned—to economics, to science, and especially to the sphere of spiritual values, whether literature, theater, painting, music, the cinematographer [as published], and, what is the main thing, the Kirghiz literary language, which exists along with the operative bilingual linguistic situation, increasingly becoming the norm of national self-expression—in everything that goes into the concept of the national "I", the unfailing Russian influence, as a force of international principle, is invariably read out. That is the historical texture, that is the fundamental situation, those are the objective factors of the origin and the acceleration of the new, socialist type of national consciousness, which entail the distinctive and the general, the "separatism" and the collective, and which includes the Russian culture as a national acquisition, carrying in it as the synthesis of the international world outlook, traditions and innovations, features of the past and features of the present. Already by the nature of things, such consciousness cannot appear in the role of a "dissonance" factor, since thereby it will deny itself, its history, and its reality. But no historical objectivity permits such "nihilism" with respect to itself. It seems that my interviewers came to approximately the same conclusion. . . .

The attempt to discover the sense and meaning of such a psychosocial phenomenon in our day must be conducted on all levels of science, journalism, art and literature, this must enter into school education activities.

It is important to state this now, when some feeble efforts of nationalism are observed in everyday life and the social sphere, when a struggle is being waged against them. But one thing is clear—such manifestations do not spring from national consciousness, but in defiance and contradiction to our national spirit. And for this reason we are uncompromising with respect to everything that prevents our international consolidation.

That is the nature of the problem of some aspects of modern internationalism, that is the reason for my attention to readers' letters, which contain the truth of life "at first hand." Read with what touching neatness the letter-memoir of Yevlaliya Genrikhovna Rober from Krasnoyarsk is executed, and although it contains small compliments addressed to me, I thought it possible to publish it since I am not so old already that such comments could have a strong influence on me. The value of the letter does not lie in this, but in the fact that internationalism in essence is a primordial virtue common to all mankind, and it is necessary to sow and cultivate it, this virtue, among the new generations.

And here, finally, the most complex and, I would say, most topical letter on which I should dwell. If all the previous letters were letters of people of the old generation, people who have made history, this epistle belongs

to a young person, a representative of our numerous young generation that is entering history—Damir Orozbayev (for a number of reasons I have changed his name) from the village of Chuy near Tokmak. The—in terms of its typicalness and openness—highly striking letter of a student of a vocational-technical school, talking about a great deal, what must still be thought out, what must be improved and adjusted in the system of school and pre-school instruction, once again recalling the necessity of the opening of Kirghiz kindergartens in the cities, about which there has been a great deal of talk. Like nothing else, this letter confirms the historical necessity, fruitfulness, and constructive character, in the long term, of the bilingual Russian-Kirghiz model of culture, which in a reasonable way combines both national and international interests. I hope that this letter will not remain outside the field of vision of the Ministry of Education and the Chuy Rayon organizations.

And as far as the self-irony of Damir Orozbayev is concerned, it goes without saying that he is not a “kelesoo” [not further identified] and not a “fool”, but, on the contrary—a very intelligent and thinking fellow. And, as they say, God willing, he will be so in the future as well.

That, as a matter of fact, is the little that I wanted to add to the letters I have mentioned, as the grateful addressee

[Signed] Chingiz Aytmatov

P.S. In one of the letters, the name of Nikolay Chekmenev, the great Kirghizstan novelist of the Fifties and Sixties, appeared briefly. To this good name, I would also add the names of the writers Nikolay Udalov and Sergey Fiksin. Here was a galaxy of real internationalists! For me, there are not nearly enough of them, but somehow I don't see a young generation approaching. And I am sorry, I worry. . . . But perhaps it will come, we will hope so. . . .

Hello, dear fellow-countryman Chingiz Torekulovich!

I would like to share my life impressions, which from the years of my youth have left a deep trace that is connected with the national question.

I read your article—talk published in the newspaper *Izvestiya* on 20 June 87 entitled “The Demand for a New Vision of the World” and I remembered my distant and dear childhood, which was closely linked by one golden chain during my entire conscious life in Kirghizia through the sincere love of the children of the various nationalities. For a long time I have understood the precious expression of Myasnikov—V. I. Lenin's secretary: The word communist rings loudly. But it must also be pronounced with great sanctity, and this strengthens me in my life, being in the ranks of the Communist Party for 45 years already.

Disagreements of one sort or another in the various formations in society have been and will be, that is the dialectical course of history, some of the disagreements are accompanied by grief and sorrow, others are resolved in a peaceful, reasonable manner, and here I would like to speak once again about the past of my distant childhood.

My parents were the example in large things and small, they lived, as I have already said, in the vicinity of a range of multinational families, such rapprochement played an exceptional role. Sometimes insignificant conflicts occurred between the neighbors and the children, but they were solved peacefully then and there. The neighbors understood each other, especially when grief occurred in the family, they tried to provide material and moral support, and thus my consciousness was formed in childhood. Well-educated children is the guarantee of respected people in the future, a well-cultivated fruit tree is the guarantee of a harvest. Is it not so? Some have hated me for my views, but I continue to keep pace with life, although I am already old.

At the present time young families live in my neighborhood, which have children of up to 8 years in age, and it hurts me, looking at them—how is that, these children are losing their native language, the parents, in the presence of their children, speak only in Russian, I have frequently turned to the parents and have said, teach the children their native language as well, besides the Russian language, so they can be valuable individuals for themselves and for others. To know two languages, that is already wealth, I know this from myself—it is good that I know the Kirghiz national language, already since 1932.

We, the people of Kirghizstan, are extremely grateful to you from all our heart, Chingiz Torekulovich, for the progressive views and ideas that serve the cause of the simplification of internationalism. If national languages have a small circulation, this does not mean that they need not be studied, but, on the contrary, a broad path must be opened to them, the latter will be intensified and perfected, and this will have an effect in all spheres of national transformation. I feel pity for people who through their thoughtlessness at times hinder our achievements and try to conceal or to bury the best national traditions.

The years passed, and with them came old age, but I have never abandoned one simple thought about the development of the Chaykhany in Northern Kirghizia.

In the past, the beautiful Chaykhany served as a fine place for the intercourse of people of different nations, and thereby for a long time played their role in the rapprochement of nations, but with the passage of time the Chaykhany for some reason departed from life. The Chaykhany, as a cultural breeding ground, are needed now in the period of restructuring. As such a place for the

construction of the Chaykhany I propose the left bank of the Ala-Archa River, which blends well into the general ensemble of the Osh Bazaar.

Help us, the people of Kirghizstan, Chingiz Torekulovich, in the creation of a network of Chaykhany and the dekhkanin [peasant] houses, and not only in the territory of the city of Frunze, but also in the oblast and rayon centers of the republic, in our day this will be traditional and new.

Good-bye.

Success to you in your writing career.

[Signed] A. Tukhin

City of Frunze

Dear Chingiz Torekulovich, possibly my reflections, which I have set forth as a short article, will be useful to you.

A meeting of the republic party aktiv, which at the beginning of the year had discussed the question "On the Tasks of the Party Organization of Kirghizia in Regard to the Strengthening of International and Patriotic Education in Light of the Demands of the 27th CPSU Congress," wrote in its resolution: "To fundamentally improve the teaching and study of the native and the Russian languages."

How improve? What must be done for this? I, a pedagogue with many years of work experience, both in schools and in pedagogical educational institutions, would like to speak on the questions of improving the study of languages in this case, as a means to strengthen the friendship and cooperation among peoples.

What is to be done?

Proceeding from Leninist instructions and the restructuring of the work of schools in the light of the new demands of the party, it is necessary to revise and change the attitude toward the study of the native language in the non-Russian schools. As is well known, V. I. Lenin showed special concern for this. In the article "From Materials for the Revision of the Party Program," (April-May 1917), he set forth the tasks of our party in the following way: "The right of the population to obtain an education in its native language, which is guaranteed by the creation, at the expense of the state and the organs of self-government, of the necessary schools for this, the right of every citizen to make himself understood in his native language at meetings, the introduction of the native language on a level with the state language in all local public and state institutions, and the abolition of an obligatory state language." In the "Draft Resolution of the RKP(b) Central Committee on Soviet Power in the Ukraine," composed by Lenin on 21 November 1919, he, on behalf of the RKP(b) Central Committee imposes

the duty on all members of the party "to promote, by all means, the elimination of all obstacles to the free development of the Ukrainian language and culture. . . ."

In the 1930's quite a bit was done in the republic, the achievements of the cultural revolution in fact signified, above all, the mass school instruction of the local population in the native language. However, in spite of this, beginning in the 1960's the number of the hours envisaged for the study of the Kirghiz language has decreased from year to year (this was done in connection with the fact that in the curriculum the hours for the study of the Kirghiz language, as also at the present time, were not firmly stipulated on a union scale, and, therefore, a trend of the reduction of the volume of native language study struck roots among union republic "specialists." As a result, the schools with Kirghiz language instruction could not guarantee the comprehensive and harmonious development of the students and turned out semi-literate people, who had a weak command of the foundations of the sciences.

Thus, what is to be done? Where to start the restructuring of the teaching of the native language in the non-Russian school? First of all, we must be strictly guided by the Leninist principle of the equality of the languages. Secondly, we must restore the hours envisaged for the study of the native language in non-Russian schools and equate them with the hours envisaged for the study of the native language in Russian schools. Thirdly, we must improve the quality of textbooks, having announced open or closed competitions for the creation of the best textbooks. Fourthly, for the improvement of the methodical work in regard to the improvement of the teaching of the native language in the school, we must have a printed publication of 3-4 author's sheets in length that is published on a monthly basis. Fifthly, we must conduct a republic meeting of teachers and workers in public education, with the participation of writers, journalists, and workers of the secondary and higher education institutions and discuss the question of the improvement of the study of the native language and literature in the Kirghiz school.

What is the state of affairs in our republic with respect to the study of the Russian language in the non-Russian schools? How to restructure the teaching of the Russian language in light of the new requirements? It must be kept in mind that the study of the Russian language by the children of the non-Russian nationalities has not only great formative significance and gives them access to the progressive Russian culture, but also great educational significance—it brings all peoples of our Homeland closer together, and, what is the main thing, it fosters a feeling of love for the most revolutionary people in the world—the Russian people. "The knowledge, besides the native language, of one common language—the Russian language—will bring all peoples of the USSR still closer together," N. K. Krupskaya pointed out. As a matter of fact, the Russian language became the language

of inter-nationality intercourse, the language of friendship and international cooperation. "Along with the Kirghiz language, embodying the experience of previous centuries and generations," the national writer of Kirghizia, Chingiz Aytmatov, declared from the platform of a meeting of the republic party aktiv, "the Russian language is a vital necessity for us." Through this he expressed the attitude of our people to the study of the Russian language.

However, it must be stated openly that the graduates of the non-Russian secondary schools have a poor command of it, although they were allotted 5 hours a week for the study of Russian language in all classes, beginning with the second half of the first class. They are not only unable to write compositions (according to the program they must write a composition upon finishing the school), but also an exposition. Many graduates do not even cope with dictations of 7th grade scope. The practice of many years has convincingly shown the impossibility of instruction in a second language of persons who do not have a sufficient knowledge of the first—native—language. The mistake of our methodologists consists precisely in the fact that, by pushing aside their native language, they aspired to attain improvements in the study of the Russian language. But such a formulation did not at all meet the Leninist principles of the equality of languages and did not produce the desired effect.

No less an important means of inter-nationality education of pupils is the study, by Russian children (more precisely, with the children of Russian schools), of the language, everyday life, and history of the local nationality. As if developing and continuing the concern of V. I. Lenin about seeing to it that in all Soviet institutions in the Ukraine "in the future all employees could make themselves understood in the Ukrainian language," N. K. Krupskaya, who on his instructions took up questions of public education and the communist education of young people, emphasized the importance of the study, in school, of the language, everyday life, and history of the surrounding population.

It should be stated that in our republic in the past during the 1960's the study of the Kirghiz language (beginning with the 3rd grade through the 9th grade for 2 hours per week) was formally included in the curriculum of Russian schools, but without teachers specially trained for this subject, without textbooks and learning materials. Such experience, it goes without saying, was not successful and led to the disappointment of many parents, who wanted to have their children instructed in the Kirghiz language. If one takes into account that in such schools in the rural locality basically Kirghiz children are instructed (even up to 99 percent of the total number of pupils), it is clear that they (their parents) did not have the possibility of instructing their children, not in the second, but the first, the native language. As a result, these children were not able to receive comprehensive development.

[Signed] D. I. Koychumanov, Outstanding worker in public education of the KiSSR

Hello, Chingiz Torekulovich!

I am a pupil of the city vocational-technical school, i. e., a future machine operator. I love to read, I have a great interest in literature, I love your books.

But at home, with my parents, in particular my mother, I have conflicts precisely along this line, i. e., about literature. She forever reproaches me for not studying Kirghiz literature, for not knowing Kirghiz customs, i. e., for not knowing how to conduct myself, especially in everyday life.

In the schools very little is mentioned about Kirghiz literature. My parents compel me to read *Manas*, *Er Toshtyuk*, *Kurmanbek*, and other Kirghiz literature. But I understand with difficulty, I can even say that a great deal in them I do not understand. I wonder, why do people laugh at me when I speak Kirghiz? Because of this I have ceased to speak the Kirghiz language altogether.

Now my parents regret that they gave me up to the kindergarten, and then to the Russian school, and "lost" their son, since among the Kirghiz I am a "kelesoo", and among the Russians "a fool." Sometimes I, indeed, consider myself to be a fool: I do not have national pride in me because I am very far from national music, literature, Kirghiz history and language.

I think I am not the only such person. A great many of the young people of my age, even if they are not Kirghiz but other nationalities, who live and were born in my republic, do not know their native language, their national music, even despise it, and say that it is funny to listen to the komuz [Kirghiz instrument].

Chingiz Torekulovich! I think, since restructuring is going on all throughout our country, and here in our republic as well, perhaps you will help so that the Kirghiz language, the literature and history of the republic, and its geography are taught in Russian schools. I have heard that this is done in other republics of our country. Then there would be genuine internationalism, then there would be few "fools" such as I.

Pardon me, perhaps I did not state my thoughts this way, but I ask you, advise me on how I am to live and to conduct myself. I love you very much and am very proud of you.

[Signed] Damir Orozbayev

Chuyskiy Rayon

By the way, not even in our rayon center is there a Kirghiz school. Children who want to study in a Kirghiz school travel to the villages Ak-Beshim and Zhany-Zhol. This is very difficult!

8970

Resolution on Preservation of Historic Moscow Detailed

18000046 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 127, 24 Oct 97 pp 1,2

[Unattributed report: "In the USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has passed a decree "On the Complex Rebuilding and Building up of the Historic Center of Moscow during the Period to the Year 2000", in which it is noted that the center of the capital, with the Kremlin, Red Square, the mausoleum of V.I. Lenin, with its many historic and cultural monuments, and its system of squares and thoroughfares, is inseparably connected in the minds of the Soviet people with the history of their motherland and with the establishment and development of the world's first socialist state. Long-range plans for rebuilding and building up the center of the capital have important political meaning for the entire Soviet people. Preservation of the unique appearance of the historical surroundings in Moscow's center, the protection and restoration of the historic and cultural monuments and the important historical structures located here, should be considered an urban-planning and ideological task of nationwide significance.

Recent decades have witnessed the construction of new, large structures in the center of Moscow, restoration of the Kremlin and of a number of architectural monuments, and the reconstruction of individual streets and squares. At the same time, development of the capital's center is taking place in the absence of any precise urban-planning and ideological concept and without broad public discussion of the fundamental problems connected with its restoration and development. As a consequence, the modern center of Moscow does not fully meet the needs of the Moscow citizens who live and work there or of tourists and guests in the capital.

In the aims of greatly improving the system for planning, construction, and utilization of all city facilities in the central area of Moscow, of ensuring strict urban-planning discipline, of overcoming departmental tendencies, and of focussing the efforts of planning and construction organizations located in Moscow on the solution of the tasks which face them, the USSR Council of Ministers considers it necessary, during the period of 1987-2000, to fundamentally rebuild the historic center which has grown up in the city of Moscow, proceeding from the premise that all work on the planning, reconstruction, construction and restoration of individual buildings and historic zones must be carried out on the highest technical and architectural level and on the basis on deep-going scientific study and historical research, under conditions of glasnost and democracy and with broad publicity and

discussion of planning decisions in the press, on the radio, and on television, and with the active participation of the population and public organizations of the country and the capital.

The decree sets the following basic directions for development, complex restoration, and construction in the center of Moscow:

- preservation and development of Moscow's functions as a capital city and an increase in the social and political, ideological and administrative significance of the USSR capital as the place where the most important state and government institutions and organizations of national and international significance are concentrated;

- preservation of the unique characteristics and development of the historical appearance of the city of Moscow, with the Kremlin and Red Square playing a leading role; careful preservation and restoration of cultural and historic monuments, as well as of structures of historical and architectural importance;

- relieving the city center of the burden of functions for which it is unsuited by moving or doing away with small industrial enterprises and organizations located there;

- establishment and strictest observance of regulated urban planning zoning, which will define the limits for permissible inclusion of planned new elements in the historic surroundings of the city center, with the aims of a limited development of architectural ensembles while ensuring an individual approach to the planning and construction of each new building and structure;

- creation of a high level of conveniences and of the most favorable conditions for citizens of Moscow and guests of the capital, based on complex restoration of existing structures, development of the services sphere, and the carrying out of necessary measures to improve engineering equipment, improvement of services and utilities, and creation of green space;

- fundamental improvement of the economic situation in the center of the city, reduction of the transportation load on thoroughfares which pass through it;

- reduction in the number of places located in the central part of the city which employ labor in the production and administrative spheres, while further developing cultural and educational functions and the provision of specialized services;

- a shift from selected construction and capital repair of individual buildings to complex, planned restoration of blocks, thoroughfares, streets and squares, the use of progressive approaches to city-planning, the creation of pedestrian zones.

The Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee has been directed to develop and approve a complex program for rebuilding the Moscow city center during the period to the year 2000, to draw up a detailed draft plan for the center of the capital, and also to ensure the development, on a competitive basis, of plans for reconstructing groups of buildings and structures which are a part of the important historical milieu of the Moscow city center, for restoring historical and cultural monuments, and for constructing new buildings and structures of important national significance, while broadly enlisting the public in discussion of these projects and in actively carrying out construction and restoration work.

Besides this, it has been directed to achieve a substantial improvement in the organization of vehicular and pedestrian traffic, to implement a complex set of measures for improving the ecological situation by eliminating sources of harmful emissions into the atmosphere, by replacing bus routes with trolley busses, by reducing noise levels, by improving the system for maintaining the cleanliness of the district, by improving the level of services and utilities and the creation of green space, and also by substantially improving the esthetics of squares, streets and quays through better use of monumental art and advertising and lighted signboards and display windows of stores, public catering enterprises and other cultural and everyday services and institutions located on the city's central thoroughfares and squares.

The Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee and the ministries, departments, and councils of ministers of the union republics that have subordinate enterprises, institutions and organizations, which are located within Moscow's city center, have been directed to ensure that industrial enterprises and production units, everyday services and supply offices, warehouses, bases and administrative institutions, which are not directly related to the functions of the capital center or are situated in inappropriate premises or residential buildings, be eliminated, removed from the city, or relocated from its central area.

In addition, it is planned to ensure:

— maximum preservation within the Moscow city center of those residential buildings that are suitable for habitation and their complex restoration and capital repair, while doing away with communal housing, improving services and utilities and green space available to residential blocks, taking into consideration the historical and cultural importance of buildings and areas;

— further development of the system of institutions which provide social and everyday services to the population in order to satisfy the needs of citizens who live and work in the center of the city, as well as the needs of tourists and guests of the capital for appropriate services;

— gradual reorientation of large trade enterprises from mass to specialized trade, and also the construction outside the boundaries of the central part of the city, primarily at the locations of railroad terminals and city transportation transfer stops, of new large department stores.

The decree assigns specific tasks to the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee and to ministries and departments, with regard to the reconstruction and construction of residential buildings, trade, public catering and everyday services enterprises, hotels, polyclinics, communications facilities, squares, streets, quays, underground pedestrian walkways, clubs, museums, and exhibition spaces within Moscow's city center, with regard to restoration, reconstruction, expansion, construction and repair of historic and cultural objects as well as of buildings and structures which comprise an important part of the historical milieu, with regard to the reconstruction and renovation of gardens, parks, squares and boulevards, and with regard to the construction of new stations on existing subway lines and of additional entrances to metro stations in the center of Moscow.

13032

Ukrainian Novel Describes Indifference of Farmers

18000050a Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 87 p 3

[Review by Mikhail Sinelnikov of novel "Rubezh" [The Frontier] by Yuriy Mushketik: "The Times Are Changing"]

[Text] "He had become a graingrower even before he was born." His father, his grandfather, and his great-grandfather had been graingrowers. The genes had done their work, you could not go against them.... That is how Orest Shostak, the young kolkhoz chairman who is the hero of Yuriy Mushketik's novel "Rubezh" thinks about himself. He thinks smiling: Of course, he could grumble a bit, examine the pros and cons of being bound to a hard lot, but there was far more joy and spiritual contentment. As a matter of fact, not everyone is given the opportunity to sense the approach of harvest time "not only from the color of the sky, the whisper of the spikes that says they are ripe," but also from an internal excitement that occurs unaccountably. "It is just as though he had ripened with the grain...."

The novel's subject matter are the chairman's business and concerns, the life of the village Sukhaya Verba, which is in the Ukrainian Polesye. A crucial moment is represented: Shostak is taking up his post following the death of Parokon, a well-known kolkhoz leader, Hero of Labor, who had been the head of the farm for more than 30 years. But however serious the problems that concern the novelist, in the telling there is invariably a lyric note that sounds without interruption—that same lyric note associated with the graingrower's feeling about himself, with his loyalty to the earth and to his peasant calling.

We also become aware of a philosophical attitude in the work. It especially crops up in the chapters that tell about Sirota-Skuratovskiy, a Kiev intellectual, a professor, whom fate brought to settle in Sukhaya Verba and who had been a teacher here for many years. In the ethical-pedagogical judgments which Sirota-Skuratovskiy shares with Shostak there is much that is starry-eyed idealism and abstraction, but their essence—a faith in reason, good, man's harmony with nature—is noble, and it is not by accident that the kolkhoz chairman cherishes it.

After all, what in essence is Orest Shostak concerned about, what does he want to achieve? He wants the rural farmworker to be placed on a higher level. No, not with awards or honors: the "Urozhay" Kolkhoz has had an abundance of such things come its way. For the grain-growers, it turns out, to be endowed with something else: self-respect, an awareness that they are not little screws, but masters of their lives. A single person has been deciding everything and giving all the orders: Parokon. His authority was irreproachable, and his will was inexorable.

The comparison of Shostak and Parokon, the principles governing their actions and their lives and inherent in them, runs through the entire novel. Orest, who comes from Sukhaya Verba, returns there after working in another region, and perceives many things with a fresh and sharp eye; he asks people many questions and he compares facts. Defects are revealed, each more serious than the last, behind the impressive and even triumphant facade of "Urozhay." Actually, the farm has for a long time been managed by extensive methods, according to plans that were "unsparing." Prestigious projects were carried out, and the return from them was small. The famous kolkhoz had gotten into debt. Most unpleasant of all, probably, were the hectares of Dikoye Pole which had not been counted and had made it possible for Parokon to "increase the yield."

Parokon, no doubt about it, is a striking and colorful figure who has done a great deal for the kolkhoz, raised it out of the postwar ruins, and set it firmly on its feet. He loved his job and was devoted to it. But Parokon loved power even more than his job. Gradually, initiative faded within "Urozhay," all attempts either by the specialists or rank-and-file kolkhoz members to express their opinion that differed from that of the chairman were suppressed. Ostentatiousness and obsequiousness, whose purpose was to perpetuate the prestige of the "lighthouse," began to be introduced more and more strongly.

Economic miscalculations which had to be concealed demanded moral compromises. The shabby morality was conducive to poor conduct of affairs. The circle was closed....

Shostak's role in the novel has nothing whatsoever to do with the function of exposure and punishment. On the contrary, Orest precisely displays a sensitivity to Parokon's memory and he spares the sincere sentiments of

many of the villagers. The important thing to him is not to judge his predecessor, the important thing to him is to understand the mechanism that engenders social inertia and individualism. The only thing the other members of the board know is what they affirm to the new chairman: we will not depart, they say, even a step from the practice of the late Grigoriy Davydovich. They swear by tradition, even...by collectivism, understood in a very specific way: "Grigoriy Davydovich will issue the call, and we will all rush as one into the breach." The down side of that kind of collectivism is the belief of the board members in their special position, for instance, in their being able to acquire mixed feed when it is in short supply—without control and to the detriment of other kolkhoz members....

The cult of the leader, of the privilege of the chosen ones, the passivity of the peasant masses, their indifference to social labor, to the land—these are all connected and mutually dependent phenomena. Orest Shostak does in fact strive to break up the defective chain that has been formed. A man of democratic views who does not abandon his own dignity and has a high appreciation of this quality in others, wants to build his entire effort in the kolkhoz on a belief in the worker, in his mind and honor, on a rebirth of that belief. How after all had it been in "Urozhay"? It did not jar on people, for example, that the club and library were spoken about as some kind of gift sent down to the kolkhoz personally by Grigoriy Davydovich. It did not jar on them—they had become accustomed to it and considered it normal: "the head," "the strong personality." Or if the chairman says from the rostrum: "If there are beets, there will be sugar. No beets, no sugar," the flatterers said in enthusiasm: "No one can say it like our Grigoriy Davydovich...." And he himself began to believe that only he could hit upon such wisdom.

We see it happen: a departure from the dogmas and sluggish habits begins to take place little by little in Sukhaya Verba. We read how uncomfortable the people in the kolkhoz "elite" felt who had used flattery and rose-colored rhetoric as an instrument for their own ambitious well-being and enrichment. We read about the kind attention which the new chairman shows to the true workers. For example, to the Khristenko brothers who go by the nickname Nalygachi. These brothers were complicated people, difficult personalities, but they had a knack for work. They knew this about themselves, and they were proud of it.... The problem of the Nalygachi is the problem of optimum combination of the personal and the social in the life of kolkhoz members. You would not get far here with oppression, high-handedness, and imperative shouting, but rather conditions had to be created in which those same Nalygachi, without infringing at all on their personal interests, would give all of themselves to kolkhoz work and derive joy from it.

Neither Shostak nor the author has ready-made formulas for solving this problem. It was no accident that in talking with the Nalygachi the chairman "was not sure"

of the full correctness of his arguments and proposals. Things had to be thought over, things had to be explored—jointly, everyone together.... And in that search, in creativity, opportunities would be discovered for people to stand up straight and achieve their own nobility, something which is so indispensable now.

Yuriy Mushketik's novel sounds up-to-date, touches upon real problems which are being actively discussed in society today. It is not superfluous to emphasize that "Rubezh" came out in the Ukrainian language back in 1983. After it was published in Russian translation (the translation was done by A. Rudenko), the book was nominated for the USSR State Prize.

As we pay the credit due to the author's work, we cannot but at the same time say that the novel, conceived as a profoundly analytical narrative, does not always maintain the level of the principles of portrayal set by the author himself. Sometimes there seem to be gaps in the equipment of realism. Some of the characters who by the very logic of events deserve close attention (for example, "Urozhay's" party secretary Sudarik) do not play an active role and drop out of the action for long stretches. The line of the opposition between Parokon and his former colleague Sikach who was ahead of the others in seeing the defects of the arbitrary pattern of leadership, but was unable to oppose it and went away, could have been developed more thoroughly and dramatically.

Or here is another case. We suddenly learn that during the years of the war Parokon, who commanded a partisan detachment, has behaved unfairly and cruelly toward his subordinates and even resorted to criminal acts. Such a situation might, of course, be within the realm of realistic analysis. But analysis is what is lacking here; Parokon's wartime biography is reported on the sly, in a fleeting conversation. And after all: Was it necessary to resort to extreme measures in condemning the character? Weren't the objectively examined circumstances of Parokon's life as a chairman sufficient?

There are other pages in the novel when you feel a lack of motivation and sometimes a forcing of passions. This applies, for example, to the suicide of the anonymous writer of slanderous letters Kislyy. It applies, and this is a pity, to the love story between Orest Shostak and Marta, Parokon's daughter (it is a pity because the story contains truly felt and lyrically written episodes). You do not believe in the drama of Marta's leaving her beloved. Yes, the daughter did suffer because of her father, but still Orest, as we have already said, behaves in a very sensitive way and gives no occasion whatsoever for disagreement....

But we do not want to conclude the discussion with critical considerations. Yuriy Mushketik's novel is an interesting and attractive work because of its treatment of a problem and because of its lyrical and philosophical inspiration. There is no doubt that "Rubezh" is in that stream of multinational Soviet literature which has

alertly and responsibly expressed the feeling of "pioneering," of changing times, of the need for profound and decisive social changes. 07045

Emigre Literature Must Be Seen in Historical Context

18000050b Moscow *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* in Russian 21 Oct 87 p 3

[Article by Feliks Kuznetsov: "Literature and the Truth of History"]

[Excerpts] The time of glasnost and perestroika probably poses as the paramount issue of socioliterary development the problem of truth: truth in life and also truth in literature. At the same time, this desire for the truth, I would say, has been displayed toward history, especially the history of our own socialist society, and consequently the truth of the history of Soviet literature and of our culture as a whole. The issue is so complicated and huge that I do not intend to examine it in its full scope. I will touch on the most topical aspects of the current literary process and attempt to place an accent on only certain matters which concern me and disturb me. Above all the following question. The dynamism and contradictoriness of social development in the context of perestroika, of the open locks, the rejection of dogmatic stereotypes, and the fundamentally new opportunities for an artist to express himself freely require of us, it seems to me, that today we first of all arrive at maximum precision in self-determination as to the initial positions of our endeavors to reach the truth.

In society today, it seems to me, there is a growing unacceptance of the extremist tendencies from both the "left" and the "right" that have been sharply outlined in the recent past, tendencies which in their polarity from one another are alike in one thing—their negative attitude toward the achievements of socialism, accompanied by an attempt to assert themselves at the same time as all but the only adherents of perestroika. These newfound "violent zealots" are proposing that we begin our history over almost from scratch, imposing ethical ostracism on all who do not concur in that interpretation of perestroika.

In overcoming dogmatism, in ridding ourselves of evil and untruth, we do not have the right any longer to ignore this danger that is quite realistic today: negativism, denial of practically everything that the party and people have done over these dramatic and heroic 70 years.

Contemporary Soviet literature has been striving in its most important manifestations to explore the road of our Soviet people throughout the full scope of the results and contradictions, demonstrating that our country has been gaining by enduring socialism and has also been gaining through its present-day revolutionary restructuring. It is a fundamentally new attribute of the literary process that literature is striving today to become more fully aware

than before not only of the loss, but also the dramatic and sometimes tragic mistakes along that road, understanding that unless we are fully aware of them, unless we analyze their sources and causes, unless we draw the most serious conclusions, unless we have full truth about the past, it is impossible to extricate ourselves from the tenets of the past, from the roads that signify stagnation and bureaucracy.

The party's emphasis on the priority of general human principles in the contemporary world, on the value approach to life and literature, on the special role and importance of the human factor, on the return of society's attention to the spiritual and ethical sphere, including the sphere of eternal values, and on the wealth, diversity, and flowering of the culture of developing socialism has extremely great importance to establishing a contemporary view of history.

Literature and periodicals have reacted to the new possibility and new needs of the times above all with a publishing explosion—by opening up the bins and granaries where literary treasures of various kinds and quality from comparatively remote and recent times which previously did not attain access to the reader have been piled up.

Quite an important role in this has been played by the Eighth Congress of Soviet Writers and by the speech delivered at it by D.S. Likhachev, member of the academy, who called for an entire stratum of the literature of past years to be returned to the bosom of our culture.

I dwelt on an analysis of this process in a recent dialogue in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* with the historian Yu. Polyakov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences ("The Past, the Whole Truth!" No 40, 30 September 1987). Now again I repeat once more my main thought: I cannot agree with those who cast doubt on the wholeness of this phenomenon, which is evidence of a further democratization of our literary life, of the broadening and deepening of our knowledge of literature, and of an enrichment of that spiritual legacy which we think of as the property of the people. But this publishing activity of our literary periodicals, it seems to me, needs to be carried on with a great sense of objectivity, on a higher level of culture and ideological-esthetic exactingness—both in the selection of works, but especially in commenting on them.

The contemporary literary process and indeed life itself in their unprecedented dynamism and complexity literally issue a challenge to the thought of the theorist and the researcher to be objective, truthful, and honest, for one thing because literature today is dispassionately confronting society with the most complicated and difficult issues—perhaps the most complicated and most difficult issues of our history since the revolution, and that is its right.

But the most dramatic contradiction in today's literary life, engendered by those same times of stagnation, consists unfortunately of the sharp gap that formed long ago in our country between the real need of society for theoretical thought concerning literature and its actual presence and level. The history of Soviet literature, the theory of socialist realism as a discovered esthetic system, and indeed even literary criticism have been in a difficult situation and require urgent measures to awaken them and raise them up.

It would seem that the neglectful attitude toward thought, theoretical thought, in general, which became deep-seated in the years of stagnation, stands behind this. But this is a typically technocratic and pragmatic approach, one that is especially dangerous for our days, since this kind of stormy navigation is simply impossible without a rudder and without sails. The times demand acute and strong theoretical thought in the party, thought that is appropriate to the most important tasks which reality is posing for literature. This is unfortunately exactly what is lacking. Literary criticism and literary science, which are called upon to be the principal means of analyzing the processes and methods of the impact of society on literature, are still not coping with that task and are dragging along slowly behind the literary process.

The broadening of the foundation of the esthetic legacy under present conditions indicate an ever deeper and fuller discovery of the humanistic potential of socialism, which is today performing the role of the "keeper of the flame" of civilized humanism and culture.

One of the main contradictions between the revolution and a portion of the intelligentsia at the beginning of our road lay in the fact that the revolution was perceived by some as a break in the humanistic tradition and previous culture. And it has to be honestly said today: the ultra-revolutionary and as a matter of fact petit bourgeois forces, using the dramatic difficulties of the times and the immaturity of revolutionary consciousness, did do quite a bit to establish in people's minds this essentially anti-Leninist and "Makhayskiyan" point of view. The cultural losses we have incurred thereby and which are now obvious to everyone have not been inconsiderable. But there is also something else that cannot fail to be seen: the opposition from the very outset to those pseudorevolutionary, RAPPite [RAPP—Russian Association of Proletarian Writers] and ultimately Trotskyist approaches by the "furious zealots" of the twenties for a fundamentally different and Leninist point of view with respect to the legacy, which won out ultimately in a difficult struggle against historical nihilism.

The return to the literature of phenomena and names earlier rejected or underestimated is a complicated, difficult, and rather contradictory process; tact, wisdom, and the greatest delicacy must be shown here both toward them themselves and also toward the historical context of Soviet literature. We need to see in this

connection the fundamental difference between the literature of the emigre community, which at times did not accept the revolution and ended up on the other side of the barricades, and the works of Soviet writers which did not see the light of day in the years of the cult and the stagnation.

Not only the attitude toward the revolution, but also the attitude toward the Great Patriotic War, toward the fascist invasion—are objective criteria which must necessarily always be remembered when we examine the question of emigre literature, which is a new one for us today. The publication of everything that is living and that is humanistically valuable in the postrevolutionary emigre literature is a sign of our greater strength, wisdom, and confidence in ourselves. But we cannot take an unprincipled position here and conceal what is just and true with respect to the political positions of a particular writer.

I will refer, for example, to the testimony of the well-known Russian idealist philosopher Berdyayev, whose objectivity in this case is above suspicion. "The invasion of the Germans onto Russian soil shook my being to the depths. My Russia was in danger, it could be dismembered and enslaved.... I believed the whole time in Russia's invincibility. The patriotism naturally inherent in me reached maximum tension. I felt myself merged with the successes of the Red Army. I divided people into those who wanted Russia's triumph and those who wanted Germany to win. I would not agree to be in the company of the second category of people, I considered them traitors. In the Russian community in Paris there were Germanophile elements which were waiting for Hitler to free Russia of the Bolsheviks. This aroused in me a profound feeling of revulsion."

And Zinaida Gippius and Merezhkovskiy were among the first with whom Berdyayev broke off all relations and toward whom he looked with profound revulsion, not hiding it. Those are the kind of extremely complicated processes which the Great Patriotic War aroused in the bosom of the Russian emigre community! Since now, in the thrill of freedom, by publishing Z. Gippius and Merezhkovskiy, we conceal from the reader that truth about them, we forget the revulsion toward traitors which in the years of the war divided even the White emigre community in half?! This, then, is really a "merged flow" in the full sense of the word.

And an other thing. How can we fail to see and to take into account the persistent efforts made long ago by our ideological opponents who were striving to overturn the hierarchy of values in our literature, to modify emphasis, and to establish the phenomena in the literature of past years which we have today discovered in place of Gorky, Mayakovskiy, Sholokhov, and Leonov?! The times also demand that we look on such immense figures of gigantic importance as Gorky, Mayakovskiy, and Sholokhov without that commemorative gloss, in the full scope of their internal contradictions, to do everything so that

their creativity is given a powerful new ideological and artistic resonance. The task is not to remove the contradictions or to set up certain figures in opposition to others, but to include in the people's culture the entire palette, all the diverse achievements of the most important artists of the Soviet era, in the real truth of all the contradictions of literary and social development.

In the article entitled "Literature Is Fed by the Roots" Yevgeniy Vinokurov rightly noted in the newspaper *Sovetskaya Rossiya*:

"When I talk about the need to go back to the literary life of possibly the complete creative inheritance of Bulgakov, Platonov, Pasternak, and a number of other names that are now frequently repeated, there is also something else that I am thinking about: by mentioning only these names, we are sinning against the full truth of the history of literature. The hour has come to remember as well, for example, those poets who were in a way published, who were in a way talked about, but they were published and spoken about in a way that cast their real immense value in a shadow. I would single out the names of Pavl Vasilyev, Yaroslav Smelyakov, Aleksandr Prokofyev, and Leonid Martynov among the poets cast into oblivion in this manner."

I would also add to this list the name of Aleksandr Yashin and Vasily Fedorov and Vladimir Lugovskiy and even Aleksandr Tvardovskiy, the great Russian Soviet poet whose creativity was also pushed into the shadows for a long time (to use Vinokurov's metaphor) by the dark clouds of praise from the critics, combined with suspicious constancy in the glorification of certain pseudolyricists.

Some things have changed for the better recently in our criticism. But one thing has remained unchanged: there are still those same dark clouds of criticism full of praise which with suspicious constancy have been showering abundant moisture of praise on certain pseudolyricists and pseudoprosewriters. The principle of inviolability has not changed, the hierarchy is changing, and new figures and new phenomena are springing up in this heavenly sect of the "untouchables," now no longer so much those of the present as of the past. Meanwhile the figures and the works which are today being returned to the readers are extremely complicated and often contradictory.

It would be incorrect to approach such a complicated sociocultural phenomenon in an oversimplified and one-dimensional way, merely changing black for white or even for pink, without a concrete historical analysis and conceptualization in the terms of social philosophy. With that approach confusion is possible such as recently occurred in Tallinn when the local newspaper published a letter of writers and journalists opposing the memorial plaque to Vsevolod Vishnevskiy, since he supposedly

was "organizer of the persecution of Bulgakov." Yevgeniy Gabrilovich, Vyacheslav Tikhonov, and the Estonian veteran Karl Aru rightly wrote as follows in the pages of *Sovetskaya Kultura* (26 September) in this regard:

"Yes, Vsevolod Vishnevskiy did not accept the creativity of M.A. Bulgakov. Indeed he obviously could not have. This is natural. As a participant in the October armed uprising, a machine gunner on an armored train, a fighter in the 1st Cavalry, he simply was objectively incapable when he came into literature as a 20-year-old from the trenches of the Civil War, as one who had firmly determined the line of his life once and for all in those trenches, of all of a sudden understanding the explorations, the doubts, and the confused vacillations of an intellectual. It is a pity, it is too bad, but that is the way it was. Because there had been a revolution. Because a new society, a new world, were born out of the collision between two worlds. And the new literature was born in exactly the same way. With the pangs of labor. At times tragically. But that is also its and our own good fortune that in Soviet literature there are the names of Akhmatova, Pasternak, Zoshchenko...alongside those of Furmanov, Fadeyev, and Svetlov. And the names of Bulgakov and Vishnevskiy—men so different and so alike in their strength, the power of their talent, and the fundamental depth of their views—will always stand side by side in our literature."

This story, worthy of a parody, is reproduced in grotesque, or more accurately in farcical form, by certain regrettable signs of how things are in literature today and which alas became established here during the time of perestroika. The authors of the letter to *Sovetskaya Kultura* describe these most recent tendencies as follows:

"...Strange things are happening: you look and people seem to be waging war for historical truth, but when you look closely—they are trying to pass off a forgery, they would seem to be advocating freedom of opinion, and yet they unsparingly suppress any disagreement with their own views, they seem to be defending one thing, but in actuality they are trampling down something else. For example, somehow imperceptibly and quickly a group of literary people and cultural figures (those who are dead and those who are now striving) who for various reasons did not receive until recently the recognition they deserved, have already been elevated practically to the rank of 'untouchables.' Even today an attempt to say something about their activity that is not in the superlative is apt to evoke charges which compared to the expression of 'organizer of the persecution' will seem like nothing more than an inoffensive joke.

"Now that with the support of the entire people they have condemned the defective forms and methods of resolving creative differences that did prevail, and having strengthened their positions thereby, those who issued the condemnations have been arming themselves with those very same forms and methods which they

condemned. The names have changed. But otherwise everything sometimes seems painfully familiar: instead of a well-argued analysis of the opponent's position we get a misrepresentation of the facts, instead of a respectful or at least tolerant attitude toward someone else's opinion, we get a crude outcry, instead of criticism that is evidentiary, thorough, and objective, we get defamation. (Quite often we dash from one side to the other. For long years we stigmatize an artist and then—almost in the same chorus—we praise him to the skies precisely because for long years we stigmatized him.)"

Reestablishing historical truth is a matter of complete and painstaking reestablishment in their rightful place of the principles of concrete historicism, of the entire complex of our true ideological-esthetic criteria—that things be examined from the standpoint of the party, the people, and art.

The principal criterion of artistic value in domestic literature has always been considered and has remained the truth—the truth of reality, the truth of history. In this connection I categorically am unable to accept the point of view that the literary process in Soviet literature of past decades has been all but a desert, that the true values of Russian literature were to be found only in the emigre community and indeed even in storerooms. It is this point of view that our ideological opponents have been striving greatly to impose on us. And we, more accurately some of us, have sometimes unconsciously been prepared to all but accept that point of view as the final truth.

But the level of emigre literature that took shape in detachment from and opposition to the homeland, in detachment from the native language, has still not been very high except for rare exceptions. The springs which have been feeding the publishing explosion will soon dry up. And then it will be obvious what the emigres themselves have been talking about with bitterness. Vladislav Khodasevich, who hardly could have been suspected of sympathy for us or of antipathy toward the emigre community, has written in an article entitled "The Literature in Exile": "Without searching for innovation, afraid of the work and practical risk it involves, fearing independent criticism and abhorring it, as the years passed it even became unaccustomed to working, since writing even good things according to your own conventional patterns is essentially not real work any longer. With very few exceptions our writers in the emigre community have been unable and somehow even have not been anxious to improve their gifts.... The mountain of books published abroad does not comprise the kind of unity which might have been called an emigre literature. Emigre literature does not exist at all in that sense."

Everything that is the best and everything that is alive has been preserved in it only insofar as it has been nostalgically fed by the juices of the native land, and today it is being drawn and is adhering to the domestic literature like a magnet. It has kept Soviet literature,

especially today, when we are reestablishing its riches to their full extent, that is presented to the world as an immense and self-sufficient spiritual force expressing in its collective experience the truth of the revolution in all the complicated aspects of its heroic and often tragic existence. Its road has been contradictory, fraught with conflict, but in the final analysis there has been only one.

Bulgakov and Platonov and Pasternak and Zamyatin, for all the difficulties of their personal destiny, were not to be found on that side of the barricades, but on this side; they were convinced patriots whose heart pained them for the destiny of their native Soviet country. And there is one who cannot really be considered an emigre, who to the end of his days proudly carried a Soviet passport abroad, and that is Ye. Zamyatin. The dramatic complexities of their creative destiny were bound up not with the fact that these writers did not accept the revolution, but with their nonacceptance of particular aspects of our way and sometimes with an awareness of the dangers that had been built up of departing from the principles of humanism and democracy, those dangers which in time formed in our society the anti-Leninist and antidemocratic psychology and practice of the personality cult. But did those dangers concern them alone? We will recall in this connection the dramatic destiny of Sholokhov or Fadeyev, the full extent of conflict and their personal destinies and at the same time their faith in the revolution and in socialism.

We cannot accept the nihilism with which certain literary people now look upon the most sacred pages of the domestic literature, those pages which we can and must be proud of.

A disturbing and dangerous trend! It has been developing a distorted and one-sided view of our country's entire history and of the history of its literature. Following this logic, we must place under suspicion the truthfulness of such characters as Professor Vikhrov of Leonov or Krymov's Basov, Nilin's Venko Malyshev or Engineer Bakhirev of Nikolayeva, Yegor Dymshakov of Ye. Maltsev or Granin's Krylov, Bondarev's Knyazhko, or Aytmatov's blizzardy Yedigey, those vigorous and really good characters which have always made Soviet literature strong. In being ironic about the oversimplification of the formula of the "positive hero," it is thus easy to cast under suspicion the vitality and truthfulness of such characters, setting Levinson in opposition to Mechik and Vikhrov in opposition to Gratsianskiy. But it is not the Gratsianskiys of this world that kept life going. Fundamentally honest characters—people of honor and conscience and the effective good—have expressed the truth of our reality, developing all those years and decades in the opposition between truly socialist, Leninist, and revolutionary principles to the pathways of bureaucracy, stagnation, callousness, and conservatism.

Otherwise where would perestroika have sprung up from?

After all, it did not spring up in an empty place, but it had matured within life, it had been prepared for both by reality and by literature. The strength and the realism of its revolutionary goals and tasks indeed lie in the fact that it expresses the objective need of the times and is deeply rooted in our life, in the revolution, and in history; it is growing out of our great Leninist legacy and is based on the best in our revolutionary traditions.

No, the "great quartet" of our popular poets recently presented by *Ogonek* is by no means only completely wholesome and flourishing, but all the great and honest Soviet prose and true poetry have at their highest points, and this is true not only of Russian, but of all the national literatures, been making the psychological preparations for the present perestroika and have consistently formed in people's minds the feeling that revolutionary changes were indispensable. These processes have not been going smoothly, but rather there have been the most profound contradictions and struggle. The truer and more artistic a work has been, the more difficult as a rule its creative destiny has been. But the sacred place is not left empty, and the vacuum created as a result of administrative and bureaucratic pressure is filled by the products of narrow-mindedness or philistinism, by a "gray" literature, by the works of a consumer "mass culture."

Nevertheless, the needs of reality have inevitably demanded the full truth about our development, about our history, about yesterday, and about today. The 27th CPSU Congress and its decisions were not a kind of "deus ex machina" for our life and literature; they have been organically and profoundly prepared by the entire prior development of life and, of course, by the development of literature, which, if it is true, is always moving a bit ahead of its time, is breaking the ice, and is crescent of the future.

Is it not surprising that literature produced to coincide with the 27th party congress such works as "Pozhar" [The Fire] of V. Rasputin, "Plakha" [The Executioner's Block] of Ch. Aytmatov, "Pechalnyy detektiv" [The Sad Detective] of V. Astafyev, "Igra" [The Game] of Yu. Bondarev, "Karer" [The Quarry] of V. Bykov, "Vse vpered!" [Everything Ahead] by V. Belov—works of the most severe social impatience which as it were sounded the alarm, awakened in society an awareness of the need for urgent changes?!

And is it not surprising that at the time of the 27th party congress works of such different literary level were ready and impatiently waiting on writers' desks as "Belyye odezhdyy" [White Suits] by V. Dudintsev, "Deti Arbata" [The Children of the Arbat] by A. Rybakov, "Muzhiki i baby" [The Muzhiks and the Old Women] (Vol 2) by B. Mozhayev, "Kanuny" [Eves] (Vol 2) by V. Belov—works which have continued the topic which previously resounded many years ago in A. Tvardovskiy's poem "By Right of Memory" and in A. Akhmatova's "Requiem"?

And in actual fact there is nothing surprising in this. But there is an ineradicable and unalterable law of artistic truth in art, an inevitable need of true literature to strive to attain the truth in the light of the highest social ideal.

This wrestling effort on the part of works fearlessly investigating the gap and the contradiction between our social ideal and actual reality exposed the objective and powerful historical need of the times. The need is being thoroughly analyzed in the movement of the history of the fatherland, in our complicated, contradictory, and dramatic journey of pioneers into the future. This process began at the 20th through the 22d congresses of our party and was artificially interrupted and suspended. But a question that is turned inward still remains a question.

Reality, the times, and society are demanding an answer to it.

The literary process of the present day is a convincing confirmation that glasnost and democratization of our spiritual life is not rhetoric, but reality. In our literature

today there are no areas closed to criticism and analytical investigation, discussion, and argument. It is important only that no side in this dispute claim a monopoly ahead of time to the full and final truth. So that not a single theme, even an extremely important one, does not strive to take up an exhaustive and monopoly position in literature, does not turn into a sensation, does not become an indulgence and justification of artistic poverty, so that criticism examines even "anticult" works in the context of life and literature and does not absolutize or idealize them, preserving an equally sober view and equally high criteria of esthetic exactingness in evaluating works regardless of their theme.

It is also important that in its movement to the future literature does not turn out to be tied only to the past, to its drama and the firing up of passions, so that in drawing lessons from the past it thinks about the future, turning its curious and investigatory eye toward our revolutionary present and future.

This is in fact its main patriotic task today and at the same time its main international duty.

07045

Jurist Proposes New Legislation for Economic Crimes

18000030 Moscow SOVETSKAYA YUSTITSIYA in Russian No 18

Sep 87 (signed to press 11 Sep 87) pp18-20

[Article by Professor Yu. Lyapunov: "Responsibility for Economic Crimes:"]

[Text Today, when new criminal legislation is being developed and the new RSFSR Criminal Code is to be adopted, questions of systematizing criminal law norms, their content and construction, are becoming especially important. Of exceptional significance among these extremely important questions of the norm-creating process are resolutely freeing the criminal law of the superfluous overlays of earlier years, a precise orientation in legislative decisions to rigorous consideration of the pressing needs to defend the interests of the state, society, and the individual, and clarity and certainty in normative wording without ambiguities and opportunities for different interpretations in application of the law.

It is important to stress immediately that socialist property includes a multifaceted system of social relations, primarily in the sphere of production of material wealth. It follows from this that it is closely interwoven with all the relations in the system of the socialist economy. As a result of this economic crimes cannot fail to really disrupt the production relations of socialist property. This indisputable fact demands the development of completely new approaches to defining those socioeconomic wealth that should be viewed as the generic and specific objects of this group of crimes, solid research, and thorough sociological analysis. Consideration here should be given to the principles of socialist economic activity and the main economic levers of the management mechanism, which received theoretical development in the materials of the 27th party congress and the January and June 1987 Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee. Integrating these basic economic interests and appropriately reflecting them in the definition of the objects of economic crimes would more clearly reveal the antisocial thrust of these offenses and the heightened degree of their social danger, which is often underestimated in criminal law practice. The need for such integration is also illustrated by the fact that the intricate complex of the multifaceted system of social relations that makes up the content of socialist property and the rich gamut of economic interests encompass production proper, distribution, and use and consumption of the results of labor. Essentially we are speaking of relations among people in all economic stages of the movement of social product: production—distribution—consumption (use). And this gives weighty scientific grounds to believe that in such a dynamic, extremely variable and mobile social process the relations of socialist ownership really

function primarily within the framework of the socialist system of the economy, which should be reflected in definition of the generic and specific objects of economic crime.

There is one more significant addition to the problem of the object of economic crimes. We know that most of these crimes are mercenary and serve the purpose of illegal enrichment while also flagrantly violating the fundamental principle of socialism—"From each according to his ability, to each according to his labor." Therefore, mercenary economic crimes really violate socialist social relations of distribution, which then must be considered as an additional object of criminal law protection. This circumstance, which is not taken into account in theory, discloses one more feature of their heightened social danger. Defining all social wealth violated by the particular offenses in their systemic interlinking makes it possible to use a methodologically correct standpoint to decide the question of the place of the subsystem of norms on responsibility for crimes in the sphere of the economy within the overall system of the Special Part of the Criminal Code.

Considering the inseparable, organic link of socialist property with its predominant and broadest sphere of functioning, the national economic complex which, as Article 16 of the USSR Constitution stipulates, is the USSR economy, the chapter on economic crimes should be placed in the system of the Special Part of the Criminal Code immediately after the chapter "Crimes against Socialist Property." This section of, provisionally speaking, "economic" legal norms should be preceded in the system of laws only by the groups of norms on responsibility for state crimes and crimes against the individual, the supreme social value in socialist society. In our opinion, the chapter on economic crimes should be followed by the chapters "Ecological Crimes" (this title seems most successful) and "Crimes against Personal Property." In this form, which reflects the real data of objective reality, the criminal law would most fully and exactly fix in a single section all the constituent elements of our society's economic system whose structure, as we know, is given in Chapter 2 of the USSR Constitution.

But establishing the place and order of placement of the chapter "Crimes in the Sphere of the National Economy" still does not completely exhaust the problem of systematizing the legal norms included in it.

In the existing republic criminal law Section II Chapter 1 "Other State Crimes" brings together the norms that envision responsibility for the most diverse crimes, crimes that do not have a generic object. For this reason it has been observed numerous times in the literature that this section is an artificial normative formation, essentially without a single, unitary social core. Scholarship has soundly proposed that the norms gathered there be dispersed to the appropriate chapters of the criminal code in accordance with unity of generic objects. But the

question arises: exactly which norms should go into the chapter "Crimes in the Sphere of the National Economy." Considering the special object of these crimes, there is no doubt that this chapter should include norms on responsibility for smuggling, making or marketing counterfeit money or securities, violation of the rules of currency transactions, and currency speculation. The money-credit system, the state currency monopoly, and the foreign trade monopoly, which are infringed by these crimes, are indisputably key elements of the socialist economic system, and therefore the corresponding norms should be moved to the chapter on economic crimes.

At the same time, some crimes are mistakenly considered economic without any grounds whatsoever. Above all this applies to the purely ecological crimes envisioned in Articles 163, 164, 166, 167, and 169 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The objects of these actions are natural resources in their native condition which have not, at the moment of commission of the crime, been subjected to labor action in the process of carrying on economic production activity. As soon as these objects are drawn into economic circulation, as soon as they begin to undergo the labor process, they automatically become commodities, property, and seizing them in this new economic capacity is theft, not ecological crime. This must be considered in shaping a scientifically sound system of norms of the Special Part of the new Criminal Code. The chapter of economic crimes now includes the norm that envisions responsibility for failing to submit or falsifying a declaration (Article 162¹ of the Criminal Code). This solution to the problem is by no means perfect because this action is by its antisocial thrust a classical form of crime against socialist property. In fact, its commission causes the state material loss in the form of lost revenue (failure to receive income tax). Therefore, by its antisocial and legal nature, this is a particular definition of a crime relative to the general definition—causing property loss by deception or abuse of trust (Article 94 of the Criminal Code). On this immutable basis resting on the unity of the generic object the norm under consideration should be moved to the chapter on crimes against socialist property. Article 159 of the Criminal Code (forgery of postal payment symbols and passenger tickets—should be treated in this same way, because this too is a particular form of the crime envisioned in Article 94 of the Criminal Code; of course, this is assuming that it is decided to keep it in the new RSFSR Criminal Code. But such a legislative decision could hardly be considered justified because the actions envisioned by it fall entirely under the characteristics of the general norm indicated above and eliminating it would by no means signify a gap in the law.

At the same time the criminal law of the RSFSR on responsibility for economic crimes is not without gaps, which gives a basis to propose making criminal a number of acts which, under conditions of swift development and the vast scale of the construction industry, have taken on a heightened degree of social danger. We refer

above all to poor-quality construction and turning over for use poorly built buildings, structures, residential buildings, and especially social-cultural facilities (movie theaters, houses of culture, hospitals, schools, preschool institutions, and the like), where cave-ins and destruction because of construction defects conceal a danger of grave consequences for the life and health of many people, to say nothing of the material loss. For this reason it would be wise to devise two independent legal norms. One should envision responsibility for poor-quality construction resulting from deviation from a ratified plan, flagrant violation of construction norms, standards, and accepted technology, use of defective building design elements and materials, and similar actions which have grave consequences. The second could define the so-called elements of the real danger if the poor-quality construction did not cause such consequences, but could have. This norm should envision responsibility for turning over and accepting into use poor-quality buildings and structures, residential buildings, and social-cultural and municipal-domestic facilities which are poorly built, incomplete, or do not match a ratified plan and have had grave consequences [sic]. It would be useful also to design the formal definition of the crime so as to include the case where there is only a real danger that the grave consequences could occur.

Most of the Union republic criminal codes do not have a special norm on responsibility for mismanagement. But this negative phenomenon, which essentially consists of a flagrant violation of the principles of socialist economic activity, wasting material and labor resources, and squandering public wealth, really exists in objective reality and injects elements of disorganization into the economic order. It is a brake on society's economic progress, and retards the rate of construction of the material-technical base of communism in the country. Development and adoption of a special norm on responsibility for mismanagement would activate the struggle of criminal law organs against this dangerous phenomenon. As an example here we could take the norm of Article 171¹ of the UzSSR Criminal Code, which gives the definition: "Mismanagement, that is failure to perform or improper performance of official duties in managing state or public property and causing major loss, by the manager of an enterprise, institution, or organization, or equally by any other person who heads a definite sector of production-economic activity."

The questions of redesigning the corresponding norms on responsibility for economic crimes in the draft of the new RSFSR Criminal Code deserve independent consideration.

First of all we must mention the norms which are moving from the chapter "Other State Crimes" to the chapter on economic crimes. It would seem wise to broaden the definition of counterfeiting and indicate that, in addition to state banknotes of the USSR State Bank, metal coins, state securities, or foreign currency, it can encompass payment documents (checks, bills of exchange, and

letters of credit- and funded paper (stocks, bonds, and the like-in foreign currency. The existing version of Article 87 of the RSFSR Criminal Code mentions only business as a qualifying element. Based on the exceptional danger of this offense, it would be sounder to broaden the sphere of action of Part 2, Article 87 of the Criminal Code by replacing the very narrow element of "business" with the much broader element of "repeated action," and adding as a new element "in large amounts."

The norm of Article 88 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, which in its present form violates generally accepted rules of legislative technique by formulating the elements of two independent crimes in one disposition, demands significant refinement. The two crimes are violation of the rules on currency transactions and speculation in currency papers and securities; the norm recognizes these actions as equivalent and establishes the same penalty for them. But speculation in currency papers is a more dangerous act because for it to be acknowledged as complete there must be gathering, resale, and presence of the profit motive, while violation of the rules on currency transactions occurs just by the fact of an illegal deal, without any intention to resell currency and extract nonlabor income. An absurd legal situation arises where the speculator who has gathered currency papers with the mercenary objective of making a profit will bear responsibility only for attempted speculation, while the person who has committed the identical actions but has no base motives in the form of profit and generally does not intend to resell the thing he has acquired commits the full crime of violating the rules on currency transactions. We must envision responsibility for these crimes in separate legal norms and establish a stricter penalty for speculation in currency papers. It is worth pondering, however, whether there are adequate grounds to make the illegal gathering, sale, exchange, or use in payment of small amounts (not more than 25 rubles- of foreign currency, committed after imposition of an administrative punishment for the same actions, should be made a crime. If the lawmaking authority took this step in relation to ordinary petty speculation in goods or other objects, establishing the corresponding criminal law norms with double administrative pre-judicial consideration, then applied to currency papers it is even more sound. The experience of BKhSS [combating theft of socialist property organs in fighting such offenses shows that the lack of an appropriate norm in the criminal code essentially opens up a loophole for the more experienced and refined currency criminals to carry on socially dangerous activity unpunished. In fact, what kind of indoctrination and preventive influence can a fine of up to 50 rubles have on a hardened currency criminal? With the situation as it is now the offender can be subject to administrative punishment numerous times without fear of being held to stricter criminal responsibility. Is this correct? This is a question that should be resolved in the new RSFSR Criminal Code.

As noted above, any law, especially a criminal law, must meet the requirements of precise presentation of the

elements of the crime, clarity of normative precepts, and absolute avoidance of "general points" and "elastic" wording. The redaction of Part 1 of Article 153 of the RSFSR Criminal Code entitled "Private Entrepreneurial Activity Using State, Cooperative, or Other Public Forms" hardly meets these requirements fully. It essentially contains no specific elements of the stated crime and permits the broadest, most arbitrary interpretation of the law, which makes it much harder to apply it in practice, especially today when combined joint individual labor activity by citizens, who frequently enter into contract relations with enterprises and organizations (renting of space, free use of equipment and raw materials, and the like), is permitted. How can we, on the basis of the vague wording of the existing law, delineate with maximum precision the lawful behavior of citizens from the named crime? We can say with all certainty that under the new conditions the redaction of Part 1 of Article 153 of the RSFSR Criminal Code is hopelessly out of date.

The cutting edge of the new law should be directed against the activities of dealers and manipulators who try to insert themselves into the socialist economy in suitable illegal organizational forms, use the rights, benefits, and advantages given to them for mercenary purposes to extract significant nonlabor income, and inject alien elements of private property entrepreneurship into the established system of economic relations. Therefore, the following redaction of the norm could be proposed as one possible draft: "Organizing or heading a pseudosocialist enterprise to produce goods and other output or carry out speculative commercial transactions using or under cover of state, cooperative, or other public forms for the purpose of extracting private property entrepreneurial profit."

"The same actions, bringing about enrichment on a particularly large scale..."

There is active debate on whether the new criminal code should keep the norm on responsibility for commercial middle man operations and, if there are grounds for it, in what form. Unquestionably there is no need at the present time to punish criminally for petty commercial services rendered by individual citizens, for example selling potatoes or apples on the market for a small amount of compensation. But commercial middle man operations between socialist organizations by private persons bring tens, and sometimes even hundreds of thousands of rubles of nonlabor income to shifty dealers, especially those specializing in delivering cut wood to kolkhozes and sovkhoses in the unforested southern oblasts of the country. This is already a serious deformation of the planning principles of supplying socialist organizations with material-technical resources and has a fairly high degree of social danger, which necessitates that it be combated with criminal law means. Furthermore, we must not forget that commercial middle man

operations by themselves are an actively operating criminogenic factor in the commission of theft by large-scale swindling where the criminals seize accountable sums of money. Because this variation of commercial middle man operations is an independent crime, its elements should be described in a separate article of the criminal code and must have a clear normative definition such as: "Commerical middle man operations, that is acquiring or selling goods or other output for socialist organizations, and equally assisting in conclusion of property transactions among them, done for compensation on a large scale..."

"The same actions bringing about enrichment on a specially large scale..."

Similarly, Article 156 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, which artificially combines two crimes that infringe on different objects, should be the basis for establishing independent norms on responsibility separately for deceiving purchasers and deceiving buyers, as is done in the UkSSR Criminal Code.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Yuridicheskaya literatura", zhurnal "Sovetskaya yustitsiya", 1987

11176

Jurists Consider Nationwide Discussion of Legislation

18000031 Moscow *SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA ZAKONNOST* in Russian No 9, Sep 87
(signed to press 25 Aug 87) pp 15-18

[Article by M. Shafir, doctor of juridical sciences, and Ye. Koveshnikov, candidate of juridical sciences: "Nationwide Discussion under Conditions of Socialist Democracy"]

[Text] In the modern period, as grandiose tasks for accelerating socio-economic development are being carried out in our country and revolutionary restructuring is taking place in all spheres of social life, further development of soviet democracy and socialist popular self-government is of the greatest importance.

Democracy and popular self-government are the healthy and fresh air which one can breathe with confidence, in which the socialist social organism can develop successfully.

The CPSU, on the basis of the resolutions of the 27th Party Congress and the Central Committee Plenums which followed, is carrying out a great project aimed at decisively renewing the forms and methods of activity of the political and ideological institutes, deepening socialist democracy, and decisively overcoming inertia, stagnation and conservatism—everything which holds back the process of the widest possible participation of citizens in the management of state and social affairs. At the same time a great deal of attention is being paid to

strengthening the role and increasing the responsibility of the soviets of people's deputies as the representative organs of state power, which comprise the political foundation of the USSR.

The measures now being taken for the spread of socialist democracy and improving the work of the soviets are subordinated to a single common goal: to persistently implement Lenin's ideal of enlisting the working masses in the government of the state and developing within each citizen the habits of self-government and the feeling that he is the master of his country.

Along with expanding the authority and changing the nature of the work of the soviets, various forms of direct democracy are also being developed: that is, direct participation of the citizens in the preparation, adoption and implementation of state or other decisions.

Representative democracy in the form of the soviets is not in opposition with the form of immediate (direct) democracy—on the contrary, it successfully and harmoniously combines with it. Lenin saw that the peculiar nature of the soviet organization of state power lies specifically in the fact that it "offers the possibility of combining the advantages of parliamentarism with the advantages of immediate and direct democracy."¹

And truly, in our country the activity of the soviets of people's deputies successfully combines with various forms of direct democracy, which permits involving the masses of workers in government on a greater scale. This means: elections to the soviets; discussing the electors' instructions to their deputies at pre-election meetings, accounting reports from the deputies before their electors, village assemblies, worker meetings at their places of residence and in the working collectives, and so forth.

"I would like to place special emphasis," M.S. Gorbachev noted in his speech at the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "on the necessity for maximum openness and glasnost in the entire process of working out and adopting resolutions on questions of socio-economic life, and for regular and public accountability of the representatives of the organs of control. Publication of drafts and decrees, and extensive information on proposals received on questions under discussion, must become the rule."²

One of the forms of direct democracy is nationwide discussion of the drafts of laws and other important questions in the life of the state. Such discussions are exceptionally popular in nature and are a brilliant expression and display of socialist democracy.

Nationwide discussions have become a firm part of our lives and the practice of socialist democracy. Everyone remembers the discussion of the draft USSR Constitution in 1977. More than 140 million people took part in it—that is, more than four-fifths of the adult population. The workers submitted more than 400,000 observations

and suggestions for the purpose of perfecting the draft Constitution. In essence the entire Soviet nation became the true author of the Basic Law.

In our country the drafts of Basic Legislation, Laws of the USSR, Basic Directions for Economic and Social Development, drafts of the most important party and state documents and other decisions are discussed. And tens of millions of people take an active and interested part in the discussion of each of these, express their opinion, and introduce suggestions and additions.

No such practice is possible in a single capitalist country, whereby a draft law would be submitted to the citizens themselves for discussion. The preparation of draft laws in bourgeois states is the business of a small group of professional politicians and parliamentarians. The workers do not have a real opportunity to have a meaningful influence on the content of the draft legislation. And this is completely understandable. Under conditions of concentration of political power and economic wealth in the hands of the exploiting classes, a bourgeois state is not only not interested in extensive discussion by the masses of questions of political and economic life, it strives to use every means to prevent the workers from taking part in the preparation of legislation.

The history of the world knows no such massive citizen involvement in the development of legislation and discussion of their drafts as exists in the USSR. Nationwide discussion in our country permits involving the broadest popular masses in the examination of major questions in the life of the state, and direct participation in the preparation of draft legislation which expresses their will and interests and which is the result of the creativity of the masses themselves. At the same time very important materials are gathered for the study of public opinion and for taking it into account in the process of authoring and adopting legislation.

The nationwide discussions conducted in our country are valued highly; moreover, one cannot but note the fact that in contemporary conditions, purely quantitative indicators of meetings held and suggestions made are clearly inadequate. The effectiveness and the success rate of such discussions are of paramount significance, inasmuch as their purpose is to give maximum expression to, and reflect in the legislative acts and other state decisions, the will and interests of all classes and social strata of our society and all the nations and nationalities of the USSR; to fortify in every citizen a feeling of responsibility for the affairs of the nation; and to promote a profound awareness of the association between everyday tasks and the broadest prospects for social development.

It must be noted that there were shortcomings in the practice of nationwide discussions held in the 1960's and 70's. As Gromyko pointed out in his report at the 7th Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the 11th Convocation, quite often they were characterized by an excess

of organization, formalism, and lack of proper analysis of the citizens' suggestions and remarks. As a result many useful suggestions were not considered as the drafts were being revised.

The rich arsenal of our democracy is also far from fully utilized in the union and autonomous republics. After the discussion of the draft republic constitutions in 1978, no further popular discussion of legislative acts or other questions of republic significance was held—not once. And there was need for it.

Very poor use is made of the opportunities for preliminary discussion of draft resolutions of the local organs of government which directly affect the interests of the population which dwells on the territory in question. How are the municipal services enterprises in a city or rayon operating; how well do domestic services, transportation, trade, children's institutions and hospitals operate; what is the situation with the state of law and order? After all, all these and many other questions are of concern to everyone. Therefore the citizens and the working collectives are not indifferent to exactly what decision will be taken by a soviet or by its ispolkom with respect to the given sphere.

The experience of the soviets in Moscow, in Sverdlovsk Oblast and a number of others which have drawn up a sample list of questions which must be brought up for discussion by the populace, has not been widely disseminated and introduced.

In this connection I would like to draw attention to the fact that although the USSR Constitution and the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics contain instructions on holding nationwide discussions of the most important questions in the life of the state of union-level and republic-level significance, these constitutional norms have not been given properly concrete expression in existing legislation. The lack of the required legal regularization has had a detrimental effect on the organization and success rate of conducting such discussions.

It was pointed out in the Political Speech of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Congress, that our Constitution stipulates conducting nationwide discussions and plebiscites on the major questions of the life of the country, and on draft decisions by local soviets. The drafting of a law on this very important question must be speeded up. We must make even better use of such reliable channels for development of direct democracy as citizen meetings, instructions from the electors, letters from the workers; the press, radio and television; and all media that express public opinion, that provide timely and keen comments on the spiritual needs and mood of the masses.³

In accordance with the resolutions of the Congress, the USSR Law "On Nationwide Discussion of Important Questions in the Life of the State" was drawn up and passed in June 1987; republic-level laws will be adopted on the basis of this law as well.

Actively participating in drawing up this law were representatives of the USSR Ministry of Justice, the USSR Procuracy, the AUCCTU, the Komsomol Central Committee, other state organs and social organizations, and scholars. The draft was distributed to the union and autonomous republics, krais, a number of oblasts, and scientific institutions. Quite a few worthwhile suggestions were received, many of which were taken into consideration during the revision of the draft. Principled study was made of not only native but also foreign experience, primarily legislation from the socialist countries.

The law corresponds with contemporary conditions and the needs for developing socialist society, and is directed toward realization of the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the principles of the CPSU Program on the development of direct democracy. It is based on the constitutional principles for holding nationwide discussions. With its adoption, the necessary legal basis is created for effectively putting these principles into practice and it is the first legislative act which regularizes the procedure for holding nationwide discussions.

The basic statutes of the Law precisely define the democratic principles for holding nationwide discussions. It establishes that all citizens of the USSR are guaranteed free and equal participation in the discussion of important questions of the country's state and social life. In the discussion of questions of national, republic or local importance, citizens of the USSR have the right to participate directly as well as through social organizations, labor collectives, meetings at their place of residence, various organs of volunteer social activities, meetings of servicemen in their military units, and through the mass information media.

The law forbids any limitation whatsoever, directly or indirectly, on the rights of citizens of the USSR to participate in the discussion: whether by origin, social or propertied situation, racial and national origin, sex, education, language, attitude toward religion, length of residence in a given locality, or the type and nature of one's occupation; hence it is clear that every citizen of the USSR is guaranteed equal enjoyment of this right.

The law places special emphasis on the fact that the discussions must be conducted on a basis of broad glasnost. Speaking figuratively, Lenin referred to glasnost as a "sword which heals wounds". Presently, glasnost in all of its various manifestations is becoming the norm of our lives, and is inherent in the organization and functioning of the various forms of socialist popular self-government.

With respect to nationwide discussions, glasnost is expressed in the fact that draft projects submitted for discussion are published in the press, promulgated by radio and television, and are also brought to the attention of the populace by other means (at lectures, in conversations, and so on).

The mass information media, in accordance with the Law, must provide all-round coverage of the course of the discussion; must publish the suggestions and remarks received from citizens, from state organs, social organizations and working collectives; and must also provide space for reviews of suggestions and critical remarks received, and inform the public of the results of the discussions.

Every citizen must have the opportunity to express in one form or another his opinion on the question under discussion. An position of intolerance of shortcomings; a creative and highly-demanding atmosphere—these are the traits which must be inherent in the citizens' meetings during discussion of the draft projects in question.

The law defines clearly and in sufficient detail the procedure for conducting nationwide discussions. This is very important for improving their success rate, inasmuch as a mechanism is established which provides the necessary accounting for and the realization of suggestions and remarks received.

Naturally, the law cannot and should not stipulate all the specific situations in which holding nationwide discussion is mandatory. But it does point out that draft laws and resolutions to be submitted for nationwide discussions are those which touch on the basic directions of the country's political, economic and social development; on the implementation of the constitutional rights, liberties and obligations of Soviet citizens; as well as other very important questions of state life which fall under the jurisdiction of the USSR.

The decision to conduct a nationwide discussion is made by the USSR Supreme Soviet or by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, either upon their own initiative or upon the suggestion of a union republic.

With respect to recommendations on the expedience for submitting this or that specific draft law or other question for nationwide discussion, they may be made by the standing commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, by the USSR Council of Ministers, by the national organs of social organizations, or by other organs or persons who have the legal right to submit draft legislation or any other questions to the USSR Supreme Soviet or its Presidium.

Practical experience shows that in a number of situations recommendations for holding nationwide discussions originate in the CPSU Central Committee.

No later than 10 days after the decision is made to hold a nationwide discussion, the drafts or other materials are published in the central newspapers, in republic newspapers, and as circumstances require, in the local press as well.

The deadline and procedure for organizing work on examining suggestions and comments received are established in each concrete situation by the USSR Supreme Soviet or its Presidium at the same time that the question is submitted for nationwide discussion.

The conduct of this work can be delegated to the appropriate standing commissions in the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet or to a special commission created for this purpose.

Citizens may send their suggestions and comments on draft laws or other questions brought up for nationwide discussion directly to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet or the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of a union or autonomous republic, to the ispolkom of the local Soviet or other state and social organs, as well as to the newspapers and other mass information media.

All suggestions and comments are summarized by these organs and are sent to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, where they are examined and taken into consideration as the draft undergoes revision. Preparatory commissions and working groups may be created for their preliminary examination; membership of such groups includes people's deputies, the appropriate specialists, figures in science and culture, and representatives of state and social organs and scientific institutions.

Next the results of nationwide discussion are examined by the USSR Supreme Soviet or the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, as appropriate, of which the public will be informed. In practice, however, it quite often happens that citizens also submit suggestions and comments which do not directly pertain to the draft law or question under discussion. The Law establishes that in these situations, the suggestions and comments are sent to the appropriate state or social organs, which must examine them in accordance with established procedures and report the results to the deponent.

Thus, with the adoption of the given Law, all necessary legal guarantees are established in order that suggestions and comments from the citizens may be examined from every angle and summarized, and in case of necessity, may be reflected in the draft under discussion.

Along with holding nationwide discussions on the scale of the USSR, it is stipulated that drafts of republic laws and other important questions of state life in union and autonomous republics may also be submitted for popular discussion. This must be provided for in the legislation of union and autonomous republics.

The Law devotes a special place to public discussion of important questions of local significance. It is stipulated that draft decisions of local soviets and their ispolkoms on plans for comprehensive economic and social development and the budget; on guaranteeing socialist legality, preservation of public order and the rights of the citizens; on the operation of enterprises and organizations which provide services to the public; and others, must be submitted for public discussion.

Practical experience in such discussions already exists in certain administrative-territorial units; however, it is not of a systematic or universal nature.

Meanwhile, local soviets of people's deputies, who are called upon to provide for the wants and spiritual needs of the population which dwells on their territory, must take advantage of all legal and organizational means to involve the public in the management of state and social affairs, and must take into consideration the opinions of the citizens and the working collectives—which will permit them to compare the various opinions and suggestions from the workers, and select the optimal variant of the decision.

It is established in the new Law that local soviets and their ispolkoms submit their own resolutions for discussions themselves, as well as by the suggestion of standing commissions in the soviet, deputy groups, deputies, organs of social organizations, working collectives, citizen meetings at their place of residence, and other organs and organizations stipulated by legislation from union and autonomous republics. Suggestions and remarks received on draft projects under discussion must be considered during revision of the draft decision, as well as in the practical activity of the corresponding organ of state power.

Detailed procedures for submitting draft decisions of local soviets and their ispolkoms and other questions for public discussion are to be defined in republic-level legislation.

The discussion and adoption at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Law on Nationwide Discussion of Important Questions in the Life of the State is a major new step in the development of soviet democracy and popular self-government. Real opportunities are created for more effective use of this important sphere of direct democracy, and for more energetic and purposeful public influence on the drawing up and passing of decisions of state.

Today the practical matters directed at taking maximum advantage of the human factor, realizing the creative initiative of the workers, and at the same time increasing responsibility, demandingness and sound organization in all spheres of social life are becoming decisively important.

Footnotes

1. V.I. Lenin, Complete Collection of Works, Vol. 34, pp 304-305.
2. Materials on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 25-26 June 1987, p 68.
3. Materials on the 27th CPSU Congress, Moscow, 1986, p 60.

COPYRIGHT: "Sotsialisticheskaya zakonnost", 1987

9006

Response to Story on 'Fascist' Youth

School Official Refutes Story

18300009 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Aug 87 p 3

[Unsigned article: How Could Something Like That Happen?"]

[Text] On 11 July of this year, our newspaper published a story "Standardbearer from Malaya Okhta" by V. Koshvanets with the subtitle "The Consequences of the Miscalculations in Educational Work With Youths." The editor's office received many letters in which readers expressed themselves with concern and indignation on the serious neglect and omissions in the extremely important matter of educating the rising generation. This shows convincingly how necessary and current the conversation was that the newspaper carried on.

"How could something like this happen?" is the question in letters from readers. From where could our young people, being educated in Soviet schools, acquire a passion (even if fleeting and superficial) for fascist symbols? Is this conceivable in a city and a country where practically every family was singed by war?

Alas, it is inconceivable but it happens. And although a significant share, as it turns out, of such manifestations involves nothing more than a senseless childish game, a kind of horrible external shell, our readers are right: nothing can remove the responsibility either from the children themselves or from parents and teachers called upon to look after the spiritual saturation of youths. We will return again and again to this theme in detail.

But today we must also speak about something else. Besides the large number of letters, the editor's office also received official responses—from the Zhdanov Rayon Administration of Internal Affairs [RUVD], from Vocational and Technical School No 34, etc. They express support for the newspaper's position and completely share its concern about the stated phenomena. At the same time, it is apparent from these responses that despite the gravity of this subject the story contains quite a number of inaccuracies. Thus, it is impossible to tell

that the material makes use of facts going back 4 or 5 years and this led to a shifting of accents and to a lack of objectivity in evaluations. In particular, the story with the photograph discovered with one of the youths was erroneously attributed to a person having nothing whatsoever to do with it—I.V. Malanskiy, veteran of labor and staff worker in the section for nondepartmental protection of the Zhdanov RUVD.

The editor's office apologizes for these errors. We hope that the response of the Main Administration for Vocational and Technical Education published below will correct the distortions and will help to restore fairness with respect to the teaching staff of Rural Vocational and Technical School No 34 [SPTU-34] and the two graduates of the school with whom the material in question dealt.

Thus, the response states:

The article "Standardbearer from Malaya Okhta" was discussed in the board of the Main Administration for Vocational and Technical Education. Specific measures were decided upon aimed at raising the rate of success of the teaching and educational process in the vocational and technical schools, individual work with students and parents and the responsibility of teaching personnel for the training of future workers and the prevention of negative phenomena among young men and women.

Without, however, denying the topicality of the question raised in the article, the staff of the main administration believes that the author had the wrong approach to the statement of the facts involving SPTU-34, which inflicted moral damage on specific people and the staff of the school as a whole.

It has been established that the indicated facts were uncovered in 1981 and 1982, when the youths R. Piskunov and V. Kumpitskiy were students in secondary school and therefore did not yet have anything to do with the vocational and technical school. At the time of their training in SPTU-34, they were subject to constant individual educational work and each of the youths was assigned a sponsoring mentor. This led to the boys having a profound understanding of the perniciousness of their previous behavior and to their regretting their misdeeds. In 1984, they were removed from the list of the inspectorate for the affairs of minors of the 70th department of the police. Both youths successfully completed school, went to work in their base enterprise and since 1985 have been in active service in the Soviet Army.

At the present time, Junior Sergeant Vyacheslav Kumpitskiy is a section commander and has been awarded the badge "Outstanding Soldier in the Soviet Army." He was granted extraordinary leave for his successes in

service. Corporal and specialist second class Roman Piskunov is also doing excellent service: he was repeatedly encouraged by the unit commander and is respected by his comrades.

These examples are graphic confirmation of the vulnerability and danger of rash conclusions, unverified judgments and evaluations.

In 1986, V. Malanskiy, a student in SPTU-24, was linked with youths who got carried away with extremist symbols. After a thorough discussion, however, he immediately stopped all such contacts and gave serious thought to his conduct. After his completion of the course of instruction, the school's leaders took measures to place him in a job.

Having analyzed the state of affairs at SPTU-24, the board of the main administration noted that the staff of teachers of the vocational and technical school is not doing enough individual work with students and does not always exercise due influence on the formation of the views and convictions of young people. Teaching and educational work in this school was put under the control of the main administration.

The problems raised by the newspaper will be the subject of special discussion at the August teachers' conference, at the meeting of directors of vocational and technical schools, and at meetings of educational councils.

L. Gorchakov, director of Glavlennprofobr

Now, in preparing this response for publication, we asked ourselves the same question: How could such a thing happen? How could a journalist, having tackled such a critical subject, not take pains to understand the whole matter, not delve thoroughly into every detail? No justifiable anger can explain the carelessness and lack of attention to the fate of an individual person and no haste can serve to excuse the inaccuracy or lack of objectivity of the evaluations made. Especially in material where every line is perceived as a verdict.

An additional check confirmed: yes, the published story did, at the fault of the author, include inaccuracies and distortion of facts.

It seems that the response of Glavlennprofobr was an unusual continuation of this material. Without in any way diminishing the acuteness of the subject, it nevertheless shows how important and successful is the prompt and skillful intervention of adults in the affairs of young people and to what favorable changes educational work leads if it is handled not formally but properly and with interest and spirit. And certainly one must simply be pleased that the fate of these students at vocational and technical schools was straightened out and that quite different lines have now been written into their references.

And we newspaper people must also draw a lesson for ourselves from this rather complex story—a lesson of increased demands and special responsibility for each printed word. We must add that the question of the responsibility of the author of the story V. Koshvanets will be examined by the newspaper's editorial board when he returns from leave.

We apologize once again to our readers.

Readers' Letters on Story, Upbringing

18300009 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Sep 87 pp 2, 3

[Article by I. Churin, responsible secretary and member of the editorial board of LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA: "So That Such a Thing Does Not Happen, Or the Young Person in the Light of Glasnost"]

[Text] Recently many readers accused our newspaper of a sharp and incomprehensible departure from the positions of glasnost. The reason for this was the editorial "How Could Such a Thing Happen" published on 5 August of this year, where several facts stated in the 11 July article "Standardbearer from Malaya Okhta" by V. Koshvanets were made more precise.

"In comparing these materials," writes, for example, the veteran of war and labor V. Samokhin, "you are forced to conclude that having pointedly raised the question of the reasons for the appearance in our country of fascistic groups of youths and of the responsibility of adults for their rise, the newspaper then became frightened by its own courage and decided to 'apply the brakes' to what it had started. The editorial basically explains everything that happened through 'senseless childish games' and it remains entirely incomprehensible whether or not the facts presented in the previously published material took place. Is the newspaper not creating another 'zone of silence' similar to those that existed in the recent past around drug addiction, prostitution and drunkenness in the youthful milieu? And how can this be done in an age of glasnost and perestroika?"

The editor's office is getting the same kinds of questions and accusations from F. Fedotov, participant in the civil and great patriotic wars; A. Barkhotkin, party member since 1927; designer Yu. Ivanov; the student N. Starostin; the readers N. Vasilyev, A. Leontyev, Ya. Mayzels and V. Gubanova and dozens of others. At the same time, the authors of the responses to the newspaper's statements (and to date more than 300 of them have come in, not just from citizens of Leningrad but also from inhabitants of other cities of the country) ask what measures have been taken in relation to home-grown terrorists and state their views on the reasons for the rise and ways to resolve the problems raised.

An analysis of the mail that has come in as well as of the official responses and explanations received by the editor's office suggested to us the subject for the continuation of the conversation started, to which on August 5 we promised to return. **This subject is our increased indifference to the education of youths and young people.** It seems that in opening it with the help of the readers themselves we will also be able to respond to their many baffled questions and accusations.

Let us begin with the most fundamental and sharpest of them, with the supposed departure of the newspaper from the position of glasnost. In our opinion, this conclusion is premature, most likely evoked by the reaction of readers to the newspaper's presentation of facts of an irreverent enthusiasm of a certain share of young people for fascist symbols and the associated manifestations of brutality. This sounded like a bolt out of the blue for the overwhelming majority of the citizens of Leningrad. It was not without reason that many of them came write out in their letters and declared: "No, something like that simply cannot be in our city and our country."

Unfortunately, it is possible. It would be a crime to invent what our newspaper related, and now not just ours. And by no means did we do this seeking another sensation (the mail to the editor's office includes such accusations against us). "Glasnost, causing one to awaken at night in a cold sweat," writes one of our readers, thinking that "one could keep quiet about some things for the peace of mind of our fellow citizens," is necessary for our society and perestroyka, not for the sake of glasnost itself. It is necessary precisely to put an end once and for all to tranquility and indifference toward what is taking place around us and toward any violations of our laws, our morality and morals. And returning to the subject of our conversation today, we really do not have the right to sleep calmly at night as long as we encounter instances of brutality and lack of discipline in the youthful milieu and as long as we find youths in our city and country with distorted ideas about life. No matter how few of them there may be, no matter how quickly they abandon their unhealthy diversions. For it is a matter of our sacred things and ideals, a matter of our Soviet youths, the fate of each of which must not be indifferent to us.

It was precisely in accordance with such an understanding of glasnost, and one cannot—one cannot, we repeat—understand it any other way, that we wrote the editorial "*How Could Such a Thing Happen,*" in which we told of the current successful fate of several former students of PTU-34 who once got carried away with extremist symbols. The author of the material "*Standardbearer from Malaya Okhta*" took no interest precisely in how life continued to unfold for these youths.

In this connection, we would like to respond immediately to the authors of the numerous letters that assessed what happened merely as "annoying negligence in the

work" of a journalist, about which the newspaper need not even have spoken. It is necessary to do so. The empathy and support of readers is very necessary in our work, where no one, of course, is immune from blunders and mistakes. But let us be consistent: in being demanding on others, we must be demanding on ourselves. This is the most reliable guarantee against errors as well as against the slightest indifference toward the fate of the heroes of our materials. Thus, what happened will be a good lesson for V. Koshvanets, severely punished by the editorial board, as well as for the entire editor's office.

And now about the main conclusion that one cannot fail to reach in analyzing the letters of readers and the official responses to the newspaper's statements. Unfortunately, it means that the overwhelming majority of the citizens of Leningrad involved in the upbringing of youths (and who, one asks, is not involved in this?) must still be imbued with a feeling of interest in their fate. The concept of "interest" here includes, of course, its traditional content—a true striving supported by action to bring up a person just starting life to be a true citizen of his homeland as well as the willingness to put the entire zeal of one's heart and soul into his training. And that applies equally to parents, regular teachers of young people, and any one of us, because the education of a morally healthy rising generation is our common concern.

And how do things stand with the "zeal of the heart and soul" today? In PTU-34 and 24, for example, whose students were the subject of the first newspaper publication, and other organizations in some way responsible for instances of irreverent behavior of youths. The basic reaction to the newspaper article was the same everywhere: we did not know or found out too late what our wards are doing and therefore, they say, it is not our fault. They are saying that if the police or other law-enforcement agencies will inform them about everything in time, then they will certainly take measures without delay.

As a matter of fact, as it turned out, information from law-enforcement authorities on youths coming to their attention does not reach the pedagogic staffs very regularly and sometimes does not reach them at all. But you must agree that references to ignorance, to put it mildly, are not at all becoming of educators called upon and simply obligated to know everything about their pupils. The name for this ignorance is the same indifference and formalism in educational work.

And perhaps it is the unwillingness to take out the garbage, to defend the honor of the teacher's uniform by any means. The official response to the newspaper article received from PTU-24 forces us to put the matter precisely in that way. It is dated 16 July of this year and signed by V.A. Popov, acting director of the school. Besides the notorious reference to a lack of knowledge, this response also contains a description of the student mentioned in the newspaper, where, in particular, it

states that: "During the time of his studies, over the course of 3 years, he showed himself in a positive light overall. He successfully masters his specialty, does not refuse public work, carrying out individual assignments, and was a permanent member of the editorial board of the group. He participated in the sports rally according to the school plan."

But just a month before this report was compiled, more precisely on 11 June of this year, the school received an extract from a judgment of the people's court of Zhdanov Rayon stating that this student, together with the student G. from school No 66 sentenced for robbing an apartment, drank vodka stolen from that apartment and is subject to being placed on the list of the inspectorate for the affairs of minors.

Just think: a pupil of a vocational and technical school is put on the police list and the acting director of the school then writes to the editor's office about the sports merits of this youth! To be sure, we can go very very far with such views of educators on the essence and tasks of the educational process (and unfortunately they prevail not only in the vocational and technical schools).

And we are already going a long way. How else, for example, can one evaluate the fact about which we were informed a few days ago in Glavlenprofobr? It involves the following. Among the graduates of the eighth grades that the Leningrad schools have now turned over to the system of vocational and technical education are more than 1,000 so-called "difficult" youths on the list of the inspectorate for the affairs of minors. But here they found out these kids need to be watched closely from the first days of their training in the PTU mainly not from their school records but after the corresponding requests for information from the police. Meanwhile, 2 years ago the Leningrad public prosecutor's office called the attention of the Main Administration for Public Administration to the inadmissibility of such a practice but, as we see, it is still flourishing.

Is it necessary to explain how such "forgetfulness" of teachers harms the cause of education? We are not even saying that it is by no means dictated by concern, perhaps false, about the interests of the young person but by the unwillingness to acknowledge their own faulty work and by the elementary fear that suddenly an objective report will prevent a difficult student from being admitted to the PTU and that they will send him back to the school.

In those same schools, they now frequently keep instances of drug addiction and the abuse of toxic substances from higher authorities. And again, it is not in the interests of the youths but in the interests of their own adult well-being. So long live glasnost, which is more and more often and more boldly tearing away

layers of "secrecy" from this well-being that no one needs, forcing us to think a little more often about where and what we have neglected and are neglecting because of our indifference!

As for the youths, everyone, above all parents, needs to think about their fate and what will become of them tomorrow. Practically all the authors of the comments to the editor's office are writing about this. "The main reason for what happened," this is the conviction of veteran of the armed forces V. Shevchenko, "is the lack of the proper training in the family. Lack of control and indifference on the part of the parents gives the youths an incorrect understanding of life, spiritual insensitivity, early unruliness, and cruelty. Therefore, if we want to see our young people morally healthy, we must put the strictest demands on the family without any allowances for circumstances extenuating guilt..." Even more categorical is V. Solod, member of the CPSU since 1943 and chairman of a council of veterans—defenders of the road of life: "Parents whose children commit acts incompatible with the norms of our life must be taken hold of publicly and asked: 'Who did you bring up, where do your children hang out at night, and what funds do they use for their outrageous and licentious behavior?'" "A court of honor! A court of conscience!"—that is what the reader G. Nikitina proposes establishing for such parents. "Their unworthy, immoral and antisocial behavior—and that is the only way to evaluate the parents' self-removal from the training of their children—should be examined at the meetings of women's councils and councils of labor collectives and other public organizations," suggests the builder A. Alimov.

Well now, these proposals include a whole program of actions for the public. It is a rigorous program but it seems that one must not reject it, especially when one remembers the price that society pays for the indifference of parents.

By the way, it is above all the civil conscience and the responsibility of the parents themselves that must do away with this indifference. Mother of four children I. Tretyakova spoke very well on this in her letter directed to the parents of the youths who were named by the newspaper: "You are probably feeling much pain and bitterness now. It probably seems to you that you are paying too severe a price for the senseless past misdeeds of your children. Do not let this pain eat away at you. Let something else be the source of your pain: let it come from the fact that having allowed, failed to notice and underestimated what happened you did not cope with your age-old obligations as parents. Let this pain of yours be passed on to all parents to warn them against repeating your mistakes."

It is difficult to add to what has been said.

The pain felt for a son, a neighbor's boy, a student, a Komsomol comrade, or for a youth simply passing on the street, the pain that he does not miss or waste

anything in his feelings and ideas about life, about our history and about our sacred revolutionary achievements is the effective remedy against indifference and at the same time it is a living water guaranteeing the moral health of the rising generation.

In speaking about today's lack of this pain, readers are writing about the formal teaching of literature and history in the schools, about the boredom and excessive organization prevailing in military and patriotic measures and at Komsomol and Pioneer meetings, about the depressing inability of adults to talk with youths in a simple and human way without lecturing them, and about the neglected state of the work in the place of residence, where children wanting to involve themselves in radiotechnology or motor sports are advised to join a circle for gentle games.

But here is what forces one to take heed in these letters. Most of the readers raise these questions somehow too far removed from themselves, as though they personally have long since done everything necessary or even more than enough for the proper education of the young generation. Hence, someone else must now resolve these questions and not we and you? But this, the endless shifting of responsibility to each other, is what maintains indifference. Putting it even more precisely, this is its essence.

In our opinion, the peculiar striving to remove oneself from responsibility for the education of young people is also seen in those responses to the newspaper's statements whose authors unconditionally reject any attempts to grasp the reasons for what happened and who see the only way to resolve the problem in the introduction of the strictest measures of punishment for those extremists attempting to harm our sacred things.

We are prepared in advance to apologize to these readers for such a suggestion, inasmuch as we completely share their rightful anger in relation to home-grown "standard-bearers," sadists and other scum. We also think that such degenerates and perverts need to be punished most severely, especially since, as the readers' letters correctly stress, their vile acts "are not by any means being committed by infants." They are being punished and judged. The "neo-Nazi" A. Zuyev, who killed a mushroom gather in the forest several years ago, was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment and other adherents of fascist symbols who "played with it" to the point of malicious hooliganism and other crimes were punished severely. That is how things will be in the future as well.

But we are now talking about something else. In their rightful anger, who do readers think should be given the most ruthless sentences? Youths and young people coming to us from out of nowhere? No, they are our own children and grandchildren and the children and grandchildren of our acquaintances, fellow countrymen and shift. They are youths and young people whom we all overlooked in some stage of their lives. Therefore,

whether we like it or not, every sentence that has already been or will be handed down to a Soviet juvenile violating the law and norms of our life is or will be a sentence against our common indifference. And so that this does not occur, one must not simply become angry but work together for the complete eradication of the manifestations in the youthful milieu that shame us as well, manifestations that simply must not exist in our city and our country.

Still, we would like to conclude this conversation with our readers on a more optimistic note. Glasnost, being the best medicine against indifference, is already starting to do its work. It is already not only forcing us to "wake up at night in a cold sweat" but is also stimulating us to take specific actions. The problems in the fight against the unhealthy extremist diversions of some young people, including those problems raised by our newspaper, are under the constant control of the prosecutor's office of Leningrad and the oblast. The police are taking effective measures to stop such manifestations.

There was demanding and self-critical talk about ways to bring about a decisive improvement of educational work with students at the August pedagogic conference of teachers in the system of vocational and technical training, at the meetings of leaders of vocational and technical schools and pedagogic councils, in the staffs of teachers and masters of PTU's 34 and 24, and in the schools.

The Komsomol, which is still greatly indebted to the society for work with this category of young people, has turned more energetically toward youths. As A. Kuznetsov, secretary of the Leningrad Gorkom of the Komsomol reported to the editor's office, questions linked with the improvement of the ideological-moral and military-patriotic training of young people were discussed at special section conferences and at the meeting of the bureau of the Komsomol gorkom. It is planned, in particular, to establish unified military-patriotic associations in each school, PTU and tekhnikum and, together with the educational methods center of Glaslenprofobr, methods are being worked out for work with various informal youth groups.

But perhaps it is even more pleasing that the ice, as they say, was also broken among the broad Leningrad public, as is evidenced by the mail to the editor's office. Thus, the inhabitant of Malaya Okhta Yu. Kondrashov writes that this winter he is committing himself to "set up a youth hockey rink in his own microrayon." After discussing the newspaper articles, members of the council of veterans of the Great Patriotic War of the Leningrad organization of the Architects Union of the RSFSR sent to the editor's office an entire collection of specific proposals called upon to "eliminate the looming omissions in the education of young people." They include the organization of marches of young people and youths

to places of revolutionary and military glory, the establishment of special commemorative badges for the heroic children of Leningrad, and much more. The architect veterans themselves are prepared to carry out part of this work.

And the reader N. Lizunova writes quite briefly and simply: "I give my word of honor as a mother that I will bring up my 8-year-old son to be a genuine person."

The honorable cause of each of us is to bring our own children up to be real patriots of the socialist Fatherland and to raise proper replacements for ourselves.

9746

Demographic, Labor Issues Discussed at Kazakh Seminar

1830034 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 6 Oct 87 p 3

[KazTAG report: "Administration of Labor and Social Development Under the New Conditions of Management"]

[Text] On 3 October there was a regularly scheduled meeting of a continuing seminar for senior officials, including representatives of the CP Central Committee of Kazakhstan, the Presidium of the KaSSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers, the KaSSR Council of Trade Unions, and the Komsomol Central Committee of Kazakhstan, together with leaders of republic ministries and departments. It was devoted to the tasks and problems of administering labor and social development under the new conditions of management.

A report by S. U. Dzhandosov, chairman of the KaSSR State Committee on Labor [Goskomtrud], emphasized that steady economic growth and a rise in the people's standard of living cannot be achieved without a sharp increase in the efficiency of work performance. Herein lies the essence and prescribed purpose of managing labor and social development under current conditions. Carrying out a strong social policy means creating an effective mechanism for managing social processes at all levels—from the labor collective to republic and all-union economic organs—and a radical change in the system of territorial and regional management of the economy regarding to problems of social development with the extension of rights of labor collectives.

The KaSSR Goskomtrud and corresponding bodies locally are searching persistently for ways and methods of operating under the new conditions, and they are determining measures providing for their active participation in the renewal of the republic's economic life. One of the most important aspects of this activity will be projection and long-term planning of overall development in the social sphere with due regard for changes in people's requirements and the interests and needs of various segments and groups within the population.

USSR Goskomtrud and the AUCCTU are instructed to develop, in cooperation with republic councils of ministers, together with ministries and departments, an integrated program of social development, raising the well-being of the people in the course of a 15-year period. The program will cover problems of labor, the population's standard of living, wages and social consumption funds, as well as fuller satisfaction of residential housing and the cultural needs of the people, and developing the material base for the social sector.

The initial program is to be introduced by the middle of next year. It should be developed with the participation of republic and local bodies concerned with labor and social problems, especially since in many respects—in particular, population, living standards, and labor resources, among others—it is necessary to clearly reflect regional characteristics.

A careful analysis should be made of the existing situation as it has developed, identifying the most vital problems, and defining ultimate objectives and developmental goals for meeting efficient standards in using material goods and services, as well as for overcoming the lags that have occurred in developing one area or another of the social sector.

Special attention is to be paid to the necessity of carrying out a workable demographic policy, conducting regional population programs as an integral part of the overall program for social development and the raising of the people's material welfare.

It is necessary for each oblast, each city and region to know and carry out its part in the republic's overall program of demographic development so as to achieve and maintain optimal rates of population growth, raising the birthrate where it is low, reducing infant and adult mortality, and improving the demographic profile of the population. Locally, attention should be paid to family planning with a view to attaining optimum family composition, and to the efficient employment of labor resources, especially of women. Demographic processes can and should be regulated—they must be subject to control.

It is also necessary to learn to control the processes of migration. There is a strong and continuous outflow of the rural population to urban areas and beyond republic boundaries. Motives for migration include inadequate work openings, limited opportunities for professional advancement, scanty social and cultural facilities, and weak development of services. Thus the implementation of demographic policy depends on resolving an array of social problems—among them, employment, improving distribution patterns, and raising the standard of living.

There are a number of examples in the republic of how industrial and agricultural enterprises even in stagnant periods have taken the initiative and independently, using their own resources, have addressed important

issues of social and demographic development. The extension of rights of the local soviets and expansion of the role of territorial control organs is creating favorable conditions for this. Plans for the distribution of productive forces, scientific and technical development, and the entire investment policy will be judged from the social point of view, bearing in mind potential demographic and economic consequences.

Preparing a comprehensive program of social development and improving the people's welfare is closely bound up with the establishment of scientifically substantiated social standards. They constitute a basis for planning and serve as criteria for the level of development achieved in the social sphere as well as an important means of determining the distribution of resources and measuring social priorities.

Many social standards are obsolescent; for example, the standard requirements for the organization of labor and reasonable standards of nutrition. With respect to a number of social problems—take, for instance, the standard of living—there have been no social standards established up to the present time. Until recently such a concept as a minimum consumer (subsistence) budget or a reasonable consumer budget, insofar as it applied to various population groups and regions of the country, was prohibited. Social requirements were not regarded as relevant to new techniques and technology or to buildings and equipment. Furthermore, existing social standards were based in part on the "residual" principle of identifying resources for the development of the social sphere.

What kind of social standards must be worked out directly at the local level is a question that should be considered carefully.

Recent experience in Kazakhstan has demonstrated an entirely new approach to social standards, as may be seen in the Housing-91 program. It is not simply square meters of housing, but housing quarters, and not quarters in general, but a visible movement of those waiting in line—that is, actual housing accommodations.

Great interest is being shown in standards of consumption, especially consumption of food products. Here, two aspects should be noted: It is necessary to strengthen the effort on behalf of the Food Program; secondly, it is necessary to increase knowledge of consumption patterns.

Basic restructuring of economic management means creating a system for achieving efficient forms of employment, vocational guidance, recruitment, training, retraining, and job placement of personnel, as well as radically improving the use of manpower.

Regional differences in patterns of population reproduction and the deployment of productive forces bring about irregularities in the employment of manpower in the republic's territory, some areas being over-supplied with manpower, while others face an acute shortage.

Resolving employment problems is to a significant degree tied up with the prudent deployment of new enterprises and the extension of existing ones; with improving the employment structure with respect to branch of industry, age, and sex; and with the redistribution of manpower. However, ministries and departments, especially those of the union government, until now have been predisposed, with the help of the ispolkoms, to place new productive facilities in major cities, primarily oblast centers, without expenditure of funds for social needs, relying on free, for the most part male, labor. This is typical institutional egotism.

Payment for labor, as of 1 January 1988, in enterprises converting to self-financing, will be on a scale of 300 rubles per worker in regions where there is a labor shortage and 200 rubles otherwise; this will serve to prevent the squandering of manpower, while bringing closer together the interests of enterprises and territories.

The problem of building up and utilizing manpower resources in rural areas merits special attention. At the present time the number of people in the rural population who are in an age group that is capable of work is 3.4 million. Nevertheless, as a result of the low level of work productivity, agroindustrial enterprises complain of a shortage of workers during peak periods, especially of qualified workers, particularly tractor and combine operators. At harvest time in Kazakhstan 15,000-16,000 combine operators and drivers are recruited from other republics. Nowadays the shortage comes to about 34,000 people. Meanwhile, during the period 1981-1985 and in the professional and technical schools alone 278,000 machine operators received training. In addition, 238,700 tractor operators, combine operators and motor vehicle operators received instruction through the school course system. Yet the fact is that the additional increment of machine operators does not exceed 8,000 people.

Unsatisfactory social and domestic conditions, poor organization of labor, and irregular employment seasonally have resulted in a low degree of permanence on the part of workers remaining at the same job. In fact, there is a question whether qualified workers and specialists can be retained when 61 percent of the rural settlements do not have standard schools, 73 percent do not have pre-school establishments, 37 percent lack libraries, 36 percent lack either fixed or mobile film-showing facilities, 58 percent lack institutions of public health, and 51 percent lack commercial enterprises.

Agricultural production is the republic's major industry. In the spring and fall it requires a work force of 2 million people; that is, about 20 percent more than in winter

months. To maintain such a work force year-round is extremely costly. It is necessary therefore vigorously and assiduously to look for ways of overcoming seasonal peaks through a rise in the productivity of labor during harvesting; through the introduction of applied science and technology; through a more efficient use of machinery; through improvement in the organization of labor; through an extension of labor payment based upon final results; and through family and rental contracts.

At the same time, it is essential that measures be taken for overcoming seasonal labor through distribution of the branches and workshops of industrial enterprises; through the organization of subsidiary arts and industries for the recycling of local raw materials; and through the broad development of services.

Intensive management methods require new approaches to the allocation of manpower resources. Whereas previously the manpower needs of the republic economy were met by involving to a maximum extent the population capable of work in social production, now the primary concern is to free up and redistribute the surplus work force.

The implementation of the Law of Enterprises, the transition to cost accounting and self-financing, the increased rate of technical re-equipping, and a rise in labor productivity will accelerate and increase the scale of the process of releasing excess workers. Only in connection with the improvement of wage rates and salaries is there expected to be a necessity for relocation, involving about 300,000 people. Reductions in the administrative apparatus will involve many thousands of people, including more than 10,000 in Alma-Ata alone.

There is complete assurance that threats of unemployment in the republic do not exist. There is only a possibility of local surpluses in the work force. In some locations there is more than enough surplus labor, such as the Caspian oil and gas complex, the Ekibastuzskiy fuel and energy complex, the new heavy metallurgy projects, and the machine-building and the refining industries. There will continue to be increasing demand for qualified workers in the service sphere and in other sectors of the social infrastructure.

Extending the scale of releasing the surplus work force requires bolstering the system for making proper use of manpower resources, for their retraining and redistribution, and regulating inter-sectional and especially inter-territorial mobility.

Particular attention should be paid to improving the allocation of manpower resources in urban areas and rayons, since it is here that the right to work and full employment should be provided guaranteed to Soviet citizens in a concrete form, and to organization of a system for job placement and vocational guidance of the population. This system will facilitate job placement of

released workers as well as identification and involvement of those citizens who want to work on a special schedule—that is, at home or part-time or a few days a week, or even in cases of having more than one job at a time.

Recently throughout the country there has been extensive development of cooperative and individual work activity. Unfortunately, in the republic this kind of work has been developing with mixed success. Only 206 cooperatives in all have been established (including 2 in Mangyshlak Oblast, 2 in Turgay Oblast, 3 in Kzyl-Orda Oblast, and 4 in Dzhezkazgan Oblast), and 6,500 people in all are presently engaged in individual labor activity. Obstacles in the path of this vital effort are unjustified refusals in giving permission, an unusual amount of suspicion, absence of accommodations, and poor provision of materials and resources.

The July plenum ordered management bodies and enterprises to undertake a qualitatively new approach to the organization of labor. A number of ministries, departments, enterprises, and organizations, however, have maintained a policy of increasing working positions and recruiting supplementary manpower. Production capital has been accumulating on the basis of obsolescent technology. The extra staff members are being installed in part to deal with all sorts of contingencies. To rest one's hopes on the idea that this "fallout" will disappear of its own accord with the transition to self-financing is out of the question. One must apply to the automation process this simple thought: The work is most efficiently carried out with the fewest number of people.

One of the most important aspects of work is the transition to the multi-shift system. In the first eight months of this year the shift index of workers in industry rose from 1.45 to 1.49. The overall number of persons employed, however, did not increase. In some places the day shift was divided into two shifts simply for appearances and reporting purposes. Currently 59.1 percent of workers are in the first shift, 26.5 percent are in the second, and 14.4 percent in the third. These figures reflect a considerable reserve of recruited manpower, reportedly up to 150,000 people.

The multi-shift system is being introduced, to put it mildly, without enthusiasm. And how could it be otherwise when it disrupts extensive and habitual patterns of city life and adds to the concerns of transport workers, educators, and workers in public catering, trade, domestic service and supply services. Yet after we have made big plans to tap this potential for raising the rate of production volume and to recruit labor by a broad range of unemployed citizens, we must finish what we have begun.

Among the social factors that pertain to labor, without belittling other factors, it is expedient to focus upon the place of work, the work situation, and the conditions of work.

Currently, more than 755,000 persons, including 222,000 women, are working in the republic under conditions that do not meet requirements and standards for the protection of labor.

The proportion of manual labor in the republic economy comes to 44.4 percent, including the nearly 60 percent to be found in the building industry and in agriculture. A special program to reduce the use of manual labor provides for a reduction in the current year of the number of workers engaged in manual labor by 200,000 and the virtual elimination of women from this type of activity. Branch and oblast programs, however, are for the most part in the habit of receiving funds for mechanization within the centralized system, and many planned efforts to curtail the use of manual effort therefore remain unrealized. A parasitical attitude is taken both locally and in the ministries; efforts are not concentrated on solving the problems of mechanizing labor, and efforts are not undertaken to provide for the manufacture of non-standard equipment and machinery for small-scale mechanization on a cooperative basis. This is not in the spirit of restructuring.

The process of improving standards of labor is not progressing at the rate that is necessary. Standards have gradually lost their function as a measure of work performance and more and more are being touted as a means of driving up wages in accordance with a certain average—rather than high—level of achievement. The process of conversion to new conditions of payment for work that has been begun by the industrial branches is being carried out in the majority of cases without being closely correlated with the establishment of proper standards. Special attention to this problem should be paid at oblast, city, and rayon levels, so that enterprises and organizations may be drawn to a single standard of work effort, and so that the flow of skilled workers from some enterprises to others may be reduced.

Improving the management mechanism and making the conversion to self-financing and self-sufficiency is closely intertwined with developing the collective contract.

Focusing upon final results, on finished products of high quality, and turning over building projects together with developing self-management, mutual responsibility, and engineering self-sufficiency is making this progressive form of organizing labor extremely promising. Unfortunately, contractual agreements are fairly often broken, chiefly by the administrations. We continue to be timid in making the transition from contract brigades to contract workshops and sections. And as of today we do not have a single contract enterprise in industry. This process, of course, is also one that is responsive to a desire for regulation and control.

Certification and streamlining of work positions is facilitating to a large degree a fuller utilization of manpower, increased production efficiency, and a rise in work

productivity. In a majority of cases, however, this effort is being carried out piecemeal and without the broad participation of workers. In a number of enterprises and associations this work has been turned over to workers in the departments of labor and wages without the involvement of the technical services.

Converting the economy to an intensive path of development is impossible without the efficient utilization of work time and the strengthening of discipline, together with the systematic organization of production. In 1986 as compared with the preceding year the loss of work time per worker was reduced by 18.7 percent in industry and by 22.9 percent in construction. Labor turnover was reduced considerably.

Nevertheless, losses of work time as a result of unauthorized absenteeism, downtime, and leave by permission of the management remain intolerably high. Last year for these reasons a total of 3,900 persons in industry and 2,200 in construction were absent from work every day.

Endeavoring to make up the considerable loss of work time, republic enterprises and organizations are making use on a wide scale of work on days off and overtime hours. In 1986 each worker in industry averaged 6.96 hours of overtime and 1.38 hours of work on days off; in construction each worker averaged 13.31 and 2.19 respectively.

Unused work time for reasons of illness belongs in a special category. During the past year in the field of industry alone in the KaSSR more than 45,500 persons were absent each day from work for reasons of illness or because of medical authorizations. This is equivalent to a reduction in labor productivity of 5.1 percent! It testifies to poor labor conditions and a total disregard of preventive measures.

Labor payment reform is an essential aspect of improving the management mechanism at the current stage of development. Experience shows, however, that the ministries and departments are realizing the possibilities of raising wages through expanding the scale of production, increasing labor productivity, improving the management structure, and releasing elements of the work force at an intolerably slow rate of progress.

The work of reviewing and introducing stricter standards of expenditures for labor, the refiguring of rates of wages for workers and for work performed, the recertification and streamlining of job positions, and review and critical reappraisal of standard labor is proceeding with great difficulty.

Moreover, the principles of earning bonuses in a number of instances have not been worked out. The new system of awarding bonuses, which has been in effect since the

first of January, should stimulate the growth of production volume and improve product quality, while encouraging fulfillment of agreements for delivery and the saving of raw materials and energy.

Certain ministries have been incorrectly interpreting the policy governing the relationship between wages and work productivity and have been overly sensitive in reacting to comments regarding policy deviations that have been revealed.

Measures for improving wages, reducing the size of the management apparatus, and the transition to the new conditions of management affect the interests a large body of elderly people. That is why the organization of social and domestic assistance is of such importance for those who are of advanced age or incapacitated and in need of care.

At the same time it is necessary to give those who can and want to work the opportunity to do so within their capabilities. Centers should be established for the employment of persons of limited capabilities through the broad use of work at home and the recruitment of pensioners in cooperatives and individual labor activity—a field in which the proportion of pensioners is presently no more than 50 percent.

An essential ingredient of labor management and social development is personnel accreditation. Scientific and technical progress and the new conditions of management pose new tasks for each worker; they require the qualitative improvement of the complement of workers, improvement in their competence and sense of responsibility, as well as the upgrading of their training and professional personnel qualifications.

It must be said that the importance of organizing the professional training of workers has been clearly underestimated by the ministries and departments as well as at the local level. A considerable number of the professional and technical schools are completed without studying or taking into account the particular requirements for skilled workers in the branches and regions. In Pavlodar, Alma-Ata, and East Kazakhstan oblasts students are trained in professional occupations that are not called for in the requests of the basic enterprises. The relative number of students being trained for occupations requiring multiple skills continues to be low. Most important, the quality of workers undergoing training, their degree of professionalism, and civic maturity remains low. To a large extent it is the predisposition of parental and school groups to send the worst students to the professional and technical schools.

We must rid ourselves of the misconception that professions are easily accessible. This is especially true with respect to training skilled workers for industry, which more than 70 percent of qualified workers are preparing to enter. By shortening the training period and by not

observing established wage and skill categories we denigrate the social significance of qualified labor. We need not regret the amount spent on the most profitable of investments—the investment for knowledge and qualifications. The production training resources of the enterprises and organizations, ministries and departments, which fall far short of the standards set for the field, must continue to be strengthened.

The existing system for training workers in professional and technical schools and for industry is not flexible enough in altering the qualification requirements for skilled workers. It is necessary to speed the transition to a system of orders and contracts for training the work force with greater adaptation to the needs of the regions.

The task of acquiring republic representation in the working class for the Kazakh nationality is becoming particularly critical. According to the latest statistics, as of 1 July of this year, whereas the proportion of the Kazakh nationality is 38.5 percent for the republic's population as a whole, the proportion of Kazakhs among industrial workers constitutes 21 percent. In construction the proportion is 21.4 percent, but in certain other fields it is even lower; for example, 13.5 percent in machine-building, 9.3 percent in the coal industry, 8.4 percent in heavy metallurgy, and 13.6 percent in electrical power engineering.

As a matter of fact, we have already indicated how to effect the redistribution of manpower resources, principally of youth, by sending them to professional and technical schools, and the Komsomol's call for Kazakh boys and girls to gain access to the working professions.

The problem of training and utilizing specialists continues to be an important issue. A significant number of graduates from the institutes and technical secondary schools—up to 12 percent of them—do not show up at the jobs to which they have been assigned, and many of those arriving settle down at positions which do not require high or mid-level special education.

There are many unresolved questions with regard to planning the training of specialists. The different regions of the republic are provided for in different ways.

For example, in such a thoroughly developed area as Pavlodar Oblast teachers with a higher education in urban areas amount to no more than 56.3 percent and in rural areas to 49.5 percent. Many of the specialists do not stay for long at their positions because of poor housing conditions. Once again this points to a necessity for unremitting attention to social problems.

The problems and tasks of managing labor and social development are diverse, large in scope, and complex. Many of them need sound scientific substantiation. Unfortunately, the republic lacks an independent institute of scientific research, and advanced research in the

various scientific institutions is not connected or coordinated. Obviously, the time is ripe for considering the establishment of a special institute.

However, without waiting for any kind of reinforcements, and relying solely on the forces at hand, the time has come to take action. The time has come to make a concerted effort, exploiting the full powers of the Party's influence, the mass media, and the administrative apparatus. For this effort is required of us by the policy of social priorities adopted by the Party for restructuring the management mechanism.

12889

Estonian Conference Urges New Studies on Nationality Relations

18000063 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 23 Oct 87p 2

Unsigned article: "Dialectic of Nationality Processes at Center of Attention of All-Union Scientific Conference in Tallinn: Analysis and Considered Assessment of Past and Present Needed"]

[Excerpts] "The commonality of the historical fortunes of the peoples of the USSR: History and Modern Times" — this was the theme of an all-union scientific conference held in the capital of our republic from 13 through 15 October, which was organized by the Estonian CP Central Committee, the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute for the History of the USSR and Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of History. The conference was dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution and to the 65th anniversary of the founding of the USSR. Taking part in it were historians, social scientists, party and Komsomol workers, and lecturers from almost all the fraternal union and autonomous republics.

The slogans of the CPSU Central Committee for the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution contain the following one: "Citizens of the Soviet Union! Study the revolutionary past of the party and the people. Hold sacred the memory of the glorious pages contained in the chronicles of our country". This slogan is a strong statement of the fact that the study of our homeland's history is being elevated to a state level, that it is becoming the affair of the entire people. The responsibilities of professional historians vis-a-vis the country's peoples are correspondingly increased in this connection!

This all-union scientific conference was conducted in a heightened spirit of responsibility as well. The upcoming 70th anniversary of the October Revolution and the 60th [sic] anniversary of the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were the focal point of an address given by Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor S.S. Khromov. The October Revolution and the First All-Union Congress of Soviets, which proclaimed the

establishment of the USSR, were key events in the solution of the nationalities question, in the establishment and development of a multi-national socialist state, created on an equal and voluntary basis. Today, at a time when a restructuring of all spheres of social life is taking place within our country, thanks to the achievement of a qualitatively new social situation, it is difficult to over-emphasize the importance of an understanding of nationality problems; they have a direct bearing on the economy, politics, ideology, culture, and the sphere of everyday social life. That which our country and people have achieved by way of solving the nationalities question represents the most important accomplishment of our society since the victory of the October Revolution. But, today, life itself has posed important tasks for further improving nationality relations. Timely solutions to the problems which have arisen in this area are assuming the greatest importance.

The historical experience of our country has once again shown that, even after the elimination of the antagonisms, inequality, and national distrust inherited from capitalism, the development of nations and nationalities and the relations between them present a whole complex of problems peculiar to our present stage. Along with new consolidating factors in the life of our nations and nationalities, we have also seen the appearance of negative phenomena connected with the period of stagnation in the 1970's and beginning of the 1980's. It seems that Soviet social scientists should have understood the essence of these negative tendencies and should have provided prescriptions for the treatment of these illnesses. However, instead of objective studies of socio-economic and other processes, which are in their essence very complicated and contradictory, the social scientists proposed a large number of treatises having a "congratulatory" nature. The speaker acknowledged that mistakes made in the area of nationality relations have remained in the shade, that it has not been the accepted thing to talk about them. The negative tendencies which appeared also became possible because we did always use, as a basis for practice, the valuable and hard-earned historical experience of our party and of the Soviet state in the struggle against chauvinism and nationalism. And, meanwhile, the history of solving the nationalities question in the USSR and of the development of nationality relations is extremely instructive: it shows in the struggle with what kinds of difficulties it was possible to create a lasting, voluntary union of peoples on a basis of equal rights. The path of international consolidation was undertaken by working peoples of various nationalities and nations, many of which found themselves not only at different stages of social development, but were also prisoners of various sorts of religious doctrines, which always operate against the unification of peoples and engender nationalism. And therefore a no less important aspect of the assertion of a new type of nationality relations was an uncompromising struggle by the party against nationalism in another sense — against pan-Islamism, pan-Turkism, and great power chauvinism. It is the task of historians to energize their work to reveal

this historical experience of the party, of the working class, and of all working people in establishing true collaboration among our peoples, in eliminating the existing inequality of nations and peoples. This struggle must be revealed on the basis of specific historic materials, with the use of new sources, and history must be presented as it is, without either tarnishing or polishing reality. This must be truthful history, written from Leninist class positions.

It is just as important, the speaker stressed, to also reveal the causes which have served to bring our peoples together, to show in its entirety how the a commonality of their historic destinies, rooted in the distant past, developed in joint struggle with foreign invaders. There are many problems for historians here — from analysis of the economic, cultural, and social factors contributing to the creation of a commonality, to study of the factors and reasons which have slowed this process. It is necessary to take a concrete historical approach toward uncovering this complex and heretofore variously understood process, based on Marxist-Leninist methodology.

Unfortunately, today, a number of studies concerning the nationality question in the USSR suffer from insufficient analysis of such an important factor as, for example, the religious one. Unfortunately, in important works published in the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, including the republic encyclopedias, you will not find any characterization of the reactionary role of Islam. Many authors fail to see that, most frequently, nationalism and chauvinism have been decked out and are now decked out in religious clothing. Attention is given to this aspect of the problem in the well-known decision of CPSU Central Committee concerning Kazakhstan. The deformations which have taken place in the life of our society, embodying instances of corruption, bribery, and inattention to development of the social sphere, to human needs, have helped to strengthen religion's positions in a number of regions in our country. The weakness of our atheistic propaganda — the element of administration by injunction and an inability to carry on individual work among the believers of various nationalities — also can and should be, in the opinion of the speaker, a subject of careful study by social scientists working in the area of nationality relations.

We need to ensure a realistic approach to analysis of the development of nationality relations in the USSR and to show convincingly, first of all, the enormous positive experience that exists in the solution of nationality problems.

Just as nations and cultures cannot truly flourish without the natural process of their drawing more closely together, so the drawing together of nations can proceed if a brake is put on the flourishing of each of them. New studies are needed which clarify the far-reaching formula given in the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress and in the addresses of M.S. Gorbachev: the development of

single culture of the Soviet people, socialist in terms of content, diverse in terms of national forms, and internationalist in terms of spirit, on the basis of the best achievements of the distinctive progressive traditions of the peoples of the USSR. It stands to reason that great efforts are required in order to provide concrete content to this formula. The thesis calling for ensuring high standards in inter-nationality relations, the speaker noted, must also become a part of our everyday life.

One cannot speak of an inseparable union of our republics while ignoring its material basis — the economy, the country's unified national economic complex. A research task also derives from this, said the speaker — to discover how a multi-nationality national economic complex is formed and functions, having subjected the natural laws and special characteristics of this process in the various national republics to analysis.

There are many new problems. One such, for example, is to study and publish specific recommendations concerning new functions for USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities, so that it will be involved to a greater degree with problems of nationality relations, whereas now, in fact, it duplicates the functions of the Soviet of the Union. Sometimes misunderstandings still arise in the relations between neighboring rayons or oblasts of the various republics, which develop into legal suits, while the leaders of soviet and party organs, instead of preventing or soothing passions, avoid making principled decisions. In large measure, the speaker acknowledged, this reproach must be addressed to the historians as well, since they are not arming the practical workers with scholarly works relating to improving the state structure dealing with nationalities.

There are no works concerning the history of certain Soviet peoples which do not have their own national states — such, for example, as the Germans, the Poles, the Karelians, the Kurds, the Baluchi, the Tungus, the Uigurs, the Bulgarians, the Gagauz [Gagauztsy], the Hungarians, the gypsies, and the Crimean Tatars. It won't do that we also still do have a well-written history of the Russian Federation which, by the way, became the prototype for the formation of the USSR.

It is necessary today to study more analytically and concretely the social-class structure of society as a whole and in the individual republics. And, first of all, how national detachments of the working class are formed. In all of the union republics, the working class presently comprises more than half the population. We write this everywhere but, at the same time, do not always analyze another fact: in a number of republics, workers belonging to the core nationality make up one-fifth of the total number of workers. Scholars must discover and show the factors which are slowing down the formation of national detachments of the working class, and to suggest ways of eliminating these factors.

In the address, the question of language policy was presented as an important state problem.

Shortcomings in the study of the Russian language as a medium of international intercourse make it necessary to turn to one of Lenin's precepts: he noted that the requirements of economic turnover always force the people who live in one country, as long as they want to live together, to study the language of the majority, but that there is only one thing that we do not want here — an element of coercion. We have something to think about and work on in this area today. But there is something else that has to be kept in mind — the weak mastery of the language of the national republics by those people who do not belong to the core nationality but who live permanently in these republics. Consequently, it is necessary to use all means to propagandize study of the language of the basic nationality of a given republic by representatives of other nationalities. This is also an important conclusion for which it is necessary to provide a good basis in scientific works.

And, of course, social scientists today have a duty with regard to such phenomena as national exclusiveness, attitudes of localism, and national arrogance. It is necessary to uncover their social and moral roots and to prescribe ways to overcome them.

The events in Alma-Ata and in the Baltic republics, the demonstrations of a group of Crimean Tatars in Moscow, and other facts show once again how necessary it is to scientifically analyze the negative phenomena in nationality relations. Meanwhile, their study still involves a great deal of dogmatism and obsolete assessment and almost no sociological research is being carried out. The training of cadres of specialists in the area of nationality relations is very poorly organized. To find such a specialist is a whole problem in itself. Perversions of personnel policy in the republics, when only national origin, family and local ties, etc. are being used as a basis, are not being subjected to critical analysis.

A tradition of particular attentiveness, sensitivity, and circumspection in the development of nationality relations, and of promptly resolving problems which arise here, comes to us from Lenin. Today, the situation demands from scholars a search for new approaches in this matter, which, undoubtedly, will contribute to the revolutionary restructuring of Soviet society.

13032

LiSSR Nationalist's Proposals Receive Official Commentary

*18000061 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
27 Oct 87pp 2-3*

[Unsigned Article: "Do Not Substitute Nationalistic for the National"]

[Text] This newspaper's editors have received a letter from a writer who, while saying nothing about himself, hiding behind a pseudonym and not even giving a return

address, expresses his views on the problem of nationality relations in our country and within the Lithuanian SSR. We have asked Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Docent A. Kunchinas to comment on this letter. The letter itself and his response to it are printed below.

Pseudonymous letter signed Algis Butrimas

In connection with the restructuring which is presently taking place in all spheres of life, I want to express my views concerning a question, which reflect the convictions of a large part of the population of Lithuania and the other Baltic republics.

It can be noted with satisfaction that, during the time that has passed since the April Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress, many positive changes have taken place in CPSU policies and that the first real changes in the life of society are emerging and gathering strength. Restructuring, democratization, and glasnost are changing the entire social situation for the better.

However, the tempo of the changes which are taking place leaves much to be desired and no decisive turning point is yet evident. The sluggishness and inertia of a large part of the population, which has developed over the course of decades, as well as the opposition of individuals personally interested in maintaining old ways, are making themselves felt. Much still is being done only for the sake of appearance. Undoubtedly a majority of the population wants to see deep-going changes. But a majority hardly believes in the possibility of accomplishing them. And there are weighty reasons for this. In the first place, there is the insufficient depth and consistency and the limited character of the measures that are being carried out. People cannot believe in democratization as long as they are being called upon to be active and show initiative only in carrying out what are essentially directions from above and so long as they are not being given real independence and responsibility. Within definite limits established by the political leadership, of course. And the people will not believe in glasnost until that time when it becomes complete. Both in the sense of affording even limited access to the mass information media to persons who want to express opinions that differ from official ones and in the sense of a truthful interpretation of the facts via official channels.

It has been said with complete justification there should be no blank spots in our history. But almost nothing has been done in this direction. In any event, there are no signs that we can expect a truthful account of the circumstances surrounding the incorporation of the Baltic states within the USSR. Thus, in a wide-ranging article concerning the events of 23 August, which you published on 1 September, only a few lines were devoted to this question. It was mentioned that treaties were signed and that the parliaments supported the entry of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the USSR. But there

was not a word said about how these new parliaments and how the idea of rejecting the status of independent states came into being. However, to be sure, the people cannot be deceived.

The material interest, which is supposed to be given rein as a result of fundamental restructuring of economic management, has great motive power. But this is not enough for the healthy development of society. The personal interest of the individual in the public well-being, which is the essence of patriotism, must be based on moral stimuli. There is still a great deal that has to be done in this direction.

We can talk about patriotism on the scale of the rayon or the city as well as on the scale of the region, the Union, the continent, and the entire planet. But we should really be guided by the most basic, natural and, therefore, effective kind of patriotism. And, beyond any doubt, this is national patriotism, on the scale of the territory occupied by one's own people, if this people in the process of their development have achieved the level of a nation. Patriotism on both a smaller and a larger scale is incomparably weaker. At the same time, the strength and effectiveness of patriotism on a non-national scale depends equally on the degree to which a sense of national patriotism is developed within a person. A patriot of his own people cannot fail to hold dear his own rayon, his own city. And true internationalism, being essentially a "multinational patriotism", is based on the same national patriotism, which presupposes the priority of the vital interests of the nation, both of one's own and of all other nations as well.

Meanwhile, the primacy of all-union interests over national ones has been and continues to be the standing principle of the nationalities policy of the USSR. For the small nations of the Baltic region, comprising an insignificant part of the total population of the USSR, this means that (even under full democracy) they have practically no influence on the making of the political decisions which, nevertheless, determine their own destinies and which can even pose a threat to the very existence of these nations. There is a commonly held thesis that, in the future, the nations will merge together and also a thesis that discoveries based on the natural laws of historical development must be employed when developing a political line. In the sphere of nationality relations, this means that a policy of assimilation must be pursued. And, for practical purposes, one has been followed, only without using this term and accompanied by talk about the equality of nations and languages. What has been said above about the lack of realism with regard to equality for nations with different-sized populations goes equally for their languages. They have even started to talk openly about something like this. Thus, Ye. A. Bagramov stated in the press with unusual frankness that equality of the Russian and of the national languages does not mean that their social functions are the same. Marxists, he said, are against national privileges. At the same time, even if the local language does

serve as the basic state language within the republics, the Russian language should be accorded the status of a language used for intercourse between republics and, by the same token, the Russian people would be placed in a privileged position. True equality is possible only if a neutral language were to be used for inter-republic intercourse. But, in this case, this is unrealistic.

From what source, under such conditions, can all-union patriotism and a personal interest by the individual in the well-being and prosperity of the Soviet Union be drawn. The situation does not change the circumstance that many political decisions made on an all-union scale are not at all contradictory to national interests. In this case, it is much more important that decisions have been made which have posed and which, in the relatively long-range future, will continue to pose a threat to the very existence of the non-Russian nations. These decisions remain in force; current policy is being conducted in accordance with them. There can be no doubt concerning the foreseeable results of such a policy. For the Russian people, they essentially coincide with the goals of Russian nationalists, and for the non-Russian peoples they mean their disappearance in the not so far off future. It is unreasonable to suppose that the representatives of these peoples do not understand this. In essence, the core-nationality inhabitants of the non-Russian republics find themselves in the position of being second-class people without any futures, relics of a special sort who are doomed to cultural extinction and who are deprived of the possibility of having a decisive influence on their own destiny. Such a situation results in an absence of a feeling of being one's own master, political and social passivity, individualism, and other negative phenomena.

In order to energize the population of the Baltic (as well as of other) republics, besides the measures that have already been taken, it is necessary to reexamine the nationalities policy of the CPSU and to construct a healthy foundation to support socialist internationalism and all-union patriotism. For this, it is necessary to acknowledge openly and to condemn decisively all injustices, whenever they are done, with regard to individual peoples and, insofar as possible, to do away with them; the vital interests of the nations must be moved to the forefront, while still emphasizing the great importance of all-union interests; the Russian language must be assigned the status of the language to be used for inter-republic intercourse while at the same time recognizing the languages of the core nationalities of the union republics as the basic state languages of these republics; national elements should be restored within the Soviet Army, so that the young people of each republic will have an opportunity to perform their military service in a cultural and language environment native to that republic. Implementation of these measures would create a healthy social situation, would mobilize citizens of all nationalities for the accelerated development of each republic and of the Soviet Union as a whole and, in sum, would provide a stimulus to the progress of restructuring. Signed: Algis Butrimas.

Response from A. Kunchinas

Recently in our republic as, incidentally in many other republics as well, there has been greatly increased interest in anything that is national. In the first place, this relates to ethnography, ecology and folklore. An increasing number of people, particularly young ones, have begun to interest themselves in the history of their own people, in the development of their national culture, and in nationality relations. This is evidenced by the large number of articles which have appeared in both republic and the all-union press and by the letter which the editors have received from A. Butrimas.

First, several words concerning the reasons for heightened interest in the nationalities question. Under conditions of democratization we have begun to speak more and more openly about many problems in our Soviet society which were earlier considered to have been solved once and for all. At the same time, a situation had developed, in which certain negative phenomena were hushed up. Information concerning them was concealed and realistic analysis of these problems was sometimes replaced by general propositions which did not take into consideration the contradictory nature of a developing society.

Under such conditions, certain spheres of our society turned out to be outside the realm of critical thought, while views different from the so-called official ones were ignored. Precisely such a situation also developed in the area of nationality relations. In school textbooks, and even in serious scientific tracts, nationality relations were presented as an area which was characterized by the fullest harmony, and assertions that, in our Soviet society, the friendship of peoples was flourishing and was almost automatically deepening, right up to a merging together of the nations, flowed naturally from this. Today, when the views of this sphere have become more realistic, it turns out that many real demands, both of nationwide and of national development, have been ignored. Many contradictions in the area of nationality relations remained hidden and, therefore, unsolved! It is precisely these unresolved problems in the field of nationality relations that are a cause of concern to our society; while negative phenomena are producing a very sharp and justified reaction, ways of solving contradictions in the sphere of nationality relations are being widely discussed and social scientists are working out the basic directions of a nationalities policy for the long term future.

What kind of position does the author of this letter take? He notes with satisfaction the positive changes in our society, acknowledges that restructuring, democratization, and glasnost are changing the entire social situation for the better but, at the same time, notes that a decisive turning point still has not become evident. Well, we can agree with this, as well as that, for full democratization, it is necessary to develop initiative from below. But, indeed, this is what they have in mind when they say that

restructuring must begin with you, yourself. And this can be applied fully to the author of the letter as well, and the question arises — why did he find it necessary to hide behind a pseudonym and, more precisely, to write an anonymous letter? And, here, it develops that the author is accusing others of the same thing which he is doing himself. But democratization will not occur if all if we continue to watch from sidelines, only registering negative phenomena.

You cannot demand from others what you do not do yourself. This is what I would advise the author of the letter. The same can also be said about glasnost, in which the people will not believe until it is full. The author agrees with this, but wants to remain unknown himself. Allow me to ask, and what will glasnost be like then? In the author's opinion, glasnost will be full when the mass information media will be made available to those who want to express views different from the official ones. Again, a question arises here: The views set forth in the letter are surely considered by the author to differ from official opinion, are they not? Then, everything is in order as far as glasnost goes as, indeed, his letter was published.

The dialectic teaches us that the truth is a process, that it is born in arguments and discussions, there are not and cannot be any eternal, unchanging truths. And we must learn to discuss and not discard other opinions, to show by means of argument their lack of foundation, and to convince, rather than doing everything we can simply to force others to accept our own positions. This, of course, is more complicated and requires greater time and effort, but this is the only path open under conditions of democratization and glasnost. Speaking of glasnost, it must be acknowledged that, in fact, certain questions regarding the history of the Lithuanian people have not been fully brought to light. This concerns both the development of the Lithuanian state in the 14th-16th centuries and detailed study of the process by which an independent bourgeois state took form in Lithuania. But it is not these "blank spots" that the author of the letter has mainly in mind. He casts a shadow over the events of 1940 and the class struggle of the people, insisting that one cannot "expect a correct explanation of the circumstances surrounding the incorporation of the Baltic states into the USSR", and stresses that "not a word" is found in literature regarding how the new parliaments of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia came to be in 1940. In this connection, it can be said with absolute justification that if a person does not want to see the obvious then it is very difficult to force him to do so. There are still witnesses alive and well today who took part directly in the revolutionary events of the 1940's and many of them have published their recollections concerning the mass support of the entire people for the idea of electing a National Sejm, which was proposed by the Lithuanian government formed after the sympathizer of Hitler's fascism, A. Smetona, had fled from the wrath of the working people. Who it was that elected the Sejm can be

judged from totally reliable and widely publicized figures: 95.5 percent of the voters took part in the elections and, of these, 99.9 percent voted for candidates nominated by the Lithuanian Union of Laboring Peoples. I understand, of course, that even these arguments will not sound convincing enough to the author of the letter. Indeed, even having hidden behind pseudonym, he does not dare to express the thought which is evident between the lines of his letter: the voters supposedly cast their ballots under the rifle barrels of Red Army soldiers, detachments of which were sent to Lithuania in 1939, and were therefore, allegedly, deprived of the opportunity to freely express their will. Such a statement would be tantamount to himself revealing or acknowledging his own total ignorance. It is generally known that the units of the Red Army, which had been sent to Lithuania with the goal of preventing further seizure of the republic's territory by the Hitlerites and with the agreement of the bourgeois government, remained in their billets and in no way influenced the preparation and course of the National Sejm elections.

And, indeed, there is no need to speculate about the will of the Lithuanian people. It manifested itself clearly not only in 1940, but even earlier — in 1918, when the working people established Soviet rule in Lithuania. This rule did not last for long; it was overwhelmed and drowned in blood by the international imperialist reaction and the local counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. But the dream of a nation of workers lived on within the people and thousands of Communist Party and Komso-mol members worked under the difficult conditions of the underground and persecution to bring this dream closer. In 1940, Soviet rule was restored in Lithuania along with historic justice, in keeping with which the people have the right to decide their own fate. And the idea, not "about rejecting the status of an independent state", but about entering into a union of fraternal sovereign socialist states, was expressed unanimously by the delegates to the Sejm who had been elected by an absolute majority of the Lithuanian people. Herein lies the truth. And the various fantasies of the nationalists, no matter what words they use to cloak them in, cannot deceive the people.

Now I want to express my own views concerning certain theoretical questions which are raised in this letter, without pretending to present a full, exhaustive analysis of all these problems. I will focus on the main ones, which make it possible to better understand the position of the letter's author. In the first place, I would like to note that the letter clearly manifests tendencies which our political enemies, certain western radio stations, and various programs specially intended for each Soviet republic constantly and persistently attempt to impose on us. Earlier, our social scientists and even our publicists used to avoid examining the concepts of "national" and "nationalistic" and, as has already been noted, there were specific reasons for this, since such studies were considered a manifestation of nationalistic views. During the period of democratization, identification of the

concepts "national" and "nationalistic" produces a danger from another quarter. This is specifically what is hoped for by our ideological opponents, who are using all their means in an attempt to erase any difference between "nationalist" and "nationalistic", with the goal of presenting everything in such a way that the struggle against nationalistic phenomena and views will be understood as a struggle against national self-identification, as an attempt to destroy everything that comprises national substance.

I would advise the author of this letter to listen to the Russian-language transmissions of these same stations, in which great-power chauvinism is encouraged. Perhaps this will help him to understand that these radio stations are concerned not with preserving the rights of all soviet nations, but that their main task in this sphere is to set the nations of our country one against the other. The influence of the hostile radio stations is further shown by the fact that the author of the letter has totally adopted their terminology. Thus, he writes about the "incorporation of the Baltic states into the USSR" and regards the people of the non-Russian republics as supposedly second-class persons destined to cultural extinction. And what justification is there for his claims to speak in the name of "a considerable part of the population of Lithuania and the other Baltic states" or for the division of all events into two periods — before and after 23 August. This bears the well-known signature of our ideological opponents, and the author of this letter has naively taken the bait.

However, the letter's author also recognizes that many political decisions on an all-union scale do not contradict national interests, although he stresses those decisions which, in his opinion, can create a threat to the very existence of the small nations. First of all, I want to make it clear that these political decisions not only do not contradict national interests but, rather, that it is specifically thanks to them that the very existence of many of them, including the Lithuanian nation, has been possible. What I am saying is that only Lithuania's entry into the USSR voluntarily, as evidenced by the protocols of a Sejm which was elected by an overwhelming majority of the Lithuanian people in 1940, and the victory in the Great Fatherland War saved the Lithuanian nation from annihilation, and indeed this was specifically called for in the plans of the fascist occupation. Specifically, there was a plan named "Ost", according to which a part of the core population of the Baltic states was to be liquidated and the rest was to be germanicized. And, indeed, one of the heads of the fascist leadership made the pronouncement that the Baltic states would disappear "like drops of water on a red hot stone". If it had not been for the Great Victory in May 1945, achieved through the common efforts of all Soviet peoples, there would be no Lithuanian nation or, what is more, any discussion of the problems of its existence and development.

The author does not specifically indicate what he has in mind when he asserts that the primacy of all-union interests has been and remains a standing principle in

CPSU policy. Probably the author is thinking of certain decisions made by all-union departments, such as, for instance, the decision to drill for oil in the vicinity of the Kurskiy Split. However, this and other similar problems by no means have a national character. The author of the letter might have described this as a decision which was made in Moscow on the basis of all-union interests. And this is just what it was and, in fact, when the intelligentsia and leaders of Lithuania expressed concern for the ecology of the Baltic Sea, they received full support in Moscow and, without this support, it is hardly likely that a decision made by an all-union department would have been reversed. So, the basis of this problem certainly was not a difference of national interests, but rather a departmental decision which was successfully countered through the common efforts of both Lithuanians and Russians, along with representatives of other nations. To the contrary, it was in my opinion specifically a manifestation of the force of internationalism.

A great deal of space in the letter is given to the relationship of the Russian and Lithuanian languages. The author understands clearly that the Russian language fulfills an international communications function, and he agrees with this function of the Russian language. However, he advocates the imposition of some kind of administrative limitations on the study and use of the Russian language within the borders of our republic, forgetting and, perhaps intentionally, failing to note that this would at the same time preclude the opportunity to give the main part of the Lithuanian people access to the culture of the peoples of the Soviet Union and of the entire world. However, under the conditions existing in our country, to study the history and culture of the Russian people and to speak Russian well certainly do not mean to reject our own native language or our own national culture. But this is precisely how the matter is presented by our ideological opponents, whose lead is followed by the author of this letter.

On the other hand, we must pay more attention to ensuring that residents of our republic who do not belong to its core nationality will be better able to acquaint themselves with the history and culture of the Lithuanian nation and will be given broader opportunities to master the Lithuanian language. And we should not look upon this as placing the Lithuanian language in opposition to any other one or even consider the invitation to voluntarily master the Lithuanian language as a manifestation of nationalism, which, incidentally, never exists without having its own antithesis — chauvinism, and vice versa. I think that a cultured person, no matter what nation he belongs to, will always take an attitude of respect and understanding toward the use of a local language and to the history and the culture of another nation and that, from this interaction, he will himself grow wiser and spiritually richer. The recidivists of international relations, upon whom the various foreign radio stations are placing their bets, appear most often

where there is insufficient goodwill and intellectual tolerance on both sides, and it is not real national contradictions, but shortcomings in the standards of intercourse which give rise to these recidivists.

And finally, concerning internationalism or all-union patriotism, to use the terminology of the letter's author, more correctly, concerning a combination of the national and international. From my point of view, the author repeats known truths while at the same time portraying himself as their first discoverer.

To be sure, the real internationalist is not someone who has generally lost his own national identity; such a person has nothing to give to the friendship of peoples. The richer the culture of each nation, the richer the international culture of our motherland will be as well. New, dialectical thinking makes it possible for us to understand that the international is impossible without the national. And the real internationalist is someone who defends national interests from the positions of the international brotherhood of laboring people. And feelings for a "small" motherland should never be placed into opposition with feelings for the greater Motherland.

In this connection, I think that the author's proposal to establish national armies in the republics appears silly. As far as I know, military units are created not for operatic performances or festive parades, but to defend the state, to protect the inviolability of its borders. The army defends the interests of the citizens of the entire country, irrespective of where a threat to these interests may arise, and therefore it cannot be set up on the basis of national characteristics.

It must be added that the author of the letter is again imprecise when he asserts that there is common knowledge of the thesis "that in the future the nations will merge together". Indeed, in the new edition of the Party Program this thought is expressed as follows: "This development involves, in the distant historic perspective, the full unity of nations". Thus, we are not talking about nations disappearing, but about the full unity of various nations. But these are not the same thing, and the author of the letter, to put it mildly, starts out by distorting the formulation of this thesis, which, as a result, permits him to draw conclusions that do not correspond with reality.

It is necessary to frankly recognize that many of the author's proposals indicate that he takes the position of our class enemies. In words, he is for socialism; however, he proposes restructuring in such a way that socialism would not be strengthened, but would be distorted into a bourgeois state.

In the new edition of the CPSU Program, it is noted that the nationalities question, which was left over from the past, has been successfully solved. However, this in no way means that there are not any contradictions in this sphere. The correctness of our country's nationalities

policy is manifested not in the fact that generally no contradictions arise in the sphere of nationality relations, but in the fact that conditions are being created for their successful resolution. Signed: A. Kunchinas, candidate of philosophical science.

13032

Azerbaijan CP CC Polls Readers on Perestroika
18300090 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
28 Nov 87 p 3

[Questionnaire published by the Azerbaijan CP CC Center for the Study of Public Opinion and Sociological Research: "Your Opinion on the State of Perestroika, Ways and Means of Broadening Democracy and Glasnost in the Republic"]

[Editorial Report] Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian on 28 November 1987 carries on page 3 a public opinion questionnaire by the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee Center for the Study of Public Opinion and Sociological Research on various aspects of perestroika and glasnost in the republic. The following questions are asked:

1. What in your opinion are the primary tasks of perestroika in your collective? Rayon? City?
2. What concrete steps are needed for the broadening of democracy and glasnost?
3. Has your collective held elections for leading cadres (yes, no, don't know)? If yes, were you satisfied with the way they were carried out (yes, no, don't know)?
4. Did you take part in these elections (yes, no)?
5. In your opinion, do the administrative, party, and social organizations in your collective take into account the opinions and suggestions of the collective's members?
1. yes, always 2. yes, in most matters 3. sometimes 4. not generally 5. it's hard to say
6. Do you think that issues pertaining to social conditions (housing, life-style, leisure, allocation of leave time, etc.) are being resolved fairly in your collective?
1. all such matters are resolved fairly 2. sometimes 3. fair decisions are rare 4. it's hard to say
7. What do you think must be done to ensure fair resolution of these issues and the strengthening of the struggle against negative phenomena?

8. How would you evaluate the progress of perestroika in your collective? (Are there some positive results, cases where no changes are visible, or the situation got worse?) If there are positive results, in what ways are they reflected?

9. Has your collective adopted complete cost-accounting, self-financing, and self-sufficiency?

10. If no, how does your collective plan to work under the new economic conditions?

11. Have any changes taken place personally for you and members of your collective since adoption of cost-accounting, self-financing, and self-sufficiency?

1. yes, significant changes have occurred under the new economic conditions 2. there have been no specific changes or advantages 3. I would suggest that advantages of working under the new conditions are dubious, but losses are tangible 4. I can't say specifically

12. In your city (rayon) this year have there been any open letter days, deputies' days, citizens' assemblies, etc? If yes, are you satisfied with the results?

13. Have you yourself been included in perestroika? If yes, in what ways? If no, what has prevented you from doing so?

14. In your opinion, what role does the primary party organization play in the restructuring of work at your collective?

15. How do you evaluate the work of party and soviet organs in your rayon or city in the development of glasnost and democratization? (There are some positive results, no changes are visible, or the situation has gotten worse.) If there are positive results, in what ways are they reflected?

16. What are your suggestions for improving the work of the Azerbaijan Central Committee, Supreme Soviet Presidium, and Council of Ministers?

We ask you to include the following information about yourself:

17. Sex

1. male 2. female

18. Age

1. under 17 2. 18-29 3. 30-39 4. 40-49 5. 50-59 6. 60 and over

19. Education

1. elementary 2. incomplete secondary 3. secondary.
4. secondary specialized 5. incomplete higher education
6. higher education

20. Party status

1. member of CPSU, candidate member of CPSU
2. Komsomol member 3. non-party

21. Nationality

22. Social position

1. worker 2. office worker 3. engineer-technician [ITR]
4. pensioner 5. housewife 6. student

23. If you do not work, explain, please, exactly who you are.

24. In what sector of the peoples' economy do you work?

01. industry 02. construction 03. transport and communications 04. agriculture or forestry 05. trade, public catering 06. material-technical provision, procurement 07. housing-communal economy 08. consumer services 09. health services 10. employee of state administration, cooperative, or social organization 11. some other sector

25. In what city, rayon do you live?

Controversy Over Family Planning in Tajikistan

Needed to Curb High Mortality Rate

18340405 [Editorial Report] Dushanbe TOJIKISTONI SOVETI in Tajik on 15 July 1987 carries on page 2 under two rubrics, "In Anticipation of the Tajik CP Central Committee Plenum" and "Speak Your Thoughts!", a 1500-word article, "The Good Fortune and Misfortune of Having Many Children," by Professor S. Hakimova, director of Tajikistan's Institute for Scientific Research on the Protection of Mothers.

Hakimova attributes the large family size in contemporary Tajikistan to the sharp decrease in infant mortality brought about by the Soviet health system. This leads to a discussion of reducing the transmission of genetic diseases. According to Hakimova, there is only one way to accomplish that—by eliminating marriages among close relatives. Tajikistan's law code prohibits marriage between cousins but they occur anyway and are numerous in villages. These marriages produce children with genetic disorders. Currently people are not made aware of the consequences of marriage among close relatives; the legal prohibition of such marriages is not enforced. The number of children with genetic diseases is growing. This is not only a misfortune for the children and their families but is also a financial burden on society as a whole. Hakimova asks why members of society remain

silent. She also expresses concern about the use of alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana by some young people. This harms the development of a fetus' nervous system.

Although modern medicine enables women with various illnesses, notably heart disease, to have children, there are still other diseases, including high blood pressure, liver and kidney disease, and some endocrine disorders, which make pregnancy too great a risk to a woman's health. The blame for maternal mortality lies not only with doctors but also with husbands. Hakimova cites the example of Leninskiy rayon, where during 10 months in 1986, 1500 women became pregnant despite having diseases that ought to rule out pregnancy. Furthermore, these women did not seek medical attention before or during their pregnancy. All of the women survived but, given the state of health care in the rayon, they might not have done so had they been brought in poor condition to a hospital. Local doctors have a low level of expertise. The necessary equipment and medicine are not always ready. Thus every year dozens of women die in childbirth; many of them already had 6-12 children.

Having many children in quick succession can aggravate some health problems. Modern medicine shows that there ought to be an interval of 4 years, or at least 3, between the birth of children. Of the women who have their children in maternity clinics, the interval between births from the second child on is 18 months to 2 years for 65 percent of the women, and is even shorter for 12.9 percent of the women; 5 percent of the women have children at intervals of 11-12 months. Thus, by age 21, many women already have 3 children and are pregnant with the fourth. Having children in rapid succession is likely to make a woman anemic and weak. Such women do not find the time to go to a doctor. As a result, they age prematurely and their children are frail and ill-suited to survival. In regions where mothers have many children, as in Tajikistan and the other Central Asian republics, the mortality rate for mothers and children has increased greatly by comparison with other regions.

Hakimova sees the organization of family planning services as necessary for solving the mortality problem. However, she reports that when she advocates this, she encounters strong opposition. The counterargument is that the Soviet Union needs people to work and to protect it. Her response is that the absence of family planning is the main reason for maternal and infant mortality. Family planning has little hope of success in Central Asia without broad participation by the intelligentsia and members of society. Society needs healthy mothers and children. Skeptics say that family planning methods are not reliable. That point was made by the head of the Demography Department of Moscow State University some years ago in an article in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. The article also linked family planning to a population's cultural level. In response, Hakimova cites the success of family planning in the Indian

state of Kerala. A mark of Kerala's success is that the mortality rate for children less than one year old is 44 percent of the average rate for India as a whole.

Reader Opinion Divided

18340405 [Editorial Report] Dushanbe TOJIKISTONI SOVETI in Tajik on 24 July 1987 carries on page 4 the article "Supporters and Opponents," subtitled "Readers' Thoughts and Opinions About the Article 'The Good Fortune and Misfortune of Having Many Children' (TOJIKISTONI SOVETI 15 July)."

A 100-word letter, "Medical Knowledge Is Necessary," by N. Mashokirova, a student, faults the 15 July Hakimova article for not discussing family planning in a strictly medical sense and for concentrating instead on familiar information. Mashokirova spoke with a neighbor of hers who has 10 children and is pregnant with the eleventh. The neighbor's husband does not work around the house and earns "only" 80-100 rubles a month. He cannot fully support his family but the wife cannot work because of the children, although she would like to. She does not know how to prevent pregnancy. There are many such uninformed women in Mashokirova's village. They need medical information, writes Mashokirova.

A 300-word letter, "I Am Opposed!," by Asalmoh Safarova, a worker at the cotton textile complex in Dushanbe, argues that having many children is not a misfortune. Every single family considers having many children to be good fortune. The misfortune is to have few or no children. Giving birth makes a woman young and healthy. Having many children never makes a mother ill. Safarova writes that she can support these contentions with the example of hundreds of mothers who have 10-12 children or more. These women are healthy and employed and have raised their children well. Women with no children or only one are prone to illness. There are doctors who recommend only one or two birth control techniques, which are bad for the mother's health and longevity. Many village women are willing to try these methods but then become apprehensive and think about the disapproval of their neighbors and relatives. Village doctors do not conduct any propaganda about birth control, and if they do, it is considered shameful. Year after year, doctors do not address these kinds of issues.

A 300-word letter, "A Cry of Danger Must Be Sound-ed!," by Maria and Hasan Yusufov, a husband and wife living in Kurgan-Tyube city, agrees with the Hakimova article. They ask what the benefit is to the people or the state if one has many children and cannot provide for them adequately. They argue that it is better to have three to six children and raise them well. The Yusufovs themselves have three. They consider Hakimova's discussion of marriage between close relatives a cry of danger. They believe such marriages are common in Tajikistan. In dozens of cases known personally to the Yusufovs, these marriages were arranged by parents

without consideration of their friends' advice or their children's wishes. The result is young families bringing sick babies into the world. The Yusufovs say that young families derive no happiness from having such children but instead face worry from the start. These children become a heavy burden for the parents, the state, and the people. If such children survive to adulthood and marry, their children will also be sickly; thus they perpetuate the process. The ZAGS as well as soviet and educational personnel must prevent the marriage of close relatives. Even more importantly, women must regulate their births. Why, ask the Yusufovs, does society need 10-12 unplanned, sickly children, who are a cause of worry?

More Readers Respond

18340405 [Editorial Report] Dushanbe TOJIKISTONI SOVETI in Tajik on 20 August 1987 carries on page 2 four readers' letters under the general title "Supporters and Opponents," subtitled "Good Fortune and Misfortune of Having Many Children." [The 15 July article, by Professor S. Hakimova, Director of Tajikistan's Institute for Scientific Research on the Protection of Mothers and Children, criticized the practices of having many children in quick succession and marriage between close relatives.]

Gulahmad Bozorov, a pediatrician on Kommunizm kolkhoz in Ordzhonikidzeabadskiy Rayon and deputy of the Yangiborzor village soviet, wrote an 800-word letter, "Let Us Be Useful to the People". Bozorov criticizes parents who think that their child-rearing duties are completed once a child is born. He cites examples from his own practice of malnourished and neglected children from large families. He says that when he tries to address this issue most mothers give the same reply: God gave the children and also gives food. Much educational work must be done among such people—more than the little that doctors have the means to do.

Bozorov blames the villagers' bad hygiene for transmitting infections to young children through breast feeding and seasonal day-care centers set up while women work in the fields. For example, last year Bozorov looked into conditions at such centers. He found a middle-aged woman feeding a young child by chewing a piece of bread and then putting it into the child's mouth.

The village of Yangiborzor has a population of about 12,000. It has one day-care center, attended by 140 children. Many other families would like to send their children there but the facility cannot accommodate them. Therefore, writes Bozorov, such children are taught by older children in the family and end up spending their days in the streets, ill-clothed and ill-fed. Not a year goes by without a child drowning while left in a sibling's care. Although parental negligence is the main problem, parents lack the means to give 10 or 11 children affection and a well-rounded upbringing or provide adequately for their material needs. Having and raising four to five children is sufficient for any family.

Family planning is new to Bozorov's village. Large families are numerous there. Five-year plans ought to contain provisions to implement family planning. In a large village, with about 6,000 children between the ages of 1 and 4, there is little one doctor can do. In the cities there is one doctor for every 800 children. Tajikistan's Ministry of Health ought to arrange for there to be more pediatricians. Until recently, Bozorov's village did not have a midwife-gynecologist either. For 2 years the village has also had a doctor who is a gynecologist but he only works half time, which is inadequate for a village that size. Bozorov calls upon doctors to study S. Hakimova's July article and explain its message to the populace.

M. Sultonov, a resident of Dushanbe, wrote a 700-word letter, "Having Many Children Is Only Good Fortune." Sultonov argues that no one, whether a city or a village dweller, believes that having many children is a misfortune. He states that such a view would be contrary to human values. For thousands of years children were considered the "fruit of human life." Why, he asks, should they now be considered a misfortune? In large families children help each other and feel mutual respect and concern. They instill in each other a love of work and a sense of thriftiness.

Sultonov states that, in contrast, one reads articles about the problems resulting from a low birth rate in developed countries in central Europe, both socialist and capitalist. Propaganda encouraging people to have children is conducted in Poland, the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Baltic republics, and various parts of the RSFSR. He then asks, "Are we not to be included in the ranks of developed countries? Finally, every moment, from every rostrum and assembly, we loudly claim that our republic has reached high economic, social, and cultural levels. Why then do we write about excluding ourselves and depriving ourselves of having many children, suggesting that we somehow lack the strength to raise or provide for many children?" To propagandize in favor of small families is unhelpful and superfluous in his opinion because each individual wants several children. He contends that there will be cause for later regrets if a campaign to eliminate large families is staged without a careful study of the problem being conducted first.

Sultonov considers Hakimova wrong about providing for the material needs of large families. He counters that nowadays "our people" in the villages (where large families are numerous) have all the necessities of life and also have a good income.

Sultonov also disagrees with Hakimova's assertion that having many children is injurious to the health of mothers and children. He has found the opposite to be

true. Hakimova should have stated the issue differently, in terms of what must be done to protect the health of mothers and their many children. He asks what has not been done to improve health care and raise people's medical knowledge; what the role of medical workers is in bettering conditions for people and informing them. He asks when and where, in what party and state organ has the question been raised of building new sanatoria, polyclinics, day-care centers, clubs, and movie theaters? To what rayon or oblast have 10 or 15 doctors been sent to improve health care services? Sultonov agrees with only one of Hakimova's points, her opposition to marriage between close relatives.

The reason Sultonov cites for the tradition of large families in Tajikistan are: the determination to raise children despite the slaughter caused by attacks on various occasions in the Tajiks' history; the traditional need for labor-intensive work, given the economic conditions; and parents' need for help at home as the older children go off to marry, serve their country, and the like.

M. Mamasoliyev, a teacher from Isfarinskiy Rayon, wrote a 100-word letter, "Few and Good." He contends that six to eight children are enough; it is not easy to raise that number of children. Large families cannot provide for and educate their children well, the way middle-sized families can. From Mamasoliyev's perspective as a teacher, the worst thing is that such families send dull-witted children to school; that drags down the quality of instruction.

Saida Rasuli, a resident of Gulistan sovkhov, Kolkhozabadskiy Rayon, wrote a 100-word letter, "My Opinion." Hakimova's article was one-sided. Misfortune does not come from having many children. Families with 8-12 children can raise those children well. The causes of illness among mothers and children are environmental conditions: the polluted and low supply of water to the cotton fields, which is the source of drinking water; and unbearably hot weather.

Tajik Supreme Soviet Issues Decree on AIDS

18000132 [Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 13 Nov 87 carries on page 3 a 100-word report that the Presidium of the Tajik Supreme Soviet has issued a decree which makes the spreading of the AIDS virus a criminal offense. Knowingly exposing another person to the possibility of AIDS infection is punishable by imprisonment for a period of up to 5 years. Knowingly infecting another person with AIDS is punishable by a prison sentence of up to 8 years.

07310

Debate on Proposed Danube-Dnieper Canal Continues

18000041a Kiev *RABOCHAYA GAZETA* in Russian
23 Oct 87 p 4

[Introduction "Will the Dnieper Flow into the Black Sea—We Continue the Discussion on the Planned Danube-Dnieper Water-Engineering Complex" and two articles under the rubric "Opinions and Doubts" by UkSSR Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Water Resources V. Khorev and Ukgiprovdokhoz [Ukrainian State Institute for the Planning of Water Management Structures and Rural Electric Power Plants] Deputy Chief Engineer V. Laskavyy "The Salt Threat" and Black Sea National Biospheric Preserve Deputy Director T. Ardamatskaya and junior academic associate O. Umamets "Forecasts without Foundation"]

[Text] The mail on the discussion has contained many requests to report on what was published earlier in *Rabochaya Gazeta* on the Danube-Dnieper Canal project. The materials were printed in the issues of 17 and 26 Jul, 14, 21 and 29 Aug, 11 and 19 Sep and 17 Oct. The editors, as promised, are striving to present all points of view on this problem where possible. We receive many letters. They are interesting, passionate and polemical. And we are glad of that. We would like, however, to direct attention toward the necessity of learning debate protocol. Some authors clearly do not know enough about it. We hope the specialists of Ukgiprovdokhoz will not condemn us, but when we publish their articles, we will not be printing those statements that could be taken as a public insult of opponents. Let us dispute the essence of the issue with respect for the arguments of our "opponents."

According to tradition, we present the authors of letters that have arrived in recent days on one proposal. Some 21 veterans of the Great Patriotic War from No 30 Kotsyubinskiy Street in Vinnitsa write: "We believe that common sense will triumph and the country will not spend billions for the destruction of the natural environment." Twelve teachers from secondary schools in Nikolayev ask: "How can we explain to our pupils that the construction expanding nearby is a good thing if it is as clear as can be that it is one of the most harmful undertakings of depressed times?" A. Orlov from Rakityanskiy Rayon in Kiev Oblast feels that "One cannot believe the words that the canal is not being built if the estuary of the Sasyk has already been 'desalinated,' while rail lines continue to be laid toward the mouth of the Dnieper-Bug estuary." P. Timchenko from Gaysin in Vinnitsa Oblast assumes that "the land-reclamation workers have used chemicals to desalinate the water in the Sasyk estuary, having resolved to improve the salt water with acid, even though it is obvious that it is dangerous to irrigate with such water." M. Olshanskiy from Dnepropetrovsk proposes: "For the purposes of economy, we must shift the metallurgical enterprises to a closed cycle of water supply as quickly as possible." M.

Shumelchuk from Kherson is sure that "the issue cannot be resolved without a direct polling of the residents of the populated areas located along the route of the canal."

The representatives of local organs of power have also expressed their opinions. First Deputy Chairman of the Odessa Oblast Ispolkom I. Sichuk: "The planning of the Danube-Dnieper water project is essential, in my opinion." Chairman of the Nikolayev Oblast Ispolkom V. Ilin: "We maintain the necessity of further discussion on the project. The whole population of the oblast has an extreme vested interest in the most rapid resolution of issues of water supply, but without a material worsening of the ecological situation in the region."

It is namely about this, the ecological situation in the region after the possible construction of the Danube-Dnieper hydro project, that the specialists in the articles published today express their opposite opinions. We offer them for your judgment.

THE SALT THREAT: The Planned Hydro Project Will Save the Estuary from Ultimate Destruction

Scientists have been working for a long time on the problem of preserving the Dnieper-Bug estuary from salinization. The majority of them have come to the conclusion that the estuary can be saved only by separating it from the Black Sea. Otherwise, it will be turned into a gulf of the sea with all of the consequences arising therefrom. The damming of the estuary will make it possible to increase the utilization of the resources of the Dnieper, which has extremely great significance for our republic.

The annual discharge of rivers in the Ukrainian SSR totals 83 billion cubic meters. In a low-water year it decreases to 48 billion. The natural distribution of water resources is extremely inconsistent here. Voroshilovgrad, Donetsk, Zaporozhye, Nikolayev and Odessa oblasts are supplied with the least water. Practically all of our surface water resources have been brought into operational economic circulation.

Purposeful work on reducing proportionate norms of water consumption have been conducted for the last two decades. Notwithstanding the incorporation of new progressive technologies, however, the volume of freshwater intake could increase by 10 billion cubic meters by the year 2000. By that time, according to the calculations of planning organizations, even in the face of the full implementation of measures for water economy and the intensification of its utilization, the shortage of water resources in the Dnieper basin in acutely dry years will comprise some 8 billion cubic meters.

Taking into account the strained water-resources situation, it was decided to supply the population, agriculture and industrial enterprises of the republic with water through the construction of the Dnieper-Bug and Nizhnednester hydro projects, with the use of the water

resources of the Danube projected for the future. Technical and economic substantiation for the construction of the Dnieper-Bug and Nizhnednester hydro projects and the Danube-Dnieper canal was developed according to a decree.

The technical and economic substantiation for damming the Dnieper-Bug estuary was developed in 1979. The ecological substantiation was done by the Hydro-Biological Institute of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences in conjunction with other scientific institutions of the Academy of Sciences of the republic. According to the forecasts of the scientists, the salinity of the water in the Dnieper-Bug estuary will reach 8-10 grams/liter by the year 2000. In the future, with a reduction of effluents from the Kazakh reservoir, a gradual salinization of the estuary and the mouth regions of the Dnieper and southern Bug of up to 16-18 grams/liter will occur. The water will become unsuitable for water supply and irrigation. The water supply for the enterprises of Kherson, Tsyurpinsk and Goloy Pristan will be disrupted, the water collectors of Nikolayev and Zhovtnevyi will cease to function and the Inguletskaya and Yuzhno-Bug irrigation systems will break down.

According to the conclusions of specialists that took part in the ecological substantiation, only the construction of the hydro project can avert the entry of seawater into the estuary and the destruction and loss of the unique natural complex of the mouth regions of the Dnieper, Ingulest and southern Bug. The Dnieper-Bug hydro project is thus first of all a natural-conservation project. The economy of the republic will be able, as a result of its construction, to utilize up to an additional 8 billion cubic meters of water a year through reductions in the sanitary effluents from the Kazakh reservoir into the estuary.

The assertions of some scientists on the possibility of "postponing" the start of construction on the hydro project for an indefinite period are unfounded, since economies of water consumption have their limits and further satisfaction of the growing needs of the national economy for water is possible only through reducing sanitary-ecological discharges of moisture through the estuary from the Kazakh reservoir. Their minimum magnitude today is 500 cubic meters a second.

It should be stated that not everyone is able to adhere to this norm everywhere. In the spring flooding this year a situation was created where sanitary discharges from the Kazakh reservoir into the estuary were 250-300 cubic meters a second. The salt line of seawater reached Kherson. The salinity of water at the mouth of the Dnieper was 5-6 grams/liter, and 10-14 in the estuary. Such situations will be repeated more and more often in the future.

The technical and economic substantiation of the Dnieper-Bug hydro project was approved by the State Expert Commission of USSR Gosplan in 1981. The

development of a draft plan was conducted from 1981 to 1986, and it is now undergoing coordination with the ministries and departments that have a vested interest.

The Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR, in coordination with USSR Gosplan, has approved a list of facilities for the preparatory period in the construction of the Dnieper-Bug hydro project. Now underway are the construction of residential housing, the productive base, rail sidings, water-supply facilities and cleansing and sewage structures... The construction of the principal structures of the hydro project can begin only after the approval of the plan.

It should be noted that considerable work has been done in the republic in recent years in the construction of purification structures. Over the current five-year plan, the discharge of pollution into the Dnieper and southern Bug river basins has declined from 6.8 million to 4.2 million tons. Water quality has stabilized in the Kremenchug, Dneprodzerzhinsk and Dneprovsk reservoirs. It corresponds to the norms for municipal drinking-water supplies.

A halt to discharges of sewage from industrial enterprises by practically all ministries and departments is planned for this five-year plan, with the exception of facilities of UkSSR Minzhilkomkhoz [Ministry of Housing and Municipal Services] and ferrous metallurgy, along with the assimilation of measures in the Dnieper and southern Bug basins of 250 million rubles. The enterprises of UkSSR Minzhilkomkhoz and metallurgy will halt discharges of such water in the next five-year plan. And this means that the discharge of waste water in the Dnieper and southern Bug basins should be completely halted by the time the Dnieper-Bug estuary is closed off.

The construction of the hydro project does not envisage raising the water level in the estuary and the creation of regulated volumes (the normal support level has been adopted as 10 centimeters above the average multi-year one and is within the range of fluctuations of water levels in the estuary). Additional collections of water are planned principally from the Kazakh and other reservoirs through the retention of compulsory sanitary discharges into the estuary.

The design of structures in the hydro project makes it possible, after the closing of the estuary, to wash it out with discharges of water from the Kazakh reservoir with the expenditure of 1,000-1,500 cubic meters of water a second, which will have a beneficial effect on the ecological situation at the mouth of the Dnieper and in the estuary itself.

A whole set of natural-preservation measures is envisaged in the estuary zone with total capital spending of 60.6 million rubles. According to forecasts of the Hydro-Biological Institute of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences, the Dnieper-Bug estuary will, after its closing, be the most productive in terms of fish products of all the

reservoirs in the Dnieper cascade. The food resources from fish will double in the reservoir. The construction of compensating complexes for the reproduction of fish resources in Kherson and Nikolayev oblasts is projected.

Calculations done by Giprograd [State Institute for the Planning of Cities] Institute have made it possible to determine the allowable capacity of sections for the possible recreational assimilation of the estuary zone as about 500,000 people a year. A Lower Dnieper Park with the preservation of natural areas is planned for popular recreation. The construction of three locks and a large navigable ship channel 100 meters wide are envisaged in the plan for the purpose of uninterrupted navigation.

The hydro project thus will make it possible to preserve the unique natural complex of the Dnieper-Bug estuary and will facilitate the supply of water to the population and the economy of the republic.

I would like to say a few words about the proposals that have been sounded in *Rabochaya Gazeta*. The reconstruction of the Kremenchug and Kakhovskiy reservoirs, the principal regulators of the flow on the Dnieper, by lowering the level of the navigable bed (raising the water level in the reservoirs was considered and rejected by the State Expert Commission of USSR Gosplan) really could increase the useful volume of the reservoirs of the Dnieper cascade in spring-fall period. The guaranteed useful yield in low-water years, however, is only increased by 5 billion cubic meters, and in drought years it declines sharply and cannot supply the economy with water. This is explained by the fact that in an alternation of low-water years the reservoirs, due to a shortfall in water flow, would not be replenished as they should. The deep bed of the reservoirs, moreover, will lead in summer to negative sanitary-ecological consequences: in thickly populated areas, tens of thousands of hectares of shallow water are formed, which leads to the demise of the fish and water vegetation.

We also cannot agree with the conclusions contained in the articles of I. Sokolov "The Blue-Green Evil" (28 Aug of this year) and V. Stepanov "Stop and Look Around" (21 Aug). In our opinion, such features disorient society. Had the authors of these articles felt it possible to get acquainted with the plans for the Dnieper-Bug hydro project, they would not have spoken of the flooding of the Black Sea Biospheric Preserve, cited fantastic data on the harm to biological resources and the economy or asserted that it is possible to obtain 2.5 billion cubic meters of water just through facing the North Crimean and Krasnoznamenskiy canals.

The proposal of the chief of a department in the Odessa Division of the Institute of Ecology of the USSR Academy of Sciences, V. Stepanov, on the possibility of stabilizing the water salinity in the estuary with the aid of narrowing the Kinburnskiy Strait was considered in 1985 at a technical council of the UkSSR Minvodkhoz with the inclusion of leading specialists from the UkSSR

Academy of Sciences and VASKhNIL [All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni V.I. Lenin], and it was rejected as being groundless.

FORECASTS WITHOUT FOUNDATION: The Water-Resources Engineers Calculate Water Consumption Growth in Ways Favorable to Themselves

The idea of creating a Dnieper-Bug reservoir is part of the plans for a unified Danube-Dnieper water-resources complex. It appeared as early as at the end of the 1950s. The incarnation of the project, however, is evoking great alarm among biologists, because a real danger exists of destroying ecosystems near the future hydro project that have existed for thousands of years.

Heated disputes are underway today on the expediency of closing the estuary, as a result of which another reservoir will be created on the lower reaches of the Dnieper and the Slavutich will practically cease to empty into the Black Sea. In connection with the fact that part of the territory of the Black Sea State Biospheric Preserve, according to the technical and economic substantiation for the project, will fall into the impact zone of the future reservoir, we feel it is our duty to pose the question of the expediency of this construction.

The idea of constructing a Dnieper-Bug reservoir, discussed for almost a quarter of a century, is largely based on a concern for preserving the natural complexes of the lower Dnieper region. At its foundation are estimated data on the progressive growth in irrevocable water consumption for the needs of irrigation and industrial and domestic water supply. According to estimates, by 1985 the flow of the Dnieper should have reached nothing, which would have entailed the salinization of the Dnieper-Bug estuary. The closing off of and desalinization of this basin was to be the panacea for this misfortune.

The construction of such a major hydro-engineering structure, without analogue in the world, will inevitably lead to the appearance of collateral and unprogrammed changes in the natural environment that do not always play a positive role at all. As was pointed out in one section of the ecological substantiation for the project, **"with the start-up of a powerful water-engineering complex, new and sometimes quite unexpected manifestations and effects will doubtless arise that must be foreseen and taken into account both from the perspective of the economy and from that of natural-resource protection, which are closely interconnected."**

It was just this part of the problem, in our opinion, that did not receive serious attention. The ecological substantiation done by the Institutes of Botany and Zoology imeni I.I. Shmalgauzen of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences was received by the planners before the materials for the engineering, geological and hydrological specifications for the project were summarized. **The botanical and zoological forecasts thus proved to be separated from**

the basic foundations—the geological and hydrological research. Serious soil surveys were not done on the left bank of the estuary. And moreover, preliminary research done on the territory of the Solenoozernyy section of the Black Sea State Biospheric Preserve by the soil-studies department of Moscow State University show that with a rise in the ground-water level of 40-50 centimeters on this territory, **irreversible salinization processes will begin. In other words, just what they are trying to avoid by undertaking the construction of the costly hydro project will happen.**

The issue of desalinizing the reservoir, whose foundation is formed by many meters of salty rock, is also quite debatable. The negative experience in desalinizing the Sasyk estuary must obviously be taken into account in developing the new project. We also have doubts about the quality of the water in the future reservoir and its suitability for technical purposes and for irrigation. The issue of "warehousing" the 75,000 cubic meters of silt that will have to be dredged from the bottom of the estuary in constructing the dam has also yet to be resolved.

According to the technical and economic substantiation, part of the terrain of one of the sections of the Black Sea Preserve should also be flooded. Two others will fall into the impact zone of the reservoir. Changing the overall ecological situation will undoubtedly lead to changes in the majority of the component parts of the preserve (soil, flora and vegetation, animal world), which deprives it of its significance as a reference.

The construction of the Dnieper-Bug hydro project will entail the destruction of the Kinburnskiy Peninsula and will alter the shore of the Black Sea, which is a health resort area for the entire country. A reduction in the flow of the Dnieper to the sea is intolerable because there exists the danger of hydrogen sulfide rising from its bottom, which will cause ecological catastrophe.

All of this was clearly discussed at a joint session of the bureau of the Southern Academic Center of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences and the Scientific Coordinating Council for Nikolayev Oblast of the Southern Academic Center of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences that was held recently in Nikolayev. The authors of these lines were there as well. The most important conclusion of the conference was the necessity of constructing the dam based on incorrect estimates for growth in water consumption. Even today in 1987 (and not just in the estimates for 1985), the flow of the Dnieper is not equal to zero. There is therefore no need to take the urgent steps on which the water-resources engineers are insisting. On the contrary, there is time to develop and implement alternative solutions that would not be so costly or ecologically dangerous. What alternatives are they? An ordinary straightening out of water use, as a result of which the annual volume of water consumption will even decrease rather than increase by the year 2010, as confirmed by the calculations of scientists from the

Odessa Division of the Institute of Economics of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences. For this it is only necessary to implement the set of measures for the utmost economy of water that has been developed by the Southern Academic Center of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences.

The associates of the Black Sea State Biospheric Preserve support I. Sokolov, the author of the article "The Blue-Green Evil" published in *Rabochaya Gazeta*, as well as V. Stepanov, who appeared with the article "Stop and Look Around." We are convinced that the expediency of constructing the Dnieper-Bug hydro project (begun, by the way, according to an unapproved plan) cannot be acknowledged due to the unforeseeable nature and scope of the negative ecological processes that will begin after its realization.

12821

Industrial Waste Pipeline To Irkut River Opposed
18000081a Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Nov 87p 2

[Article by D. Stom, doctor of biological sciences and S. Karkhanin, special correspondent: "Around the Pipeline"]

[Text] Irkutsk Oblast—Several kilometers from the city of Baykalsk there is an opening in the forest which cuts through the coastal taiga. Freshly cut pine trees are stacked one on top of the other. A short distance away, bulldozers are standing idle. The preliminary work is being completed on the construction of a pipeline for the removal of the cleansed industrial waste water of a pulp and paper combine, which for two dozen years has been pouring into Lake Baykal. The water is to be diverted beyond the borders of the lake's basin — into the Irkut River.

Our newspaper has mentioned this project on more than one occasion and has made space available for its advocates and opponents. However, it is apparent from the editorial boards' mail that heated arguments concerning the "pipeline" are continuing. Will this project, which outlines an operational and seemingly efficient solution for many ecological tasks, be beneficial to the "pearl of Siberia" and to the entire region as a whole?

How Costly Will the Expenditures Be?

Academician N. Logachev, chairman of the Presidium of the Eastern Siberian Branch of the Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences and deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet:

The decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers concerning Baykal was welcomed in all areas. At the same time, many residents in the Angara River region have persistently and sharply raised the question of abolishing the construction of

the pipeline. In September, a construction-ecological committee of experts held a meeting in USSR Gosstroy to discuss the "technical-economic estimate for the construction required for diverting the waste waters of the BTsBK [Baykalsk Pulp and Paper Combine] into the Irkut River." The estimate was prepared by the Soyuzgiprovodkhoz Institute. This estimate uncovered and defined more precisely a number of circumstances which led to the following conclusions.

The discharging of the combine's industrial waste waters into the Irkut River will inevitably result in contamination of the river's ecological system and further aggravate its already unfavorable sanitary-hygienic condition of the Angara River, where the water intakes of several cities and villages are located. The Irkut River will immediately lose its fishing economy and spawning role. Nor will the requirements for its drinking water mission be maintained. Of importance also is the fact that the diversion of the industrial waste waters will not fully solve the problem, since approximately one half of the combine's harmful waste products, in the form of atmospheric discharges, filtration and accidental overflows from settling tanks and sludge accumulators, will continue within the confines of the Baykal Basin.

Certainly, if the Baykal situation is hopeless, the Irkut River could be sacrificed. But the permanent value of the lake cannot justify ecological harm to the entire upper Angara River region, where approximately 1 million persons live. Moreover, heavy equipment and blast hole drilling work in the construction zone of the pipeline and along the approaches to it will inevitably harm the soil cover and forest in the lake's zone. In addition, the powerful technogenic effect will disfigure the landscape of the slopes in the lake's basin. Large amounts of foreign materials, including oil and lubricating materials will empty into Lake Baykal.

As a result of construction of the pipeline, there will be ecological expenses not only for the Irkut River but also for Lake Baykal. The total amount of expenditures for this construction work will exceed by a factor of 2-3 the 50-50 million rubles initially planned.

The combine has already been in operation for 21 years and over the past dozen years it has operated some of the best items of purification equipment in the country. During the 6 years remaining prior to its modernization, at which time compensating capabilities for the production of soluble cellulose at the Ust Ilmskiy Timber Complex will be introduced into operations, no irreversible changes in the ecological system of Lake Baykal can be allowed to take place. This point of view is shared by an overwhelming majority of scientists and specialists in Irkutsk and Baykalsk, individuals who are directly concerned with studying and protecting the lake's natural complex.

The idea of constructing the pipeline was dictated by good motives and by concern for protecting our unique basin. But in the process the possible negative consequences to the lake itself, the Irkut River and to the entire upper Angara River region were not weighed in an exhaustive manner. Today the situation is much more clear and it underscores a large and unjustified risk which I do not feel should be undertaken.

As already reported by our newspaper, the Irkutsk scientists have proposed the replacement of the pipeline with a complex of installations developed by them on the combine's territory, which will reduce the water consumption and ensure additional purification of the industrial waste waters. Thus it can be said that they are not waging this argument with empty hands. Such is the position being taken by people who on more than one occasion have proved their sincere interest in ensuring that Lake Baykal does not perish.

The next address of the "public committee of experts" for the project — the pulp and paper combine, which was the customer for the construction of the pipeline. What is the current attitude of the enterprise towards this project?

The Time for Discussion Has Passed

V. Glazyrin, director of the Baykalsk Pulp and Paper Combine:

A simple answer cannot be provided for such a complicated question. As a specialist and as the director, I must carry out all of the points in the party and governmental document on Baykal that concern us. And they are being carried out on schedule. This year we are reducing water consumption by 3 million cubic meters. The purification of the industrial waste waters is being improved and all of the norms established for us are being observed. Two variants of technical-economic estimates for redesigning the combine for furniture production have been prepared. Today our task consists of engaging in less discussion about the pipeline. It is our belief that the time for discussion has ended. The combine's opinion regarding the pipeline is of little importance. However, importance is attached to what is stated in the document. I do not doubt but that the pipeline plan, which we must receive in December, will be an efficient one. And still we have no final plan; the work must be carried out using working drawings if the schedules are to be met. We acquainted ourselves with the recommendations offered by the scientists and I can only state that they are achievable goals.

As you can see, the combine's director is a man of a few words. And thus, Valeriy Vasilyevich neither expressed opposition to the diversion of the industrial waste waters, nor did he advance any arguments favoring it.

The next participant in the "public committee of experts" spoke out in a considerably more frank manner. With his first steps along the 6 kilometer cutting through the forest, he encountered those difficulties which the scientists had warned about.

Will the Plan Be Carried Out?

A. Sitnikov, chief of Construction-Installation Administration No. 11 of the Angarsk Construction Administration:

We builders oppose the pipeline. There are many reasons for this. The technical-economic estimate for the construction period calls for 29 months and yet we are required to complete its construction in just a year's time. True, there is no final plan and we are proceeding on the basis of working drawings and these are inadequate. The surveyors also have nothing to boast about: they have never before encountered such a complicated route. Mountain ridges, swamps, taiga and the danger of mudslides. The plan's chief engineer has stated that there are areas along the route where the equipment cannot be employed. The acquisition of the land through the local soviets has still not been formulated. In short, our situation is very serious at the present time. Yet there was some recent news: the Gosstroy committee of experts eliminated an emergency storage tank from the future plan. It turns out that if an earthquake occurred, and they happen frequently in these areas, the pipeline could be damaged allowing the industrial waste waters to drain directly into the lake. Is it not possible that a pipeline in the Baykal region would turn out to be a situation in which the "medicine" for nature would be worse than the "disease" itself?

Certainly, the difficulties mentioned by the builder can finally be overcome one way or another. However, is it merely accidental that the project arouses so many valid doubts? There is still one other aspect to this affair — the interrelationship of ecology and morality.

Lessons of Baykal — Lessons of Democracy

Valentin Rasputin, Hero of Socialist Labor

At the present time, more than 40,000 signatures have been obtained in Irkutsk alone from individuals who oppose the pipeline and who favor the rapid modernization of the combine. Looking back over the past few decades, the temperature of public opinion has never been this high. The oblast's workers view the pipeline solution as burdensome for the state and as ineffective for the "sacred sea" and as a maneuver by the ministry aimed at saving the combine.

And this is not the first time that the question has arisen here: could it be that society is wrong? Could it be that it embodies the manifestation of natural interests which

cannot be taken into account with the state requirements? Experience has revealed on more than one occasion — the history of Baykal, the turning around of the northern and Siberian rivers and Yasnaya Polyana, on the basis of which governmental decrees were subsequently handed down — that this is not so. Public opinion which can bring bold "plans of the century" to a halt is a national and moral point of view. Society is not a street nor a random crowd, but rather it is made up of scientists, writers, workers, doctors, engineers and students, whose civic position will not allow them to tolerate abuses or favorites.

Let us imagine that the state is prepared to go to any expense in order to ease the situation as far as Lake Baykal is concerned. In such a case, why should use be made of many tens of millions of rubles in order to curtail cellulose production? Why not carry out the recommendation by the Irkutsk workers to open up a Baykal account and put the national shoulder behind these losses — instead of carrying out doubtful and costly maneuvers? As a former member of the state committee for preparing the party-governmental decree on Baykal and as an active member at the present time of the inter-departmental committee for controlling fulfillment of this decree, I can testify to the fact that the pipeline, from the very beginning, has aroused and continues to arouse disputes among those scientists and specialists who participated in the work of the committee. Perhaps it will not be possible to ignore the decisive opinions of my fellow-villagers, those who are not in agreement with the haste being displayed — in the absence of a plan, without an ecological committee of experts, with no adequate economic basis for the construction and with considerable doubt as to its use! Perhaps we should recall what will happen in such instances: we will build, we will throw money into the pipeline and we will ruin the Irkut River.

But the material and financial losses can be counted, whereas it will be impossible to count the moral losses ensuing a wilful decision handed down despite national opinion.

We are learning democracy. Why should we learn it if we are not organizing a referendum in Irkutsk on the question of building the pipeline and checking all results in a thorough manner?

The "public expertise" conducted by an Irkutsk kor-punkt [correspondent's point] was unable to allow those to speak who unreservedly approve of the construction of the pipeline for one very good reason: no such people could be found in the Baykal region. This then is the atmosphere of opinions in which the future project exists today. In all probability, it makes sense to have the inter-departmental committee which monitors the carrying out of the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers concerned with protecting Baykal to weigh all factors thoroughly again and again. It is hoped that all those who truly are disturbed over the fate of nature in Siberia will be heard from.

Concern Over Low Percentage of Ethnic Kirghiz in Industry

18300025b Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 9 Oct 87 p 3

[Article by L. Lebedeva, candidate of economic sciences and Z. Toktokhodzhayeva, junior scientific associate at the Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics: "Who is the Machine Tool Operator? The Working Class of Kirghizia Through the Prism of Population Structure"]

[Text] Today, as our public life is undergoing perestroika, we are forced to admit that forward movement does not mean taking satisfaction from what has been accomplished but rather seeking to find ways of extricating ourselves from situations that have resulted from our neglect of the negative aspects that have accompanied the positive ones as a whole. Indeed, the situation today, as was noted at the 27th CPSU Congress, "as better as it has been than ever before, still has its contradictions and difficulties."

Take, for example, the formation and development of a national vanguard of the working class which constitutes an important problem for our republic. At one time the premise that the nationality problem in the Soviet Union had been successfully resolved was accepted as dogma. The subsequent development of Kirghiz nationality was understood to entail merely a development of its culture and art. It had been thought that the development of a national working class did not have any special significance either from the viewpoint of the national economy's needs for personnel or from the viewpoint of the development of the nation itself. Now, unfortunately, we must admit, even if somewhat belatedly, that this most urgent problem has not been conclusively resolved.

The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee "On the Efforts of the Kazakh Republic Party Organization Concerned with the International and Patriotic Training of the Workers" notes that the need "to pay particular attention to a further strengthening of the working class national cadre, and above all, those in the leading sectors of industry." This applies to our republic in full measure.

One cannot say that nothing was done and that nothing is being done in Kirghizia to form a national vanguard of the industrial working class. At various periods Kirghiz nationals were successfully entering the industrial sectors to one degree or another. Their success was achieved in two ways: Either industrial enterprises were built within the local residential areas of the indigenous population or rural residents left their native areas and became skilled in new vocations.

An analysis of the employment trends in the national economy sectors of Kirghizia shows that whereas the total number of labors and white collar workers in

industry more than doubled during the period between 1963 and 1983, the number of Kirghiz nationals in that group more than quadrupled. Moreover, that process proceeded even more intensively between 1973 and 1983. Suffice to say that the average annual growth rate of industrial laborers and white collar workers during that period was almost 3.5 times greater than the total growth. That meant that Kirghiz young people had grown in numbers and strived more fervently to enter the industrial work force (this trend has even intensified lately). After all, whereas the average annual intensity of indigenous involvement in industry was 2.4 times greater than the total increase between 1973 and 1977, that level was already 4.6 times greater than the total in the subsequent period (1977 - 1983)!

This would seem to present a positive picture. However, those growth rates were far from sufficient. Consequently, in 1983 the level of Kirghiz national employment in industry was 226 Kirghiz per 1,000 persons employed in industry, 210 per 1,000 persons employed in construction, and 300 per 1,000 persons employed in transportation and communications. But, the indigenous population constitutes almost one-half of the republic's population. Consequently, the problem of indigenous employment in the industrial sectors is still one of extreme acuity.

An important reason for this situation is the fact that the greatest development of industry and the material production manufacturing sectors as well as the development of the complex of non-production sectors took place in the areas with the smallest concentration of the indigenous population. In the city of Frunze, for example, which produces almost one-third of the total industrial output, Kirghiz nationals presently account for only 17 percent of the city's population. A similar situation is to be found in the small cities of the Chu Valley where a significant segment of the republic's industrial potential is concentrated. When the census of 1979 was taken Kirghiz accounted for 10.6 percent of the population of Tokmak and only seven percent of population in Kara-Balta... In areas where Kirghiz are in the greatest concentration, as for example in the city of Naryn where they account for 88.2 percent of the population, there has been very little industrial development there. This also applies as a whole to the Issyk-Kul, Talas, and Naryn oblasts. There the ratio per 1,000 person employed in national production is 215, 207, and 159 persons working in industrial sectors respectively.

Thus, there has been a clear long-standing disproportion between the placement of industrial sectors and the residential location of the indigenous population. It is now very difficult to overcome that disproportion. But that must be done. In our view, this requires a whole series of mutually dependent measures that are connected both to the development of industrial production sectors in the areas of greatest indigenous population concentration and to an accelerated development of a complex of non-industrial sectors, and especially the

development of such a leading link as the formation of the sector that is related to "human investments". This is a sector upon which the qualitative features of the society's main production force are primarily dependent.

A well planned and skillful effort aimed at vocational guidance and vocational training for young people is a vitally important undertaking. It is no less important to develop and change the industrial structure of the national economy so that is better represented by advanced industrial sectors. At the same time one must not fail to take into consideration the traditionally evolved skills of the indigenous population.

In short, what is needed is not a strong-willed resolution of these important socioeconomic problems, but rather a well thought out and rational management of the republic's labor resources. An important feature of such management is that its implementation must take into consideration the demographic (high birth rate level and natural growth rate of the population), nationality (there are more than 100 nationalities represented by the republic's residents and it is essential that each one of them develop in their own way), and economic (the evolved and optimal industrial structure of the national economy, the uneven industrial development of individual territories, the labor surplus in some regions of the republic and the labor shortage in other regions) features of Kirghizia.

6289

Infectious Disease Concern in Tajikistan

18340401 [Editorial Report] Dushanbe TOJIKISTONI SOVETI in Tajik on 22 July 1987 carries on pages 3 and

4, under the rubric "Beware—Dangerous Disease," a 500-word article, "Crimean Fever: What Caution Was Necessary About It?", by R. Jumayev, head of the Sanitary and Epidemiological Administration and deputy head state sanitary doctor of the Tajik SSR.

The spread of Crimean Hemorrhagic Fever in Tajikistan alarmed many citizens. Ticks spread the disease. The fever was first identified by scientists in 1927; the first information about it spread in Tajikistan in 1944. Clinical symptoms appear 2-7 days after someone is bitten by a tick that carries the disease. After 3-4 days of illness, the gastro-intestinal tract, lungs, and other internal organs hemorrhage. A person should be hospitalized at the first signs of the disease and even then may not survive because there are no special treatments for it.

The disease is found nowadays in the Crimea, Astrakhan, Rostov, Krasnodar, Stavropol, Kazakhstan, the Central Asian republics, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. It occurs only in the southern part of Tajikistan. People run the greatest risk of catching it from exposure to private livestock, which graze in small areas near inhabited places and which are not usually treated with anti-tick medicine. The disease can also spread via livestock pens and summer pastures, where insects are numerous.

The best preventative is the chemical destruction of ticks infesting livestock, houses, livestock pens, etc. Other good counter-measures in inhabited areas include the elimination of dilapidated buildings, plowing a zone of land around a village, locating summer pens away from houses, and maintaining cleanliness in homes and pens.

END