

224054

JPRS-UPA-88-025
7 JULY 1988



JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Technical Information Service
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

19980812 094

10
93
A05

Soviet Union Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-025

CONTENTS

7 JULY 1988

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Estonian Creative Unions Reform Proposals Published [Unattributed report; MOLODEZH ESTONII 13 May 88]	1
Latvian Plenum Addresses Nationality Issues [Latinform; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 7 May 88]	3
Internationalism Subject of Debate at Kazakh Obkom Plenums Tselinograd Oblast	14
[O. Yerkimbayev, A. Rotmistrovskiy; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 3 Apr 88]	14
East-Kazakhstan Oblast [M. Abugaliyev, A. Akava; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 5 Apr 88]	15
Mangyshlak Oblast [M. Buldekbayev, G. Groyser; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 5 Apr 88]	17
Alma-Ata Oblast [Ye. Shaymerdenov, V. Golovanov; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 22 Apr 88]	18
Dzhezkazgan Oblast [N. Idrisov, A. Sivashchenko; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 26 Apr 88]	20
Kzyl-Orda Oblast [B. Abdrazakov, B. Bekteпов; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 29 Apr 88]	21
Tajik CP CC Targets Youth in Anti-Religion, Internationalism Programs [Unattributed report; KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, 12 May 88]	22
CPSU Cencom Passes Resolution on Work of Kurgan Party Organs [Unattributed report; PRAVDA, 20 May 88]	24
Moldavian Supreme Soviet Views Republic's Alcohol, Narcotics Problems [A. A. Mokuanu; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 13 Apr 88]	26
Vorotnikov Introduces Journal Issue on Siberia [V.I. Vorotnikov; SOVIET UNION, May 88]	31

MEDIA, PROPAGANDA

IZVESTIYA Official Urges More Open, Bolder Foreign Affairs Reporting [A. Kuvshinnikov; ZHURNALIST, No 3, Mar 88]	33
Azeri-Language CP Daily Runs Responses to 'Andreyeva Letter'	36
'Tragedy' of Stalin Personality Cult [Bakir Nabiyev; KOMMUNIST, 17 Apr 88]	36
Labor Hero Praises Restructuring [Safar Abdullayev; KOMMUNIST, 17 Apr 88]	37
Reader Accuses MOLODEZH GRUZII of Ignoring Komsomol Shortcomings [P. Kobakhidze; MOLODEZH GRUZII, 5 May 88]	37

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Lenin's Role in Collectivization Put Into Perspective [V. Selyunin; NOVYY MIR, No 5, May 88]	39
--	----

RELIGION

Lithuanian Church, State Leaders View Current Changes [ELTA report; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 15 May 88]	58
---	----

CULTURE

Writers Speak Out at History, Literature Conference [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 5 May 88]	60
Leningrad Writer Provides Text of Stalin's Censorship of Zoshchenko [A. Yezhelev; IZVESTIYA, May 88]	65
Kaverin Defends Zoshchenko as First To Describe Fear During Stalin Era [V. Kaverin; IZVESTIYA, May 88]	68
BSSR Writers' Union Chief Advocates Elevating Position of Belorussian Language [N. Gitevich; SELSKAYA ZHIZN, 30 Apr 88]	70

SOCIAL ISSUES

Inter-Ethnic Tensions in Estonia Outlined by Prominent Cultural Figure [E. Pyldroos; MOLODEZH ESTONII, 13 May 88]	73
Differing Views of Perestroyka Debated at Social Science Seminar [Vladimir Gurevich; MOSCOW NEWS, 29 May-5 Jun 88]	74
Estonian Law Expands Public Input in Decision-Making [Unattributed; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 4 May 88]	76

REGIONAL ISSUES

Armenian Student Protesters Air NKAO Views, Score Dearth of Media Coverage [Z. Arevshatyan, S. Arutyunyan; KOMSOMOLETS, 7 Jun 88]	80
More on Student Hunger Strikers in Yerevan [G. Rubinyan; KOMSOMOLETS, 9 Jun 88]	83
Status of Armenian Refugees From Sumgait Updated [Armenpress; KOMMUNIST, 7 Jun 88]	83
Armenian Education Minister on Plans to Train NKAO Students in Armenia [L.P. Garibdzhanyan; KOMSOMOLETS, 7 Jun 88]	84
Readers' Letters Offer Advice on NKAO Crisis	85
Strikes Viewed as Counterproductive [G. Ovsepyan; KOMMUNIST, 5 Jun 88]	85
Stalin Blamed for NKAO Problem [V. Osipyan; KOMMUNIST, 5 Jun 88]	85
LiSSR: Language, Culture of Non-Native Nationalities Promoted [Unattributed report; SOBYTIYA I VREMYA, No 8, Apr 88]	86
NKAO Well Supplied With Foodstuffs During Strikes [Azerinform; BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 11 Jun 88]	87
Azerbaijan Official on NKAO Water Supply Initiatives [Yu.V. Borisenko; BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 5 Jun 88]	88

Estonian Creative Unions Reform Proposals Published

18000418a Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian
13 May 88 p 3

Text "Letter from a Joint Plenum of the Boards of the Creative Unions of the Estonian SSR to the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers and the Creative Intelligentsia of the Estonian SSR"]

[Text] While supporting the perestroika initiated in all spheres of the life of Soviet society by the CPSU Central Committee and the course toward perfecting democracy and radical economic reform, and recognizing the first steps that have been taken in our republic along the path of expanding democracy and glasnost, protecting the language and culture of the indigenous nationality, restricting migration into the republic, effecting environmental protection, and in other spheres, the plenum of the boards of the creative unions of the Estonian SSR notes with concern a number of processes and phenomena in our life that are hampering the course of perestroika and shaking the people's trust in the leading organs.

The disproportions in the economy are growing. In all spheres, including in cultural life, decentralization is insignificant. The idea of regional cost accounting for the Estonian SSR has been met with a disapproving attitude from above even though the course of extensive discussion of this idea testifies to the support for this proposal from the people. The continuing pressure from the all-union departments is blunting the sense of being the master and lowering the sense of responsibility in the actual producers. Plans for the exploitation of mineral resources in northeast Estonia have been augmented with very equivocal plans for construction in Tallinn and Narva that threaten to result in new and in principal insoluble economic, social and ecological problems. Resolution of the housing program is being considered in isolation from today's tasks of shaping a unified living environment.

The position of the Estonian language in the republic has not been settled. The up to now uncontrolled migration into the republic is exerting a dangerous influence on the demographic balance, and through this on the general economic and cultural situation, and is making it virtually impossible to resolve the housing problem and creating a tense atmosphere in society, particularly with regard to dealings between the nations. At the same time, incompetence and superficiality are observed in the assessment made of the national question in the Estonian SSR, and this issue is regarded merely as a problem of indoctrination.

As a result of all this, a demographic crisis threatens the preservation of the Estonians as a nation, and in order to resolve this, immediate and decisive steps are needed on

the part of the government. The plenum believes that it is a self-evident fact that in its activity the government of the Estonian SSR should regard the need to preserve and develop the Estonian people as a top-priority task. We support the view that real equality of the national cultures can be guaranteed only by protecting the priority of the Estonian language and culture across the entire territory of the Estonian SSR.

In our opinion, even until very recently the management of political life in Estonia has been characterized by a lack of competence, hastiness in decisionmaking, and a sense of nervousness. Instead of seeking out, finding and eliminating on the only basis possible—socioeconomic—the true causes of the existing shortcomings and tension, forces opposing perestroika have been trying to blame the existence of this tension either on external propaganda and the local mass media, or on nonformal groupings. Unfortunately, these accusations have been supported at important forums. Similar views have also been disseminated in the all-union press, which is showing the processes taking place in Estonia in an incorrect light.

The joint plenum of the boards of the creative unions of the Estonian SSR approve the information letters and proposals of the Cultural Council of the creative unions to the republic directive organs, in which letters the housing program, the phosphorite problem, glasnost, the substance and level of official information in the assessment of events and processes in our society, cost accounting for the Estonian SSR, establishment of Estonian as the state language, the compilation of special juridical acts and other problems were reviewed. We consider it essential to strengthen cooperation between the Cultural Council of the creative unions in the Estonian SSR and the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers.

The plenum appeals to the creative intelligentsia in the republic to use its talent, capabilities and creative potential to pursue the party course aimed at perestroika, proceeding from the directions and principles of the 27th CPSU Congress. To this end the plenum introduces the following proposals:

1. That the republic legislative organs sponsor change in the USSR Constitution and the Constitution of the Estonian SSR in order to guarantee the economic and cultural independence of the Estonian SSR and its right first and foremost to handle its own affairs itself.
2. That citizenship of the Estonian SSR be defined in the republic constitution and legislation.
3. That a course be set toward transferring the republic to full cost accounting; that ideas be worked on to make Estonia a special economic zone; that all materials from working groups working on the concept of regional cost accounting be made public.

4. That leading organs and the creative unions in the republic take specific steps to decentralize cultural life in the Estonian SSR.

5. That in order to overcome the lagging that has lasted for decades additional funding be made available for the rapid development of the material base for the sociocultural sphere.

6. That priority be restored to national scientific disciplines (language, folklore, archaeology, history, ethnography, anthropology and so forth) in our spiritual culture, and that allocations for their development be increased and training for scientific personnel be expanded.

7. That state support be provided for the development of scientific and cultural contacts with Estonians living outside Estonia.

8. That preliminary and objective information be provided for the entire population of the republic concerning all problems and plans connected with Estonia through the channels of the mass media, in both Estonian and Russian.

9. That preliminary public debate take place in the press on the fundamental decisions of the government of the Estonian SSR concerning key issues in the life of the republic.

That a system be set up and introduced to study public opinion on all urgent problems in public life, and that the results of such polls be regularly published.

10. That statistics on the status of Estonia's population and its living environment be published regularly.

11. That maximum glasnost be guaranteed in the republic with regard to the activity of the law enforcement organs and that those organs be really monitored by the public and the opportunities for violations of the law in those organs be reduced to a minimum at a time when in complex situations they may acquire a dangerous and provocative character.

12. That the mass actions to exile people that took place in the Estonian SSR in 1941 and during the postwar years be deemed unlawful, and that all acts serving as a basis for those actions be appealed in order to repeal them. That lists be published of all those repressed. That the Estonian SSR Museum of History contain a section in which all material relating to unlawful repressions during the period of Stalinism be housed. That a monument be set up to the innocent victims of Stalinism.

13. That all lists of books destroyed during the period 1940-1950 be published. That specific steps be taken to stock our libraries with the books contained in those lists and with the valuable literature in the national language that was destroyed.

14. That it be deemed essential to effect radical changes in existing construction policy.

15. That it be deemed impermissible to set up experimental sections at the phosphorite deposits in Rakvere and Toolse. That a Pandivereske national park be established and that further geological survey work be banned at the Rakvere (Lyaene-Kabalaske) deposit.

That disagreement be voiced against the present plan to expand the Pribaltiyskaya GRES and construct a plant for toxic chemicals in Maardu. That support be given for the position of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers according to which an oil-terminal port and a port for chemicals not be constructed in the republic. That radical steps be taken to eliminate the ecological emergency situation in the Bay of Pyarnu.

16. That support be given for significant measures to restrict immigration into the republic; and that at the same time work on and the implementation of significantly more radical measures be continued in order to achieve a negative balance in immigration into the Estonian SSR.

17. That everything necessary be done to restore the importance of Tartu as a cultural center. That obstacles on the road of realizing plans for construction of a Museum of the Estonian People be removed.

18. That significant changes be made in the position with respect to the publication of literature in the Estonian language, abandoning the large print runs for publications in Russian aimed at the all-union network of books sales, on which our stocks of paper and printing capacities are being spent. That publishing rights be extended to the creative unions and societies, higher educational establishments and scientific and cultural institutions.

19. That it be deemed necessary to emphasize that our people expect from the leadership of the Estonian SSR greater initiative and sense of principle in protecting the interests and constitutional rights of the republic. Proceeding from this, the plenum expresses dissatisfaction with the activity of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary K. Vayno and the Chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers B. Saula.

The creative intelligentsia of Soviet Estonia is aware of its own responsibility in the present complex but hopeful period. We see our task in cooperating closely with all who pin their hopes in perestrojka—both workers and peasants and representatives of the intelligentsia, and the political leaders.

This letter adopted at the 2 April 1988 joint plenum of the creative unions of the Estonian SSR at the Toompea in Tallinn.

Latvian Plenum Addresses Nationality Issues
18000349 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 7 May 88 pp 1-3

[LATINFORM report on 5 May 1988 speech by B.K. Pugo at Latvian CP Central Committee Plenum: "Deepen Democratization and Raise Up Patriots"]

[Excerpts] As already reported, a Plenum of the Latvian CP Central Committee was held on 5 May, and discussed the question: "On the Tasks of the Republic Party Organization for Intensifying the Ideological-Political, International and Patriotic Upbringing of the Workers at the Contemporary Stage of Perestrojka." Delivering a report at the Plenum was Latvian CP Central Committee First Secretary B.K. Pugo.

"Comrades! At the Plenum today we are given the collective task of spelling out the ideological situation in the republic and planning specific measures for improving ideological-educational activity. The need for this has been dictated by life, in the interests of accelerating socio-economic development, and by the innovative nature of the changes begun by the party.

"The revolutionary restructuring needs an ideology of renewal: that is how the problem was stated at the February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. What is the meaning and purpose of this renewal? Above all it must restore the moral significance of socialist values, the chief of which is—an orientation toward the working man. We must cleanse the ideals of socialism of the corrosion of bureaucratism and everything that is alien; and we must liberate the best creative forces of man. Democracy, faith in the people, tolerance for the unfamiliar and for quests, benevolence, competence, understanding, and defense of the interests of the people and the interests of socialism—these were summed up as the key principles of the party policy in the intellectual sphere of perestrojka at the Plenum.

"The position of the CPSU Central Committee is concise and clear-cut—decisive rejection of everything that is dogmatic, bureaucratic and voluntaristic: for they have nothing in common, neither with Marxism-Leninism, nor with true socialism. We are for an ideology of sober analysis and energetic action, directed toward solution of today's problems, and at the same time one which is oriented toward the future.

"We must answer the question, 'To what extent does our ideological work meet the contemporary needs of the party?' To do this we must thoroughly and self-critically delve into the present situation, and evaluate the effectiveness of the methods and forms of ideological-political, international and patriotic education we have adopted; we must decisively reject that which is obsolete, and speak honestly of past mistakes; and we must demonstrate our own ability to grasp and correct them. Otherwise we will be unable to develop the initiative, creativity and independence of the people. The most

important thing is—deepening democratization. And the Latvian CP Central Committee unanimously supports this line of the CPSU Central Committee. Only genuine democratization will involve the people to the fullest in the profound transformations in all aspects of the life of our society.

"Along with the growth of the social and political active-ness of the workers, there is also growing faith in the irreversibility of the transformations begun. At the very same time we see that there are quite a few people in the republic, including administrators, who see democratization as some kind of cosmetic repair, as a kind of liberalization of the administrative-command system of management. The Central Committee Buro cannot agree with such an approach to the matter, and will steadfastly strive to overcome it. The purposes of renewal can be served only by a mechanism of power and management which is under the control of the people, from top to bottom. At the very same time we must constantly bear in mind that democracy also bears the very highest responsibility for the fate of socialism.

"For the sake of fairness we should note that we are already beginning to get used to the fact that speakers may have various views on the very same problems. Let us recall the last Latvian CP Central Committee Plenum, and the recent session of the republic Supreme Soviet. At them we heard not a dutiful response to the report, but sharp and constructive criticism. And there was a variety of opinions. The decisions were not simply affirmed, but were worked out in our collective intellect. The remarks of the deputies were taken into consideration by the Council of Ministers, and it is continuing to work on developing the general scheme for the management of the republic's national economy.

"In the near future, the concept for the economic and social development of our republic to the year 2005 will be brought forth for republic-wide discussion. In the course of this discussion the position of the populace may be more precisely determined with respect to the development of our industry, the material base of cultural institutions, and other major problems. Such a discussion will be for the good of the cause. The people will more rapidly gain a feeling not only for their own part in working out the solutions, but also one of responsibility for acceleration of the socio-economic development of the republic. Experience shows that today not a single major problem can be resolved without careful study and consideration of public opinion.

Debate Does Not Hinder the Cause

"Very likely, after many decades, we are beginning to truly experience socialist pluralism of opinion. We are unaccustomed to this and do not yet fully understand it. We have become accustomed to unfirmness of opinion, but perestrojka requires unity of action. Divergent

points of view, quests and disputes, while agreeing on the fundamental questions—these do not hinder unity, but are the conditions for strengthening it

“We must all take into consideration the fact that during the years of stagnation a considerable number of unresolved problems, conflicts, undeserved insults, and instances of social injustice have accumulated. Certain questions have not been considered or have not been studied for decades. Many people have no clear-cut conception of the reasons for the appearance of contradictions in the development of our society, or on ways to eliminate them. But the desire to put things in order quickly is great. Therefore, along with well-founded and constructive criticism, one may also hear severe judgments, brought about by lack of information, and emotion. Letters to the Central Committee, and meetings in the collectives reveal that confusion and perplexity have arisen in the minds of some people. The deepening of democracy, the rejection of administrative-command methods of leadership and management, criticism of the cult of Stalin, the expansion of glasnost, and the lifting of all kinds of bans and limitations have given rise to doubts: ‘But are not the foundations of socialism being shattered?’ The February Plenum gave its answer to that. No. I say again, no. Democracy and glasnost are undermining conservatism. To the socialist system they only add strength.

“Today we must proceed from the necessity for a sharp turn on the part of our aktiv and all communists, toward the ideological content of perestroika and its ideological support. We cannot say that republic party organizations are not undertaking efforts to increase the effectiveness of ideological work. Party training systems and economic education are being improved, and the search is on for new and more effective forms of propaganda and agitation. However we must honestly and openly admit that in recent years we have devoted more attention to economic and management activities. To convince oneself of this, it is only necessary to glance at the agenda of party committee plenums. Only a very insignificant part of the questions examined was devoted to ideological work.

“We must self-critically admit that it was only after the 24th Congress of the Latvian CP and the Plenum that the Central Committee became wholly dedicated to these questions. It quite often happens, that economic and social processes and ideological work are not organically united; it is as if they are taking parallel courses, which fundamentally contradicts the very essence and the purpose of ideological activity. I would like to invite your attention to the thoughts of V.I. Lenin: ‘An “Ideologist” has earned the title of ideologist only when he is at the head of the movement, showing it the way; when he is able to solve before others do so all the theoretical, political, tactical and organizational problems which the “material elements” of the movement naturally encounter.’

“If one approaches an evaluation of the status of ideological work in the republic and the degree to which it coincides with the goals and tasks of perestroika from such Leninist positions, then one must admit that we are clearly not doing enough here. No matter which links of political education we take—political and economic training, lecture propaganda, mass political and individual work—in spite of a certain amount of innovation, they still contain a considerable number of the stereotypes of the past.

“One-third of the party officials polled believe that profound changes have taken place in mass political work. But 90 percent of the workers polled in the course of the very same sociological research believe, that the style of mass political work in republic party organizations has either not changed significantly or remains the same as before. Is this not an example of the fact that even today, we adhere to the old, understated measures, and the striving to present the desirable as the actual? We must steadfastly strive to overcome this lack of self-criticism and change our style of work. We must not allow perestroika to become bogged down in the quagmire of conservative habits, empty assurances, garrulousness, and bureaucratism. We must decisively put a halt to double-entry bookkeeping: one for the report, and the other for business.

“The increased socio-political activeness of the populace has exposed the glaring contradiction between the demands of public opinion and that which our means of propaganda and agitation and ideological aktiv as a whole have managed to propose for it. There is no way one can extricate oneself from the swamp of bureaucratism. Dozens, hundreds of letters, oral statements and complaints from the workers are filled to overflowing with instances of bureaucratic heartlessness of administrators and their attempts to divert attention from ‘difficult questions’ and avoid concrete solutions to them. This leads to a situation in which part of the people begin to lose their faith in the organs of state power and in social justice.

“It is no accident that against this background various kinds of spontaneous formations and unofficial associations are appearing and growing. This is a result of the sluggishness, the inertia, the tenacious and uncritical dogmatism—and above all, the faith in the infallibility of those very administrative methods.

“Take for example the recent protest demonstration in Riga against metro construction. The dialog on this has been going on for a long time, both in the press and among the broad masses. And when the first demonstrations against metro construction appeared, and this was last year already, officials of the Riga party gorkom and gorispolkom did not attribute special significance to them, saying, ‘There’s no use in paying attention to statements by short-sighted and incompetent people.’ It would seem that if the gorkom and gorispolkom were convinced of their correctness, they should mobilize the

aktiv and direct all their efforts to the enterprises and academic institutions, and try to dispel the unfounded fears of the people about the metro, and point out its advantages. But this was not done. As a result, the gorkom and gorispolkom did not hold a meeting in defense of the metro, but an environmental protection club did so and rallied the opposition against the metro construction.

"And those in favor of the metro do have something to say in its defense: it would permit significantly reducing the amount of above-ground transport, make the air on the streets of Riga cleaner, and reduce the amount of time spent on the road. And it is the citizens of Riga themselves who have an interest in this. After all, no one at the union-level authorities is forcing the metro construction on Riga. At one time, the citizens of Riga themselves expressed their interest in drawing up a plan; they expressed approval of it in the course of a contest held for the best station designs. But today, it goes without saying, one cannot just cast aside the widely-held opinion that before building the metro, it would be better to build more housing and improve the above-ground transportation arteries.

"The public has expressed its opinion on these questions. The frequent repetition of the conclusions and opinions which has begun is tiresome: it is now a matter for the specialists. The Riga Gorispolkom must set up without delay a competent and authoritative commission. It should study all aspects of building the metro in detail, and submit its proposals to the republic government, which will then render its decision, taking all factors into consideration, including public opinion.

"Today in the hall there are both members of the Central Committee and deputies of the republic Supreme Soviet. With our hands to our hearts, let us each ask ourselves, how often do we visit the auditoria where so many critical questions have accumulated? Are we carrying on open dialog with those who appear in the role of the so-called informal leaders? Let no one be insulted if I ask, are we not at times becoming like those 'leftist' revolutionaries who were afraid to work in the trade unions, where they did not have support, and whom Lenin so sharply criticized in his time?

"Until now, certain leaders of party and Soviet organs in the cities and rayons of the republic have held the opinion that all the critical, unwonted, and therefore sometimes inconvenient events have taken place for the most part in Riga. You need not lull yourselves with those thoughts, esteemed Comrades. Social activeness is on the increase today everywhere, and it will appear everywhere and anywhere. And we must devote maximum efforts to ensure that everything that works in favor of socialism is supported and developed. And everything that is contrary to socialism must be repulsed.

"How should party, Soviet, trade-union and Komsomol workers operate in the conditions which have evolved? They must work better with the people. They must learn to hear them out, and to affirm and persistently defend the party line. The Leningrad party raykom, for example, is taking a proper approach to this question. Its officials go to the small auditoria too, and persistently switch from monologues to dialogs and discussions; and they are learning to defend their opinions. We all must abandon administrative methods and bans. It is time to understand that the time of 'ideological comfort,' when it was possible to hide, forbid, or drive off that which we did not like, has gone forever. Of course it was easier to issue orders than to persuade. But under conditions of democratization we have not and cannot have a more effective means of achieving our assigned goals in ideology than persuasion.

The Lessons of History

"During periods of major socio-political and economic advances, interest in the historic past of one's country, nation and party naturally intensifies. And this is entirely understandable. People try to find a deeper interpretation for the path they have traveled, to delve into the complex periods, and draw lessons for the future. Enriching and strengthening one's sense of history is at the same time a work on formulating a healthy national self-concept, on the culture of international intercourse, and internationalistic maturity.

"The history of our republic is complex and contradictory. The tempests of historic changes have visited the Latvian lands and its citizens in our century. There have been periods in the history of Latvia when the counter-revolutionary has existed side by side with the revolutionary, the socialist with the bourgeois, and the national with the nationalistic. And the truth of history convincingly testifies that all of these years were filled with the struggle of the Latvian proletariat for its better future, for socialism: a struggle led by the Communist Party of Latvia—one of the oldest cohorts of the CPSU. As early as the beginning of the century, Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote that, 'The Latvian proletariat and Latvian Social democrats have occupied one of the principal and most prominent positions in the struggle against the autocracy and all the forces of the old order.'

"The finest sons of the Latvian people were in the vanguard of the defenders of the Great October Socialist Revolution. And they preserved its truths in the bitter years of the personality cult as well. It was not the Latvian people who were guilty of the victims of the white terror, in setting up the forced labor camp in Kalntsiems but the Latvian bourgeoisie and its supporters. In the 1920's and 1930's too the people were struggling with it, and worked indefatigably. And the people had their indisputable successes—in the development of agriculture, science and culture. Nor must one forget the fact that for ordinary people life was not so sweet in those years. It was not the people that was the

master in the bourgeois republic, but the factory owners and the large land-owners. It was to their rule that the workers of Latvia said, 'No' in 1940, and made their irreversible choice in favor of socialism.

"History creates a people, and a dialectical understanding of history presupposes knowledge of all its complexity and contradictions: how the people lived, worked and struggled; how their many successes and failures were interwoven; their discoveries and their errors; the bright and the tragic; the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses and the violation of socialist legality. Keeping silent about mistakes means that one shows disrespect to the memory of those who became the innocent victims of the lawlessness and tyranny of Stalin's cult. Along with other peoples in the country, the Latvian people suffered considerable losses in those years.

"It is our duty to engrave in historic memory the names of Yan Rudzutak, Robert Eykhe, Ioakim Vatsiyentis, Yuliy Danishevskiy, Vilgelm Knorin, and the many thousands of people whose lives were tragically cut short at the height of their powers and in their unwavering faith in the Leninist ideals of socialism. We must restore to the history of the revolution the true place of such individuals as Ivar Smilg and Davis Rozitis: for a long time only their relatives and those close to them believed in their devotion to the revolution. It is our moral duty to restore the good name of those families, who in the post-war years were loyal to Soviet rule, who believed in its justice and labored conscientiously, but were found among the innocent who were arrested. Everyone expects this, and our society simply must have such a moral purification. The commission of the republic Council of Ministers must carefully investigate every unjustified decision on exile, and must show concern for restoring the dignity of the people who suffered innocently.

"Of course the thirst for a true, in-depth understanding of the historic past cannot be quenched by a few newspaper articles or brochures. That which has been done recently by the Institute of Party History at the Latvian CP Central Committee and the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History, is only a beginning, though an important and necessary beginning of a great and painstaking investigative work by social scientists, and above all the historians of the republic. There are still many unexplored areas and they must be eliminated: neither the bad nor the good must be silenced; every phenomenon must be evaluated, proceeding from the concrete historical situation. The situation must be approached precisely thus, as the July 1959 Plenum of the Latvian CP Central Committee showed the way. That plenum examined the shortcomings in cadre policy and in the international education of the workers, and discussions were held on ways to develop the economy of the republic.

"Today, under conditions of glasnost, we must persistently determine, whether or not during the examination of these problems and in carrying out the resolutions of

the plenum, one-sided views and voluntarism characteristic of the administrative-command system were predominant; whether there was sufficient basis for accusing certain Comrades of nationalism. After all, in all their subsequent work in the party they proved their devotion to socialism. These are not simple questions, and they must be approached with a great sense of responsibility. The Buro of the Central Committee has delegated the task of studying them to an authoritative commission, whose membership includes party officials and well-known scholars. We have every right to expect more active work from the historians in the study of other urgent problems of contemporary history.

"One can understand the public's desire to be able to read the once-secret pages of our past sooner. However, haste and rash judgments, or replacing in-depth study and comparison of the facts with general arguments, and groundless but outwardly 'bold' emotional challenges, can play a detrimental role and create a superficial and one-sided impression of the historical past of our people and our party.

"History is the fate of nations, the fate of the people. It informs us of the profound roots of international friendship of the Latvians and the neighboring peoples; and it teaches us to be internationalists in fact. Since ancient times the Latvian people and the Russian people have been friends and brothers. Together with them, the Latvian proletariat fought at the barricades in the first Russian revolution; they overturned the tyranny of the tsar; and they defended Soviet Russia and Soviet Latvia on the front lines of the Civil War. This friendship was forged even deeper in the terrible years of the Great Patriotic War, in the joint struggle of the Soviet people against Fascism.

"The Latvian people will never forget the assistance which the fraternal republics rendered to it in restoring its war-wrecked economy. And yes, those achievements which we managed to make after the war contain a large contribution from our friends, who supplied Latvia with raw materials, supplies, energy and petroleum products. The fact of the matter is that even today the republic's industry cannot operate for a day without deliveries from other regions. And even the rural area receives from union resources more than half the required volume of combined feeds, and practically all its equipment and fertilizer. In turn, the work rhythm at many of the country's enterprises depends largely upon deliveries from Latvia.

Our Strength is in Our Unity

"Life in Soviet Latvia today provides a multitude of examples of the internationalism of its workers of various nationalities, in the economic, social and cultural spheres. They are united by common socio-economic interests and by the desire to multiply the material and spiritual blessings of society. However, in analyzing national relations, we must not bypass the problems in

this sphere. This is all the more important, for not a single one of the problems of perestroika can be solved today without considering its influence on national relations. 'In a word,' as M.S. Gorbachev noted at the February 1988 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 'we must occupy ourselves fully with national policy at the contemporary stage. Along all lines—both in theory and in practice. This is the most principled, vital question of our society.'

"Contradictions, which are characteristic of any kind of development, are inevitable in the national processes as well. And they are making themselves known today as well. At times one might hear that democratization, glasnost and perestroika, they say, have only made the national problems more acute. That is not so. It is only that many critical and important questions of social development, which had been hushed up previously, have not been brought forth. And they were brought forth because genuine opportunities have appeared for honest discussion and fundamental solutions.

"However, the healthy and natural process of rapid growth of national self-awareness is not always accompanied by the formation of firm internationalist convictions and a sense of participation in the nationwide cause of revolutionary restructuring. Along with the noticeable rise of social activeness and constructive posing of genuine problems, one also notices the stirring of national prejudices and manifestations of narrow-minded egotism and regionalism. One is brought into contact not only with nationalists but also those of an openly anti-Soviet bent, who hide behind lofty phrases of glasnost and democratization. Still fresh in everyone's mind are the impressions of the demonstrations, which were nationalistic in nature, that took place last June and August in Riga.

"We have already noted that many ideological workers were taken unawares by those events. Nor were they in any condition to forestall them. They revealed their political weakness, their habit of following under orders, their fear of operating independently and showing initiative, as the situation requires. Countermeasures were taken much too late. But national problems, as everyone knows, do not exist in and of themselves in a pure form. They are interwoven in the closest possible manner with economic, social, political and ideological problems. Any kind of blunder in the economy; in social, demographic or cadre policy; or shortcomings in ideological-political work sooner or later can have an effect on the state of international relations. The shortcomings which were spawned in the period of stagnation did not pass unnoticed, although we had little to say about many of them, or made it look as if they did not exist at all.

"The extensive method of industrial development and the principle of distributing the leftovers to the social sphere no doubt played a negative role as well. For a long time a number of union ministries followed a narrowly departmental line on increasing the capacities of their

enterprises situated in the republic by means of increasing the number of workers. They could not be bothered with solving social problems, and shrugged them off onto the shoulders of the local authorities. And Gosplan, the republic Council of Ministers, local Soviets of Peoples' Deputies, and even party organs—the Bureau of the Central Committee, and party raykoms and gorkoms—did not display the proper firmness, adherence to principle, and far-sightedness in trying to solve these problems.

"Let's take for example the Alfa Industrial Association in Riga, where, in the 11th Five Year Plan, 20 times fewer resources were spent for development of the socio-cultural-domestic area than for increasing industrial capacity. A similar picture evolved at many enterprises. And this led to lengthening the waiting period for housing, for kindergartens, and at polyclinics; problems sprang up in domestic services and public transportation; and problems of supplying foodstuffs and consumer goods to the populace became more acute.

"It is entirely natural that dissatisfaction began to arise among the indigenous populace, regardless of their nationality. And it is that dissatisfaction that our ideological enemies are trying to exploit to cause conflict among the nations. But the people's dissatisfaction was brought about not so much by the flaws in the relationships among representatives of the various nations, as by the lack of interaction between republic and union-level departments.

"Does our Soviet state really have an interest in, let's say, polluting the water area around the sanitarium in Yurmala with the discharge from the Slokskiy Pulp and Paper Plant? Of course not. It would, beyond all doubt, be more advantageous for it to quickly eliminate this source of environmental pollution. But you see the USSR Ministry of the Timber, Pulp-and-Paper and Woodworking Industry is in no hurry to do this. You see, for them that is just an extra worry. The technology and work at the purification installations would have to be improved. One can understand such difficulties, but the community of Yurmala and the citizens of the republic cannot acquiesce to the position of the ministry. And the Yurmala party gorkom and gorispolkom are correct, in that they are giving the ministry no peace. In this regard they will receive the full support of the republic leadership.

"We are also correct today in reaching the conclusion that a number of the conflicts, especially in domestic life and in the services sphere, arise not only from shortcomings in solving economic, social and ecological problems, but also from confusion in the everyday recognition of defects in international upbringing, and in the lack of an elementary culture of international intercourse.

"If one adds to domestic conflicts large and small the shortcomings in the study and use of languages, the gaps in the history textbooks, the negative influence of various radio-voices, and the shallow and sometimes mistaken articles in the mass information media—it then

becomes clear why people who are not ideologically mature respond to the ideas which have come from the past and from the West. They are not quite so harmless as they might appear at first glance. Here and there, under their influence, one might once again entertain ideas of national socialism in one's own little corner, on one's own scrap of land. But one cannot improve socialism behind the closed doors of one's national residence. Perestroika is the type of cause that only the entire family of fraternal nations is capable of. It is the kind of work which requires cooperative efforts, and unity of thoughts and actions. Only unity can guarantee success. Our republic was and will be an integral part of the country's unified national-economic complex, within which everything is interrelated. The better things are in the country as a whole, the more opportunities it can offer for the development of each republic. And on the other hand, the better things go in the fraternal republics, the stronger our Motherland is.

"Recognizing their responsibility for the fate of perestroika, the workers, kolkhoz members and the intelligentsiya of Latvia are striving to put things in order at home more rapidly, and to speed up the solution of the painful problems. Discipline for contracted deliveries has been strengthened at a number of enterprises. Special supervision has been placed on filling orders for fraternal republics. Upon initiative of party and Soviet organs, a number of effective measures have been adopted for improving the supply of foodstuffs to the populace. Thus, in the first quarter the sale of meat was increased by almost 1,500 tons. Work on putting the Housing-90 Program into effect is increasingly expanding: it is to reduce the waiting period for an apartment by almost a factor of two. Schools and educational institutions have begun to devote more attention to the history of the Latvian SSR: in the current academic year, 35 more hours have been set aside for that course than before. Language study has been improved in most schools. At many enterprises and institutions, as well as at the Latvian CP Central Committee, hundreds of study groups have been formed, in which people study the Latvian language on their own volition. In Riga a school was opened for in-depth study of the Russian language, at which Latvian upperclassmen who wish to become officers in the Soviet Army are studying.

"Yes, in the last year we have truly done a great deal more to solve a number of problems than in previous years. But a great deal remains to be done. The results of discussion of letters from the Latvian CP Central Committee to communists in the republic speak convincingly of this. During the meetings about 4,000 critical remarks and concrete proposals were expressed on improving international and patriotic education. The meetings also revealed that in many localities these questions are approached in a perfunctory manner; the complexity and importance of their decisions are underestimated; and the state of affairs is not analyzed in a self-critical manner. A low level of activeness by communists in the

discussion of the letters was noted in many party organizations in Riga, Liepaya, Yelgava, Ventspils and in the Rizhskiy and Kraslavskiy Rayons.

"Many party committees and party organizations have not yet attained a good grasp of the moral-political climate in their working collectives and do not understand the true state of affairs. As analysis shows, leading cadres in the republic do not understand in sufficient depth the essence of the transformations which have sprung up in national self-awareness. Many look upon the problem of strengthening internationalism as merely a struggle with nationalism in its extreme forms, or as rooting out extremism.

"A number of organizations and administrators are guilty of inexcusable delays in carrying out the plans approved by the Central Committee Buro. For example, the Latvian Republic Trade-Union Council, and party gorkoms and raykoms were required to include in their plans for the socio-economic development of the working collectives, sections on measures for improving international and patriotic education. But to this day most of the plans do not contain such sections.

"Last year LaSSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade was to have published the second edition of a terminological dictionary on international relations. But they are still making amendments to it. Last year LaSSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting was to have organized a young peoples' political discussion club. But the TV journalists have not yet managed to carry out this task.

"If today one were to ask Comrades A.K. Zitmanis, I.A. Reyman, Ya.Ya. Leyu, the first secretaries of the party raykoms and gorkoms, and other leaders who are also in no hurry to carry out the assignments, whether they realize the importance of accelerating the restructuring of ideological work, their answers would be convincing. And there would be new assurances. But you see, perestroika does not want promises, but deeds—even ordinary ones, but at least specific deeds.

"The buro, the secretariat, and departments of the Central Committee must step up their supervision of the planned program, and must hold strictly accountable those comrades who hinder fulfillment of the tasks. It would not be out of place today to thoroughly analyze our long-term social programs as well, and to introduce the corrections required to improve international relations.

"Most likely the republic Supreme Soviet will soon have to examine how the Population Program is being carried out, and what still needs to be done to increase the birth rate and to render greater assistance to young families. The slogan about a third child in every family, which was

promoted in the republic at one time, is extremely timely today. Putting it into practice would permit significantly increasing natural population growth.

"Significant improvements must be made in our public transportation, especially in Riga. Here there is something for the Riga Gorispolkom, the Ministry of Municipal Services, and the Ministry of Motor Transport and Highways to think about.

"The newly-created State Committee for Environmental Protection, together with the public, must get a firm grip on correcting the ecological situation. Its constructive proposals in this area will always find support in the party organs and in the government of the republic. The first steps in this direction have already been taken. Careful studies of the ecological situation have been conducted in Ventspils, Olayne and Yurmala, and specific ways to improve the situation have been outlined. Now the chief task is to put the plans into action more rapidly. The republic gosplan must once again thoroughly analyze the possibilities for increasing the amount of funds allocated for environmental protection, and must persistently bring this matter before the union-level ministries.

"It is vitally important to accelerate work on construction of general municipal purification plants in Riga. This task is within the capabilities of the Riga Gorispolkom and the Ministry of Construction. It must be resolved more persistently and more rapidly. Such construction projects must be taken under strict supervision in all the cities and rayons in the republic. And they must be completed at the same time as the projects for which they are intended.

The Reliable Method for Problem-Solving

"I would like to call your attention to an important and principled question of national policy: by what method should we resolve the problems which have accumulated and those which are springing up? It could be disputed for a long time, but there is only one reliable method: only through the utmost development of democracy is a solution possible. And democracy requires that when examining national questions, the interests of all nations are taken into consideration, and that they are assured complete equality both in theory and in practice. Excessive bureaucratic administration, issuing orders, and pressure-politics will not speed up the solution of national problems; such methods can only make them worse. On the other hand, adopting the principle of maximum mutual good-will and mutual respect will help find ways to resolve the most acute contradictions.

"We have no all-purpose ready-made prescriptions for life. We must seek solution to problems jointly. We are placing great hopes in the approaching 19th All-Union Party Conference. It will undoubtedly provide the answers to many questions on further ways for developing our society. We have proposed a number of questions

for discussion at the Conference: questions on improving the nationality policy; on the possibilities for expanding the rights of union republics and local Soviets; and on more active participation of union-level ministries and departments in solving regional social problems.

"In our view there is an imminent necessity for setting up an economic mechanism in the country which would better regulate the interrelations among the republics, oblasts, cities and rayons: a mechanism which would, on a strictly normative basis, permit distributing product manufacturing between the territory on which it is produced—where the necessary manpower must be provided—and those regions to which such products are delivered.

"The Latvian CP Central Committee and the republic Council of Ministers have appealed to the CPSU Central Committee and to the national government with a proposal to formulate in the current five-year plan a budget for the republic partially directed toward the needs for developing the non-production sphere, on the basis of stable deductions from the income of the enterprises situated on the territory of the republic. And beginning with the 13th Five Year Plan, it would be possible to switch to normative deduction of financial resources in the budget, depending on the national income produced.

"This would permit improved coordination of the labor activity of the republic's populace with accelerated housing construction, cultural development, and improved health care. We can and must do a great deal ourselves to eliminate the accumulated shortcomings. We need only act more boldly and energetically, and overcome the fear of making a mistake. We have no right to lag behind events. We must make more accurate predictions of developing situations, and not await but pre-empt the appearance of negative tendencies.

"Among the problems which cannot be solved at one stroke is inter-republic migration, which in recent years has seriously disturbed the public. This is not a new phenomenon. It helps acceleration of scientific-technical progress, and also helps resolve cadre problems. The specialists who have moved to the republic have done a considerable amount for the development of the national economy of Soviet Latvia. One need not go far for examples: who in the republic does not know Nikolay Nikitovich Golodov, director of the Sarkanays Metalurgs Plant in Liepaya; or Aleksandr Nikitovich Karev, director of the Chain Drive Plant in Daugavpils, both members of our Central Committee? They and dozens, hundreds of other workers have deservedly won the respect of the Latvian people through their honest labor.

"But it is also indisputable that the size of the migration in recent years has greatly exceeded the bounds of reason and must be reduced. During the years of extensive industrial development we were practically unable to get along without imported manpower, since the republic had practically exhausted its own labor resources. But

now, when a firm course has been taken toward intensification of production and for developing high-technology branches, we can no longer indulge those managers who are in the habit of achieving growth in production volume by virtue of increasing the number of workers.

“The Ministry of Light Industry especially must become seriously involved with reducing the influx of manpower from other regions. Its initiative in setting up branch-enterprises in regions with a surplus of manpower deserves our approval. Such branch-enterprises are already in operation in Murmansk Oblast and in Moldavia. Their experience deserves careful study and dissemination to other major enterprises in the republic. Also deserving of interest is the re-profiling of a number of resource-intensive enterprises, which is based on the new concept of economic and social development to the year 2005.

“The local organs of Soviet rule must cut off in the strictest manner attempts by departments to increase the number of offices and enterprises in the cities. At the same time economic levers should be used more fully. It would seem appropriate to increase the payment enterprises must make to the local budget for developing the social sphere, for the specialists and their families which they bring in. It would be expedient to establish such payments not only in Riga, but in other cities of the republic as well. The local authorities and the Ministry of Internal Affairs must strictly adhere to procedure when registering arriving citizens.

“There is yet another effective means for reducing the unjustified influx of manpower from other regions: this is, searching for labor resources in the republic itself and assigning them to the working collectives. By taking such a path, we will not only reduce the migration, but—which is even more important—we will increase the ranks of the indigenous populace who are members of the working class. It is precisely on such proletarian internationalism that we must depend most of all in perfecting our national policy as well.

“We cannot but take note of the fact that city-dwellers are in no hurry to occupy a number of vacant jobs. Of course it is not easy to stand at a loom, wash dishes or chop cutlets. Buy after all, someone must do this work as well. It is true that such an attitude toward difficult and unprestigious work exists not only in Riga but in other major cities of the country as well, where they are forced to turn to the so-called limitchiks for help. Appeals alone are not enough to solve this problem. We must accelerate fulfillment of tasks of the republic Comprehensive Program for Reduction of Manual Labor and Improvement of Work-places. The republic goskomtrud must not only increase its supervision over the course of carrying out the aforementioned program, but must also work out

more effective measures for increasing the material interest of the people in working at hard and unprestigious jobs. Every working collective must devote some thought to this.

Internationalists are Not Born, They are Made

“Further development of Latvian-Russian bilingualism will require much greater effort. It is good that we have managed to achieve a certain turning point in the people's thinking and have aroused their interest in better knowledge of the Latvian and Russian languages. But that is not enough. We must strive for bilingualism to become firmly rooted in our lives, our everyday life and in the practical work of every organization and institution. But this must be done tactfully and delicately. Can one really, for example, hold a person to blame for not knowing the Latvian language if it was poorly taught when he went to school, and there was no opportunity for deeper study later?

“One must not forget that quite recently the Latvian language training system was intended more for enthusiasts than for the broad masses. One could have wished for better-quality instruction too. And even today there are not enough instructors, textbooks, or study groups. Nor is the Ministry of Consumer Services in any hurry to expand the system of paid courses. Why have they not recruited instructor cadres from VUZ's and scientific institutions for their organizations?

“These problems must be resolved more quickly, and every opportunity created for study of these languages. It is especially important to speed-up introduction of Latvian-Russian bilingualism in those spheres in which the workers constantly come into contact with the populace. For workers in these branches, knowledge of both languages is one of the most important elements of their professional mastery. Therefore it is entirely proper to take this into consideration during attestation, and to provide moral and material support to those who have best mastered the languages. I believe it would be appropriate for us today to charge the administrators of the ministries of trade, consumer, services, municipal services, health care, interior affairs, social services, communications, and Latvian Union of Consumer Cooperatives: Comrades R.G. Salputr, Ya.D. Tumovs-Bekins, V.G. Markot, V.V. Kanep, B.Ya. Shteynbrik, G.E. Luss, O.K. Stungrevits, and I.Ya. Strautinsh, to take the necessary measures for bilingualism to become firmly rooted in the practical work of these branches.

“While improving instruction in the Latvian language, we must at the same time not devote less attention to study of the Russian language. Its importance for international intercourse and for assimilating the culture of the fraternal nations of our country must be explained even better.

"We must place our stake on language study on the kindergartens and the schools. It is precisely here that the foundations must be laid for bilingualism and the culture of international intercourse. We must take a serious interest in developing a system of two-track schools in which classes are conducted simultaneously in the Latvian and Russian languages. In the early 1980's the process of establishing them slowed down somewhat, for a number of officials at the Ministry of Education believed that they more often give rise to conflict situations. But after all, where if not in such schools can a culture of international intercourse be formed from one's early years? And it is not simply the special lessons, but the entire way of life in the school that counts.

"It goes without saying that working in such schools is more complicated than in a monolingual school; on the other hand, with proper organization of the academic and educational processes, the returns are much greater. Graduates of two-track schools assimilate languages better and blend much better into multinational collectives. These very significant factors must necessarily be taken into consideration in the course of implementing school reform, and when organizing schools preference should be given not to the linguistic but the territorial principle.

"The initiative of the teachers at Schools No 55, 72 and 75 in Riga deserves our approval and support. They have begun to set up Latvian-language study groups at base enterprises for the parents of their students. Such experience should be emulated by other schools as well, at an opportune time.

"Today it is very important for families, schools and the Komsomol to combine their efforts in perfecting the international upbringing of the young people. The fundamentals of internationalism and the culture of international intercourse must be formed in early childhood. If from his early years a child is taught to live his people, and be proud of them; but give no less respect to other nations, then he will hardly 'succumb' to national chauvinism. Thus, both the family and the school must create a spirit of internationalism, and must ward off while there is time the unhealthy influence of people infected with the bacilli of nationalism. Internationalist convictions and a culture of international intercourse must be formed not only at friendship festivals, but also in every lesson and lecture, in the labor and leisure detachments of the upperclassmen and students, and in the youth brigades.

"Service in the ranks of the Soviet Army was and still is a serious test of civic maturity. Everything must be done to ensure that the young men entering the Army from Latvia are morally and physically prepared to carry on the tradition of the Latvian Red Riflemen. And our boys demonstrated just such readiness while carrying out their international duty in Afghanistan.

"The Komsomol must set the tone for this training. It must bring the young people together in concrete matters, and develop in them feelings of comradeship, friendship, and collectivism; the Komsomol must be the leader of the youth movement, involve the young people more broadly in the processes of democratization, and be more active in defending their interests.

"The negative events of the past year remind us all that we must study Lenin's national policy much better. As it turned out, a number of the ideological workers confused the terminology, and have difficulty in distinguishing the national from the nationalistic. Scientific research on the urgent problems of international relations is clearly inadequate. Books on this subject are published in miserly numbers: for example, only 500 copies of the handbook, 'Social Processes and National Relations in Soviet Latvia,' were published by 'Zinatne.' Shortcomings in lecture work are making themselves known too. And incompetence and political illiteracy produce timid actions and helplessness in polemics. These shortcomings must be eliminated as soon as possible.

"Study of national policy and the problems of international relations must be improved not only in the system of party and Komsomol training, but also at the higher educational institutions and in creative collectives and societies. And the people must not be taught passively, but through discussions, disputes, clashes of opinion, and through the study of specific problems and conflicts.

"In order to better solve this problem, the instructors, propagandists, lecturers and agitators themselves must be better trained. Seminars must be held for them more frequently, and scholars should be more widely engaged in analysis of the problems. An International Relations Section is being set up at the Party History Institute at the Latvian CP Central Committee. But no one is trying to deal with all the questions. More active participation of our Academy of Science is required as well.

"The republic's scientific potential is sufficiently great. We have a right to expect from the social-science specialists scientifically-grounded concepts for resolving the more complex problems of the republic's social development. The Academy of Sciences should give some thought to setting up special working groups for in-depth study of the urgent problems of international relations. It would probably be expedient to hold, this year, a republic scientific-practical conference on the urgent tasks of international and patriotic education of the working people.

The Communists Will Set the Example

"It is time to strengthen with deeds the prestige in the party organizations of the National Relations Section of the Latvian CP Central Committee. Gorkoms and raykoms have a right to expect clear-cut recommendations from it on national questions. Scholars in the republic must be more actively recruited for working out these

questions. At the very same time party gorkoms and raykoms must themselves show greater initiative and be more persistent in trying to resolve the problems which have piled up. A number of them have already held plenums, at which tasks for improving international and patriotic upbringing have been thoroughly analyzed. Other committees have yet to do this.

"Party committees should properly give central attention to improving ideological work and to improving the selection, posting and education of ideological cadres. In recent times we have done quite a bit to renovate them and bring in the younger generation; and we have filled the ideological departments of party committees and organizations with capable workers. Now it is necessary to seriously set about raising their skills. We cannot be satisfied with the fact that more than half the secretaries on ideology and the chiefs of the propaganda and agitation departments at the party gorkoms and raykoms do not have higher party education.

"International education must spread to all national groups of the republic's populace. True, at the same time one must always take into consideration the peculiarities of this or that nation, as Lenin demanded. He wrote, that "Nothing slows down the development and the strength of proletarian class solidarity as much as national injustice and nothing is so futile as the acute sensibilities of 'offended' nationals, both with respect to feelings of equality and violation of that equality—even though it was through carelessness; even though it is in the form of a joke—by their proletarian comrades. And that is why in the given situation it is better to go too far in the direction of flexibility..."

"The principal supervisors bear special responsibility for the state of the moral-political atmosphere in multinational collectives. They set the tone, they show the example and they must be capable of uniting and melding people together into a unified whole, irregardless of their nationality. And we have such supervisors. Among them we can boldly list: G.B. Urvantsev, director of the Avtoelektropribor Plant; Kh.A. Chibulis, director of the bakery products combine in Rezekne; R.Ya. Vitolinsh, director of the Elgavselmash Plant; A.V. Prokopenko, director of the Rigas Apperbs Association; D.Ya. Litsis, of SPTU-59; K.E. Vilson, chairman of the Silayne Kolkhoz; D.A. Mandzhgaladze, chief physician at the Ludza Regional Hospital, and others. And it is no accident that within the collectives which they supervise not only are things going well, but the spirit of comradeship is strengthened as well.

"But there are also the kind of supervisors who consider their own ignorance as to which nationality they are subordinate to, superior to internationalism. And they must know, both in order to set up their favorites, and in order to take national peculiarities into account in educational work, so that they do not inadvertently offend a person with a careless phrase. Such supervisors do not understand the principles of Lenin's national policy;

they underestimate the role of the human factor; and they devote little attention to educating the people. Thus one must determine whether or not they are worthy of being supervisors in contemporary conditions. Very likely, during attestation and updating the performance appraisal of supervisors of any rank, or any organ or collective, we must continue to make a principled evaluation, whether or not they possess the required political qualities; and whether they are capable of providing genuine international education to their subordinates.

A Great Deal Depends on a Person's Culture

"One cannot but agree with the fact that a lack of spiritual qualities lies at the root of many of our misfortunes. Interesting discussions on this are being held in creative societies, among the republic's artistic intelligentsiya. Many communists spoke of this as well in the course of discussing the letters to the Central Committee. And in fact, life in a contemporary, progressive society is unthinkable without continuous popular appeal to the genuinely spiritual values which are preserved in literature and art.

"The Central Committee Buro shares the profound interest of our creative intelligentsiya in developing the national culture, and in creating, preserving and increasing its wealth. And this is why we all badly need an overall conception of the further development of culture in our republic. The creative societies can and must make their own valuable contribution to this development.

"We place a high value on the participation of the creative intelligentsiya in the resolution of many of the acute problems in the socio-cultural sphere, and for their desire to be in the thick of perestroika—which was convincingly demonstrated in the open letter from the creative workers to the citizens of our republic. There is no doubt of the fact that the creative intelligentsiya sincerely supports the party line, and stands up for more vigorous development of the Latvian national culture and for raising the prestige of our republic. And that is how we perceive the initiatives of Imant Ziedonis, Yanis Peters, Dzhemma Skulme, Viya Artmane, Raymond Pauls, Vladlen Dozortsev, Arkadiy Kats, Marina Kostenetskaya and many other creative workers. It is due to their efforts that language festivals, Art Days, as well as the Russian song festival put on by the young people in Yurmala are becoming a tradition; and it is due to their efforts that a great deal of work is being done to preserve monuments of culture, and to correct the ecological situation in the Daugava Basin. Girt Yakovlev, a member of the Riga Gorkom Buro, and music scholar Arvid Bomiks, a buro member of the Kirovskiy Raykom, are carrying out their charge from the party very responsibly.

"Further development of the national culture requires the concrete and immediate material support of talent, of creative societies, and film-production matters on the part of the republic government. In consideration of the

situation which has evolved, the Latvian CP Central Committee Buro has commissioned the republic Gosplan, together with the creative societies and the Ministry of Culture to draw up a program for the development of the material-technical base of culture to the year 2000.

The People Need Glasnost

"Our mass information media have done a great deal to emancipate our minds and arouse interest in all aspects of perestrojka; they have also done a great deal to propagate the ideas of internationalism, raise the culture of international intercourse, and aid the struggle with our shortcomings. Materials on problems of history, national policy, and international education, prepared by the newspapers TSINYA and SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, the magazines KOMMUNIST SOVETSKOY LATVII, and by the Latvian Information Agency, have undoubtedly been useful. Articles in the mass information media in support of enterprising and questing people, and articles criticizing the opponents of perestrojka, deserve our approval. The Latvian CP Central Committee will continue to support criticism which is sharp, impartial and constructive; and will encourage in every way the expansion of glasnost.

"However, it must be acknowledged that a number of newspapers and magazines, as well as radio and TV programs, still contain quite a few shallow and not-well-thought-out materials. For example, at times articles and reports on the pages of the newspapers PADOMYU YAUNATNE, LITERATURA UN MAKSLA, and SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, as well as the magazine AVOTS, lack calmly reasoned argument, well-considered analysis, and constructiveness! Certain TV programs are guilty of peremptoryness and lack of tact. Quite often the desire to consider oneself the spokesman for truth in the final instance creeps into them.

"Quite a bit of misunderstanding and, at times, conflict situations arise because of the fact that the people still do not have sufficient knowledge of what the party and Soviet organs, the republic Council of Ministers and the ministries are doing to resolve the problems which have accumulated; they have a poor impression of how they are changing their style of work, and how they take into consideration the suggestions of the workers. That means that even more glasnost is required. At the 27th CPSU Congress it was stressed, that 'This is a political question. Without glasnost there is not and there cannot be any democracy, nor political creativity by the masses, nor any participation in government.' The people must understand life in all its contradictions and complexities. No matter how many successes there are, whatever is holding up development or hinders it must be swept aside. The workers must have complete, reliable and timely information on all the questions of interest to them.

"The resolution on the expansion of glasnost which was adopted by our Central Committee in early 1986 has played its role. There has been more glasnost in the selection and posting of cadres; there is growing active-ness in the working collectives in discussion of the plans for socio-economic development; and the preparation of reliable information on critical questions has become more energetic. But this is not enough; we must go farther. A clear-cut bilateral system of glasnost must be created, one which ensures more rapid handling of information both from the bottom up, as well as from the top down. The people must know everything and must have an opportunity to openly pass judgment on every-thing.

"But we cannot allow to pass unnoticed the stupid rumors and fabrications which are frequently flung around by those who do not wish us well; that go beyond all proportion and stir up the public. We must react to them more rapidly and remove the tension wherever it springs up. Should we work in such a manner, there would not be any unnecessary queues for sugar, flour or groats, for example—such as those which took place recently in Riga.

"The nature of the interaction of trade-union, Komsomol and other social organizations with the spontaneous formations requires serious re-evaluation. We must see them as helpers and not competitors, and do everything possible to strengthen interaction with them. But we must not strengthen these ties in the way that, for example, L.Ya. Berzon, chairman of the Latvian Society for the Preservation of Nature and Monuments did. For a long time he did not even try to find a common language with the environmental protection club, and it was only after the intercession of the Riga Party Gorkom that he even took notice of its existence.

"The party organs have never been and will not be opposed to the creation of associations on the basis of interests. But only when these interests are healthy, and their realization is for the good of socialism. An altogether different approach must be made to those groups who are attempting to take advantage of glasnost, democratization, and their status as informal associations, for their own selfish goals.

"Among the latter, for example, is the so-called Helsinki-86 group. It is in essence a parasite on the ideals of perestrojka; it takes them for its own; it plays on the national feelings of the people; it provokes a negative attitude toward changes; and it incites nationalistic and chauvinistic moods. It has made too much noise, and has not done a single good thing for the good of the people. Such actions are incompatible with perestrojka. And we must decisively rebuff the extremists and demagogues, taking advantage of both public opinion and the force of the law. And the law, as is well-known, has severe penalties for inciting international dissension.

"It was not the self-styled 'advisors of the people' who began and are leading perestroika, but the party. It was not the habitual complainers but the party, Soviet and economic organs, and the workers who are trying to solve the problems which have accumulated. Communists and every patriot, thinking of this, must struggle not only against extreme forms of display of nationalism, but also against any attempts to damage international relationships.

"Under contemporary conditions, wherein the politization of clerical propaganda is observed, new approaches must be sought out for atheist education as well. This work must not be curtailed, nor must we lull ourselves with reducing the number of church services. Here, I believe, what is most needed is the ability to carry on individual educational work.

"Ordinarily, when we speak of international relations, we have in mind relations between Latvians and Russians, who make up the overwhelming majority of the population of the republic. We must take a broader look at this question. And we must consider more fully and satisfy the needs of all the national groups which dwell in the republic.

"One would think that the cultural institutions, the publishing houses and the mass information media should take a more well-considered approach to the interests of the Latvians of Latgaliya in the preservation of their ethnographic traditions and their cultural heritage, and take it into consideration in their work.

"We must carefully study the proposals on the possibility of setting up classes for organizing the study of the Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Belorussian, Polish, and other languages; and take counsel with the interested groups of the public in various regions of the republic on this question. It makes sense to organize departments in regional libraries for the languages of all the nations which live in this or that region.

"The Ministry of Culture and trade-union organs should become more actively involved in establishing choirs, dance and folklore ensembles from those who love creative folk activities, from among all the nationalities widely represented in the republic. Representatives of the Latvian creative intelligentsiya must become more active in developing an interest among all citizens of the republic in the culture, traditions and customs of the Latvian people. Publishing the newspaper LITERATURA UN MAKSLA in the Russian language would be of great assistance to this work. Through our common efforts we must do everything to ensure that the non-Latvian population has more opportunity to become familiar with both the Latvian, and its own national culture.

09006

Internationalism Subject of Debate at Kazakh Obkom Plenums

Tselinograd Oblast

18300241a Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 3 Apr 88 p 2

[Article by O. Yerimbayev, A. Rotmistrovskiy, KazTAG, under rubric "Educating Culture in Relations Among Nationalities": "Reinforcing Brotherhood By Deeds: From the Plenum of the Party's Tselinograd Obkom"]

[Excerpts] The plenum participants sharply criticized individual managerial workers for having ignored distortions and omissions. The results of the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee resolution that is being discussed are as yet insignificant. This is attested to by a study of the affairs in the outlying areas, by meetings and discussions with the workers, their letters and statements, as well as the result of questionnaire survey that was carried out in a number of collectives at enterprises and educational institutions. All the inhabitants of the oblast are not yet confirmed internationalists. Some of the students, certain workers, kolkhoz members, and even specialists lack firm knowledge about the principles of the Leninist national policy of the CPSU. Every fourth student surveyed said that he still encounters instances of estrangement and a disdainful attitude toward other nationalities.

There have been obvious signs of weakness in propaganda and explanatory work. More than 40 percent of the workers have absolutely no knowledge about the economic ties that their enterprise has with collectives in other republics. Almost half the workers, during the course of the year, have not heard a single lecture on the national question and have not studied that question in the political and economic training system.

Until recently the number of measures to provide international education was used as the chief indicator of the effectiveness of that work. They were strung together, one after the other, but there was an obvious insufficiency of the ability to penetrate deeply into the content of the problems and the ability to interpret from party positions the processes that are occurring and comprehend them in all their completeness and momentum. Not infrequently it was impossible to discern behind all of this a real live person, and the criteria for evaluating both the achievements and the miscalculations were eroded.

The plenum participants cited instances of the formal organization of the study of the Kazakh and Russian languages and the republic's revolutionary past. The proper attention was not paid to social, cultural, and everyday questions. Educational work was carried out in an unsystematic, ad hoc manner with citizens of German nationality, of whom there are more than 100,000 in the

oblast. Some of them continue to harbor emigre moods, particularly in Astrakhanskiy, Atbasarskiy, Makinskiy, and Shortandinskiy rayons, and in Tselinograd.

The CPSU Central Committee resolution aims the party organizations toward an active, aggressive fight against nationalistic moods, feudal-landlord manifestations, tribal and family traditions, and religious prejudices. Nor can one fail to see the link between religious and nationalistic survivals: they feed one another. Forty-five inhabited places have various associations of believers in operation, and some of them are extremist in outlook. However, certain party organizations and ideological cadres have reconciled themselves to the situation that has been created and do not carry out any purposeful individual atheistic work.

Are we really not to be indignant when, around the oblast center and certain other cities and settlements, pompous structures are erected over graves, and the participants in and organizers of funerals are given lavish gifts with the silent consent of the local authorities?

Plenum participants also cited other situations: certain persons have been subjected to the illusion that, by observing religious prescriptions, they are displaying faithfulness to national traditions. Some of the Makinsk schoolchildren who were surveyed—Russians, Ukrainians, and Germans—answered that they celebrate Easter as a national holiday; Kazakh students at one of the occupational-technical schools participate in kur-ban-ayte. Dozens of inhabitants of the indigenous nationality in Kurgaldzhinskiy, Yermentauskiy, and Tselinogradskiy rayons do not fail to devote their attention to religious rites. They include members of the Communist Party and the Komsomol. There have been instances when a Communist, upon retiring, has gone to a mosque and even become a mullah. The situation is unfavorable with regard to the rituals involved in burying the dead. In many inhabited places the cemeteries are in a neglected state, and are subdivided on the basis of national or tribal attributes.

At times the ispolkoms of the local soviets and the trade-union agencies reconcile themselves to vulgarity, tastelessness, and ideologically harmful traditions, and fail to substitute Soviet ceremonies for them. In the cities of Tselinograd, Atbasar, and Makinsk last year, the solemn registration of newly born infants was carried out even less frequently than their christening.

It was also pointed out that the activities of the cultural institutions do not completely conform to the needs of the time. There has been a slow process of renewing the forms and methods of using people's free time, and of enriching the workers' spiritual culture, especially among the young people. Little attention is being paid to expanding the contacts among the national groups, and their reciprocal influence. Little is being done to use the potential of the creative intellectuals. The soviets of people's deputies and the trade-union agencies have not

been taking the proper steps to develop and reinforce the sociocultural sphere, and this has been leading to an exodus of the population from the oblast. Something else that requires further intensification is the fight to assure a sober way of life, the fight against nonlabor income, money-grubbing, and parasitism.

The plenum adopted a resolution which stipulated the necessary steps to increase the effectiveness of the education of the workers in the spirit of internationalism and patriotism, and the fraternal friendship of peoples. The Communists and workers of the oblast have been aimed at the more energetic participation in the second stage of perestroyka. Specific steps have been defined to provide its ideological support and to implement other important tasks posed by the February 1988 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the speech that was given there by Comrade M. S. Gorbachev, to ensure the worthy meeting of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

East-Kazakhstan Oblast

18300241b Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 5 Apr 88 p 2

[Article by SOTSIALISTIK KAZAKHSTAN correspondent M. Abugaliyev and KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent A. Akava, Ust-Kamenogorsk, under rubric "Educating Culture in Relations Among Nationalities": "Still a Lot of Problems: From the Plenum of the Party's East-Kazakhstan Obkom"]

[Excerpts] Speaking at the plenum, Obkom First Secretary A. V. Milkin mentioned the positive shifts, but at the same time also admitted that an effective system for the international and patriotic education of the workers has not yet been created in the oblast. Thus there are a large number of omissions and areas of incomplete work, and the old approaches have not yet been eliminated. For example, the people in the party organizations of Ust-Kamenogorsk and of Shemonaikhinskiy, Markakolskiy, Ulanskiy, and Bolshenarymskiy rayons do not yet see in complete volume the problems pertaining to matters of relations among the nationalities, and in a few places the people have not yet rid themselves of complacency.

Something that was surprising in this regard was the statement made at the plenum by G. M. Glukhodedova, chairman of the Ulanskiy Rayon Ispolkom. She stated that there are no problems in the international and patriotic education of the workers in that rayon. True, she subsequently reduced that cheerful tone somewhat, but the impression that remained was that everything is proceeding well in the rayon, and there was plenty of experience that could be borrowed from it. It becomes obvious why the people at certain party organizations in Ulanskiy Rayon have taken a casual approach to the discussion of the resolution adopted by the CPSU Central Committee. Otherwise how can one explain that the resolutions adopted by the meetings of Communists at the Komsomolskaya and Ust-Kamenogorskaya poultry

plants and the Nikitinskiy and Karauzekskiy sovkhoses abound in general phrases, appeals to "intensify" and to "increase," but do not state concretely what has to be done.

And in few places, for example, in the party organization of the Kolkhoz imeni Amangeldy, Samarskiy Rayon, the situation has reached the point of absurdity. There the party committee prepared measures for implementing to the CPSU Central Committee's resolution pertaining to the Kazakh republic party organization by—would you believe?—copying off verbatim the raykom measures with all the instructions addressed to the rayon organizations.

The responsibility for international, patriotic education rests primarily on the party committee secretaries and the managers of the labor collectives. Unfortunately, all the party and economic workers have not yet perceived this properly. It is no accident that at the plenum one could hear sharp criticism directed at V. M. Bobrikov, party committee secretary at Vostokmashzavod; Yu. F. Slabkov, party committee secretary at Vostokoblagropromstroy; Yu. M. Knizhentsev, party committee secretary at Khimstroy Trust; I. V. Bratash, general director of the Association of the Meat Industry; V. A. Belosulstev, director of the instruments plant; and certain others.

A placid attitude toward the problems of international education is inadmissible today. Especially since, whichever labor collective you take, that collective includes representatives of many nationalities in our country. It is through their efforts and with the broad support of the workers from the other fraternal republic that Ore Altay has become a land of heavy industry today. Its economic ties have been expanding constantly. But during previous years the underestimation of the human factor and the social needs of the population began to exert a detrimental effect upon labor productivity and people's creative participation. Today, therefore, not all the difficulties have been overcome. It has not been possible, plenum participants stated, to reject completely the extensive development of the economy. In industry, one observes a reduction in the return on investments. Many labor collectives have not been fulfilling their pledges for contractual shipments.

The party committees at a number of enterprises and organizations make little use of the opportunity for a socialist competition with the workers in other oblasts and republics. Labor rivalry, as a rule, is limited only to production ties, and this narrows its scope. What education of a sense of comradeship in the collective, plenum participants emphasized, can one expect at the Ust-Kamenogorsk Instruments Plant if that collective disrupted shipments to the Konditsioner Plant that is located in the city of Domodedovo, and to the Moscow Precision Measuring Instruments Plant?

Another thing that requires more careful attention is the resolution of social questions. Their underestimation has had a detrimental effect upon the creation of stable collectives. One can observe an exodus of the population from the rayons that are more backward in social development.

One is also alarmed at the fact that the number of workers of the indigenous nationality constitute a small percentage. At the same time, as the CPSU Central Committee resolution emphasizes, the working class is the basic carrier and conductor of the ideas of internationalism. The omissions in the development of a national detachment of the working class must be eliminated, but the people in the oblast have not yet been seriously imbued with this concern. In particular, the vocational-guidance work in the secondary schools requires considerable improvement.

The strictest following of Leninist principles of the national policy, plenum participants emphasized, largely determines the climate for relations among the nationalities. At the present time a process of balancing the structure of party organizations with regard to national makeup is under way in the oblast. However, the situation is by no means completely satisfactory here. At the Serebryansk Gorkom, and the party's Oktyabrskiy, Ulbinskiy, Bolshenarymskiy, Katon-Karagayskiy, Zaykanskiy, and Kurchumskiy raykoms, work to accept persons into the CPSU is carried out without a consideration of the national makeup of the population.

One also encounters situations when a manager attempts to "staff" the people who are most closely associated with him by bringing in persons of his own nationality. That is what was done, for example, by V. Zh. Abylgazin, former chief of the oblast Vtorchermet Administration. The same situation developed at the branch of the Institute of Regional Pathology.

Today it is also important to study the influence of religion upon national awareness. Because in a few places religion continues to retain its positions. As has been indicated by sociological research conducted in the oblast, this is explained by the fact that the attitude taken toward religious vestiges is frequently the attitude of continuing national traditions and customs. Consequently, it is necessary to introduce on a broader scale the new traditions and customs that correspond to Soviet morality and the norms of socialistic interrelationships among people, and that promote the reinforcement of friendship and the development of the mutual understanding among representatives of various nationalities.

The basis of the culture of relations among nationalities is formed in the family, develops in the kindergarten and school, and is reinforced at the institution of higher learning or the technicum, technical school, the army, on the job, and in everyday life. Unfortunately, this "chain" does not always work. In February 1987 the party buro

and the rector's office at the Ust-Kamenogorsk Pedagogical Institute were subjected to serious criticism at a plenum for shortcoming in the international education of the student body. However, the situation has changed very little there.

Another problem that requires more careful attention is the problem of bilingualism. But many party workers and economic managers have an insufficient understanding of the importance of this question. The study of the Kazakh language is poorly organized, and there is a shortage of instructors and textbooks for the courses. Much is said about preparing graphic aids for agitation work in both languages, but the situation has not gone farther than just words.

The plenum also raised the questions of increasing the rate of participation of the soviets of people's deputies, the trade unions, and the Komsomol in international and patriotic education.

By critically interpreting what had been done and pointing out the shortcomings in the international and patriotic education of the workers in the oblast, the plenum participants indicated the ways to eliminate them.

Mangyshlak Oblast

*18300241c Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 5 Apr 88 p 2*

[Article by M. Buldekbayev and G. Groyser, KazTAG, Shevchenko: "Engaging Thoroughly: From the Plenum of the Party's Mangyshlak Obkom"]

[Excerpts] The large-scale territorial-production complex on the eastern shore of the Caspian was created with the participation of all the union republics and many of the autonomous ones. For thousands of people of 95 nationalities, Mangyshlak became their second homeland. The Shevchenko Plastics Plant ships polymers to more than 700 addresses, and the collectives at the Kazakh Gas Refinery and the Mangyshlakrakushechnik Production Association have hundreds of populated places and enterprises among their business ties. The petroleum workers on the peninsula compete with the people in Tyumen, the chemical workers compete with their counterparts in Novopolotsk, and the fishermen compete with their Turkmen friends. But many enterprises have not yet achieved the proper steadiness in the shipments of their output or its high quality.

It was mentioned at the plenum that the CPSU Central Committee resolution on international and patriotic education was not discussed in a businesslike manner everywhere, and the measures that were developed are vague. At the Caspian Construction Administration, the Sovkhoz imeni Yeraliyev, and the workers supply department in the city of Novyy Uzen, absolutely no meetings were held to discuss this question. The party

committee at the Sovkhoz imeni 60-letiyе SSSR adopted a decision consisting of two paragraphs that do not even mention the international education.

Unfortunately, at the obkom plenum also, certain speakers took the well-trodden path of reporting on their own achievements. After mentioning the number of measures, trips, and concerts and recognizing the shortcomings that had been mentioned about them in the report, D. Aripov, first secretary of the party's Beyneuskiy Rayon Committee, and V. I. Dubovaya, equipment operator at a Shevchenko industrial enterprise, switched over to questions that were not related to the agenda. Certain Communists do not yet complete mastery of all the problems and new approaches to international education, which is an inseparable part of the program proposed at the February 1988 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee for providing ideological support to the perestroika.

More careful and more purposeful work is required in forming international labor collectives. It cannot be considered normal that at the repair and construction administration of the city of Shevchenko, in individual construction-and-installation administrations, and at the Aktau Maritime Port, the number of workers of the indigenous population is extremely small. There have been serious problems in the selection of cadres in Novyy Uzen. At the Mangyshlak Energy Combine there are only a few specialists of the indigenous population engaged in basic production, transportation, and in the municipal and other services.

This situation can be changed by a system of occupational-technical education. But whereas, for the oblast as a whole, Kazakh youth constitutes half the students in the occupational-technical schools, in the city of Shevchenko itself the proper attention has not been devoted to this important question. Neither the oblast administration of occupational-technical education nor the base enterprises have defined the long-term needs for cadres of the indigenous nationality in the complicated occupations or for servicing the new technology.

However, the certification of the managerial cadres at the industrial enterprises in the oblast center has shown that individual officials have insufficient mastery of the theory and practice of the Leninist national policy, and have not completely grasped the essence of the party's present-day requirements. A questionnaire survey ascertained that five-sixths of them do not subscribe to a single republic newspaper or magazine, and only a minority of the persons surveyed has been studying the Kazakh language.

The necessary conditions for developing national and Russian bilingualism have not yet been created. Clubs where adults can study the Russian and Kazakh languages have been operating ineffectively. There is a shortage of instructors in the secondary schools. The formal approach to the job at hand has not yet been

eliminated. In Yeralityevskiy Rayon the success rate for Russian language constitutes 95-97 percent, and on the sovkhoses in the rayon, the success rate is generally 100 percent. Why is it, then, that with every passing year there has been an increase here, among the inductees, in the number of persons who have a poor knowledge of the language of communication among nationalities? In Beyneuskiy Rayon, the number of such young people has proven to be more than 37 percent.

The schools hold Russian Language Days and Russian Language Weeks, and have created elective courses in that subject. Unfortunately, these measures have not yet yielded the desired result. Schoolchildren have a poor knowledge of the republic's history or the culture and customs of the indigenous population. Kazakh children read very few books in Russian. And yet, under conditions of a rural population of a single nationality, it is especially important to study it and to develop cultural ties between the nationalities and tourism, both within the entire country and international. More than 200 young men and women on the peninsula went abroad last year, but only one of them was an agricultural worker.

In questions of relations among the nationalities there are no minor matters. The ispolkoms of the local soviets, B. Bozzhigitov, first secretary of the party's Fort-Shevchenko Gorkom, said, must take into consideration, when distributing housing, the traditions of life in which several generations live together. When people move later on, they definitely want to move together. Why, then, should difficulties be created for them when they want to exchange housing?

A restructuring of the system of Marxist-Leninist education has begun in the oblast, and the questions of the Leninist national policy are now being studied more thoroughly in that system. People's universities of the friendship of nations have been created in all cities and rayons. But for the time being it has only been proposed to open up 100 schools to teach the course "Vitaly Important Problems in the Development of National Relations and International and Patriotic Education." The shillyshallying in this matter is inadmissible.

It sometimes happens that, when a particular situation concerning relations among nationalities is being discussed, certain people interpret it incorrectly, but the propaganda or agitation specialist who is standing right there cannot give a well-argued objection or defend the party's point of view.

Definite steps are being taken to increase the rate of military-patriotic education. Many veterans of the war and of labor regularly meet with young people and conduct "Peace Lessons" and "Bravery Lessons." The internationalist fighting men who served in Afghanistan have also been included in this work. However, we have so far only heard discussions of creating in Shevchenko a

military-sports club house for young people of preinduction age. The general-educational and occupational-technical schools have a weak training-materials base for providing initial military training.

Thus there are no grounds for complacency, speakers at the plenum emphasized. It is necessary to take more rapid steps to correct the miscalculations, to achieve a sharp improvement in the international and patriotic education of the workers, and to engage in the study of this question more deeply and more thoroughly. The decisions of the February 1988 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee require of the party organizations in the oblast that they work vigorously at the second stage of the *perestroika* and direct their efforts toward the attainment of real changes in all sectors of economic and cultural construction and toward the worthy meeting of the forthcoming forum of our country's Communists.

Alma-Ata Oblast

18300241d Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 22 Apr 88 p 2

[Article by Ye. Shaymerdenov, SOTSIALISTIK KAZAKHSTAN correspondent, and V. Golovanov, KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent: "Reinforcing Friendship By Deeds: From the Plenum of the Party's Alma-Ata Obkom"]

[Excerpts] Commissions to deal with national and international relations, and groups to study public opinion, have been created in the party's gorkoms and raykoms and at major organizations, and are now in operation. It has become a broad practice to conduct the sociopolitical certification of the cadres and to have the managerial cadres give reports at meetings where their performance appraisals are approved. Moreover, in the course of the certification and the reports given by managers at all levels, consideration is taken of their specific participation in the international and patriotic education of the workers.

The Marxist-Leninist education of the cadres has been improving. They have been raising their political-ideological level in the oblast's school for the ideological aktiv, and in the theoretical seminar for the first managers of enterprises and organizations. The oblast has 27 universities of the friendship of nations and 58 lecture series in operation. There has been an intensification of the attention paid to questions of national-Russian bilingualism. Clubs for the study of the Kazakh, Russian, German, and Kurdish languages have been created. In most of the schools and preschool institutions, the conditions have been created for teaching children in their native language.

In general, definite political shifts can be seen. But at the same time the level of international and patriotic education is still insufficiently high. In the fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee resolution, one has seen the manifestation of inadmissible foot-dragging, and the

measures being carried out have not been yielding the necessary effect. One still observes individual instances of chauvinistic and nationalistic attacks, distortions and warpings in relations among nationalities, and speculation on national feelings and tribal traditions, all of which continue in several places to lead to protectionism and other shameful phenomena.

The obkom buro listened to a report from the party's Kalininskiy Raykom concerning the rate of fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee resolution. And what transpired? The raykom has not planned a specific program of actions. What kind of effective international and patriotic education can one expect if, in many party organizations, the CPSU Central Committee resolution was not even discussed? The moral-psychological climate continues to be unfavorable at a number of scientific-research and design institutes—the institutes of physiology, regional pathology, hydrometeorology, Stroyproyekt, and certain others. The party organization at Kazakh State University imeni S. M. Kirov has failed to carry out the necessary vigorous measures to create a healthy atmosphere among the instructors and students. The level of culture in communication among the nationalities continues to be low there, protectionism and crude violations of the procedures for admitting students have not been eliminated, the number of violations of the law has not been decreasing, and teaching discipline has been improving slowly.

Plenum participants also cited other instances of a formal attitude toward the international and patriotic education of workers on the part of the party committees and the primary organizations. Individual party activists do not understand the complete importance of relations among nationalities. And, as everyone knows, complacency and pride in questions of international education invariably lead to problems.

Among some of the participants in the discussion one could discern attempts to make self-serving statements and to smooth over the seriousness of the existing problems. Persons whose statements lacked a self-critical evaluation of the state of affairs included M. Chormanov, second secretary of the party's Alma-Ata Gorkom; B. Ospanov, first secretary of the party's Narynkolskiy Raykom; G. Sizonov, chairman of the Dzhambulskiy Rayon Ispolkom;... For example, R. Buranbayev, partkom secretary at the Alma-Ata Cotton Fabrics Combine, painted in rosy hues the work of international and patriotic education in the collective. But how can one reconcile that favorable picture with the fact that at that very large enterprise only a few dozen people are studying the Kazakh language?

A sharp discussion ensued at the plenum concerning the formation of a national detachment of the working class. Incidentally, this problem was raised many times previously. But the situation, especially in the leading branches, has remained practically unchanged. Moreover, it is difficult to hope for any noticeable positive

shifts: not a single party committee has a program for forming national cadres of the working class, or a precise system for training them. It is no accident that there has been a decrease in the number of young Kazakh men and women studying occupational and technical subjects. Today the young men and women of the indigenous nationality constitute 47 percent of the total contingent.

In the CPSU Central Committee resolution on international and patriotic education it has been noted that the fight against feudal-landlord survivals and patriarchal-tribal customs has been essentially discontinued in the republic. These omissions are also typical of Alma-Ata Oblast. In Kaskelenskiy, Kegenskiy, Enbekshikazakhskiy, and certain other rayons the party organizations have not achieved the proper aggressiveness or the proper rate of results in antireligious propaganda. It is no accident that one has observed there the increased activity of the clergymen and the nonmosque mullahs who perform religious rites. Something of major concern is the fact that, in certain religious associations, as many as 20-25 percent are young people.

Plenum participants stated that the obkom of the Kazakhstan Komsomol has not been demonstrating any particular vigor in the international and patriotic education of young men and women. The Komsomol activists, infatuated with increasing the number of measures, have not achieved their high effectiveness. They communicate little with young people, know little about their needs and wants, and fail to pay attention to improving their working, everyday, and recreational conditions. As in the past, the Komsomol and the trade-union agencies pay no attention to the students' and workers' dormitories. A rather large number of shortcomings in political-educational work and in improving everyday living conditions were found in the dormitories of the polytechnical, energy, and pedagogical institutes, the electrical communication technicum, and the Almaatakulbystroy and Almaatazhilstroy trusts.

The plenum participants analyzed the participation of the creative unions, publishing houses, magazines, and mass information media in the international education. In particular, it was noted that in certain published items, the OGNI ALATAU oblast newspaper and VECHERNYAYA ALMA-ATA dealt superficially with questions of ideological work.

A broad group of other problems were also considered. But the statements made by many plenum participants did not have any particular sharpness. The criticism was basically directed "from the top." But the criticism addressed to the buro of the party's obkom, the secretaries, and the department chiefs was shy and muted.

Thinking and acting in accordance with the laws of internationalism—that was the theme of the plenum. The resolution that was adopted reflected the basic trends in the activities of the oblast's party organizations

to increase the effectiveness of the international and patriotic education of the workers and to reinforce the friendship and brotherhood among people of various nationalities.

U. D. Dzhanibekov, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, spoke at the plenum.

Dzhezkazgan Oblast

18300241e Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 26 Apr 88 p 2

[Article by N. Idrisov and A. Sivashchenko, KazTAG, under rubric "Educating Culture in Relations Among Nationalities": "Taking a New Approach to the Job at Hand: From the Plenum of the Party's Dzhezkazgan Obkom"]

[Excerpts] It was noted that the party's Nikolskiy Gorkom does not have a precise system for the class, international, and patriotic education of the population, or for monitoring the rate of fulfillment of measures. The gorkom secretaries, including L. I. Lukyanova, who is responsible for ideological work, show little concern for the specific nature of the actions and undertakings, and at times reconcile themselves to the fact that those actions and undertakings have little to do with real life.

The people at the party's Zhanaarkinskiy Raykom take a simplified approach to relations among nationalities. Its secretaries—M. M. Musin and S. Z. Mukhamedyarova—instead of relying on thorough analysis and well thought-out recommendations, limit themselves to an "arithmetical shakedown" of measures pertaining to cadres and other matters, and do not strive for the broad explanation of the spirit and meaning of the CPSU Central Committee resolution. Speakers at the plenum stated that this style is also typical of the party's Dzhezkazgan Gorkom. In the oblast center the recreational opportunities for young people are poorly organized, the crime rate among minors has not been reduced, and many able-bodied persons are not involved in production. None of these situations are of concern to the commission on national and international relations, headed by L. N. Zakharova, second secretary of the party's gorkom. There is a great distance between conferences and the effectiveness of the work in the outlying areas.

The underestimation of international and patriotic education is felt sharply in most of the primary party organizations. They are not taking any practical steps to increase the number of young workers of the indigenous nationality. In the oblast, where, in the course of the creation of domestic industry one of the advanced detachments of the Kazakh working class grew stronger and more mature, it is currently being provided weakly with new replacements. There has been a particular reduction in the percentage of the national worker cadres

in heavy industry. At the concentration plant in Dzhezkazgan, the oblast motor-vehicles production association, and the Atasu Mining and Concentration Combine, that number does not exceed 10-21 percent.

Plenum participants quoted the statement made by M. Sagimbekov, director of the Akshagylskiy Sovkhoz, Agadyrskiy Rayon: the indigenous population, he said, does not know how to build, and therefore, in order to fulfill the Zhilye-91 program, it will be necessary to wait for moonlighters. Attempts to cite factors that are known to be fabricated in order to replace the search for effective ways to resolve social problems, for the purpose of justifying one's own passivity, are rather frequent. But why is insignificant use being made of the opportunity to increase the construction of housing and of structures for cultural and everyday purposes?

The soviets of people's deputies and the economic agencies have been lax in resolving national questions. The administrators of the Dzhezkazgan and Karazhal gorispolkoms, the oblast agroprom, the oblast trade and bread-products administrations, and the oblast public-health department have not deemed it necessary to engage seriously in problems of reinforcing the friendship among representatives of various nations or of satisfying their cultural and spiritual needs. The reasons for the exodus of certain groups of population from the oblast have not been analyzed, and no effective steps have been taken to improve medical and trade service, especially in the area of the protection of motherhood and childhood and the improvement of the ecological environment.

Party, soviet, and other elected agencies and the members of their apparatus do not always observe the representation of various nations and nationalities. Plenum participants stated that the disproportion in cadre questions must be corrected more persistently and in a more thoughtful manner, without any mechanical "handing out" of the assignments.

It is no less important to observe the requirements of socialist internationalism in regulating the growth of the party cadres. At the Dzhezdinskiy Motor-Truck Enterprise, which employs workers of ten nationalities, out of 24 Communists only one is a representative of the nonindigenous population. It will necessary for the oblast's law-enforcement agencies to get rid of elements who have compromised themselves, and to guarantee the proper representation there of all the nationalities residing in the oblast.

In overcoming nationalistic, tribal, and religious survivals, much depends upon agencies of the press. But the ZHEZKAZGAN TUY and DZHEZKAZGANSKAYA PRAVDA oblast newspapers deal with these topics infrequently and unsystematically. The cultural-enlightenment institutions have not yet become centers of international and moral-ideological education. Because of the weak material base at the libraries, some of the library collections are gathering dust at storage areas.

The plenum participants also mentioned the simplified approach to the analysis of national relations at the social sciences departments of Dzhezkazgan Pedagogical Institute and the branch of Karaganda Polytechnical Institute. The students' everyday living conditions do not meet present-day requirements.

I. Kolbasin, first secretary of the party's Agadyrskiy Raykom, raised important problems in his statement. The administrative agencies of the oblast and the republic, he said, must listen more carefully to the opinion of the local authorities when carrying out their activities. When planning the economic and social development of definite regions, it is necessary to take into consideration the national composition of the population and other peculiarities in order not to make, for example, rash decisions concerning the elimination of small-scale populated points, ignoring people's desires and harming the economy.

Little is being done to introduce bilingualism. The Kazakh language is studied in all Russian schools, but its instruction is far from perfection. The knowledge of Russian among the young schoolchildren of the indigenous nationality is obviously insufficient. Only one-third of the students in the Kazakh schools are progressing well in this subject. At the Aynabulakskiy Sovkhoz, 60 percent of the people are Kazakh, but there is only one Russian school. In the village of Torangylyk, approximately 40 of the children in the kindergarten are of German nationality, but, unfortunately, nothing is being done to teach them their native language.

Plenum participants mentioned specific steps for improving the international and patriotic education, for increasing the oblast's contribution to the country's single national-economic complex, and for assuring the meritorious meeting of the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

A. A. Ustinov, chief of the Department of Propaganda and Agitation, Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, spoke at the plenum.

Kzyl-Orda Oblast

*18300241f Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 29 Apr 88 p 3*

[Article by B. Abdrazakov, SOTSIALISTIK KAZAKHSTAN correspondent, and B. Bektepov, KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent, under rubric "Educating Culture in Relations Among Nationalities": "At the Juncture of Problems: From the Plenum of the Party's Kzyl-Orda Obkom"]

[Excerpts] In recent times, little has been done in the oblast to reinforce or develop Leninist principles of relations among nationalities or to improve the international and patriotic education of people. But, as Ye. N. Aulbekov, secretary of the party's Kzyl-Orda Obkom, admitted in his report, these are only the first steps in the

large and important job that has previously been neglected. Undesirable phenomena had an effect upon the socioeconomic development of the oblast.

Fundamental conclusions have been made from the past miscalculations. The democratic methods of restructuring the work at all levels of the economic and sociopolitical sphere are becoming increasingly obvious signs of the times. This has been largely aided by the glasnost in discussing and resolving the most varied questions. At recent plenums and party meetings, almost 200 critical comments were addressed to secretaries and buro members. Two hundred thirty-seven members of elected agencies were replaced, and 45 secretaries of primary and shop party organizations were re-elected. Last year alone, 44 administrators were removed from the jobs they were occupying because they had failed to cope with their duties or had compromised themselves. Elections on a competitive basis began to be a broad practice.

At the same time, one continues to observe the disproportion in the representation of nations and nationalities in the party, soviet, and other agencies of administration. For example, in the apparatus of the party's Aralskiy, Terenezekskiy, and Yanykuranskiy raykoms, representatives of the indigenous nationality are the only workers. Many administrators, including party workers, have a poor knowledge of Russian.

Many questions of the relations among nationalities became the subject of well-principled discussion at the plenum. Moreover, the plenum participants attempted to analyze the most deeply underlying aspects of the problem. Especially sharp discussion ensued around the principle that was stated in the CPSU Central Committee resolution, to the effect that internationalism not in words, but in deeds, must manifest itself primarily in building up the contribution made by Kazakhstan and all its oblasts to the country's single national-economic complex. In the report from the obkom buro it was admitted that Kzyl-Orda Oblast, for the time being, receives more from the outside than it itself provides. For example, in 1987 nonedible consumer goods with a total value of 8 million rubles were shipped outside the confines of the oblast, but those with a value of 153 million rubles were brought in. The share of industrial output constituted slightly more than one percent of the republic volume; and agricultural output, 2.8 percent.

There is a rather large number of instances attesting to distortions in the formation of multinational collectives. What considerations, for example, guided the management and the party organization at the Kzylordaimash Plant when it formed one shift of workers primarily from among Russians, and another one exclusively from representatives of the indigenous nationality?

The plenum participants frequently heard the following idea: the multinational nature of the labor collective, in and of itself, does not guarantee international communication among people. This can be achieved by painstaking work in international education, work that is

based on the comprehensive resolution of economic, social, and spiritual problems. The plenum participants were convinced of where the disregard for these factors can lead to: an example was provided by the building-materials and structural combine of Glavrissovkhozstroy. It was precisely at the juncture of the production and everyday-social problems there that the differences of opinions began among the workers. In the final analysis, the interrelationships in the collective worsened noticeably, and this immediately had a detrimental effect on the production activity of the enterprise and the moral-psychological atmosphere.

A rather large amount of criticism was addressed to the Komsomol obkom. The problem of increasing the effectiveness of the education of young people has taken on the maximum seriousness today. The facts speak for themselves. From the beginning of the current year alone, more than 300 Komsomol members visited the sobering-up station. The crime rate is high among teenagers. All these situations are the results of omissions in educating the upcoming generation, and the lack of the proper attention to young people's spiritual and cultural needs on the part of the party and Komsomol organizations.

The attempt to carry out a comprehensive analysis of the questions of patriotic and international education enabled to plenum participants to ascertain the entire seriousness of such a problem as the poor knowledge of Russian among a considerable number of young people. This problem is not a new one. Because of the linguistic barrier, many graduates of Kzyl-Orda schools are unable to enter institutions of higher education or military schools. In addition, the ordinary service in the army becomes exceptionally complicated for them. As D. Aysina, chairman of the Terenozekskiy Rayon Ispolkom, remarked in her statement, the chief reason here is the extremely weak occupational training of the teachers, and the lack of a modern methodology for Russian-language instruction in Kazakh schools.

The plenum directed its attention to the fact that many administrative workers who are representatives of other nationalities do not know the Kazakh language. But in all the rayons of the oblast, the correspondence is carried out in Kazakh.

A self-interested exchange of opinions in various areas of the international and patriotic education of the workers ensued at the individual section meetings.

The resolution that was adopted stated specific ways to eliminate the shortcomings in the international and patriotic education of the workers and to intensify the activity of the party organizations, the trade union and the Komsomol, and administrators at all levels in reinforcing the friendship and brotherhood among people of all the nationalities residing in the oblast.

O. V. Vinogradov, chief of the Party-Organizational Work Department, Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, took part in the work of the plenum.

5075

Tajik CP CC Targets Youth in Anti-Religion, Internationalism Programs

18300243 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 12 May 88 p 3

[Unattributed report on meeting of Tajik CP CC: "At the Central Committee of the Tajik CP"]

[Text] The Tajik CP Central Committee has considered the status of implementation of the 1987-1990 Republic Comprehensive Program of Internationalist and Atheistic Education in light of the requirements of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 20th Congress of the Tajik CP. It was noted that some work toward realization of that program is underway in our republic. Central Committee departments and the obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms of the Tajik CP, ministries, departments and ideological institutions have begun to deal more objectively with problems of how to improve our republic's internationalist ties with the other regions of our country and intensify the struggle against manifestations of religion and harmful traditions and rituals. A series of complementary practical measures has been developed and is being carried out for the purpose of resolving problems in interethnic relations among the Central Asian republics, problems that have accumulated and were not resolved in the past. The public's role in affirmation of an internationalist consciousness and socialist rituals has expanded. Festivals are being held in honor of individual streets, the Soviet family and model houses, makhallas and communities. Greater attention is being devoted to ways of improving the material base of the social-cultural and ideological realms. However, party committees and primary party organizations continue to underestimate the increasing significance of internationalist and atheistic education under conditions of ever deeper democratization of all aspects of public life in our republic. In this important respect state organs, trade unions, the Komsomol and other public organizations and creative institutions are restructuring too slowly. They are not only not taking new situations and processes in the ideological situation into account in their practical work, but are also not carrying out fully the tasks set for them in the 1987 Comprehensive Program. Until recently approaches to the development and strengthening of interethnic ties with our fraternal union republics in the economy, science, culture and other fields of endeavor were timid and inconsistent. In 1987 the volume of contractual obligations for industrial goods experienced a shortfall of 68.3 million rubles; this figure was 9.1 million rubles during the first quarter of 1988.

The development of interrepublic labor collaboration remains slow and often formalistic. Our republic has no agreement on socialist competition with any of its neighboring republics, with the exception of the traditional cooperation among workers in the agroindustrial complex of the Central Asian republics, Azerbaijan, Moldavia, Stavropolskiy Kray and Ulyanov Oblast. But even that has been reduced to nothing more than occasional trips to exchange experience relative to the construction of facilities for the storage of vegetables, fruit and potatoes, as well as experience in the field of trade. Central Committee departments and party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms have not taken the requisite steps to increase responsibility on the part of ministries, departments and economic administrators with regard to development and cultivation of economic ties and improvement of the form of those ties. In this respect inadequate use is being made of effective methods of interaction with advanced collectives at supply enterprises based on the principles of the "Workers' Relay." These issues are not being adequately reflected in the system of party, production-related and economic studies, in lecture propaganda, in oral or graphic agitation work or in the mass information media. It is no coincidence that many blue- and white-collar workers have not even been informed of the ties between the enterprise where they work and its subcontractors, or between their republic and other regions of the country, nor have they been informed of the nature and extent of aid to Tajikistan from the rest of the country both now and in the past. Theoretical and practical problems relating to the formation of our national unit of the working class are being resolved in an extremely unsatisfactory manner. As a result a disproportion persists in the ethnic structure of blue-collar workers and engineering and technical personnel. For example, Tajiks make up approximately 60 percent of our republic's population, yet they account for only one-fourth of the industrial working class. The TaSSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, the TaSSR State Committee for Labor and the Tajik Komsomol Central Committee have not performed their assigned tasks with regard to studying the conditions under which the young people of our republic enrolled at our country's vocational and technical schools study, work and live, to what degree they tend to remain at one place of study and the question of whether graduates are being utilized in accordance with the requirements of the economy. Often party committees fail to consider ethnic composition when regulating the growth of party ranks, when selecting and assigning cadres and when forming elected organs. Local soviets are not taking the necessary steps to create proper conditions for satisfying the needs and interests of the members of our various nations and nationalities. All these things form one of the causes behind continuing negative manifestations in the area of interethnic relations, and are detrimental to the molding of an internationalist consciousness, especially among young people.

The role of the scientific and creative intelligentsia in the development of a social consciousness appropriate to the

tasks of restructuring remains a small one. The creative passivity of persons working in the social sciences and their detachment from practical matters make theoretical interpretation of the real problems and contradictions in our lives more difficult. The contribution made by social scientists to the drafting of recommendations regarding the affirmation of a scientific-materialist world view and communist convictions, the introduction of new Soviet rituals and traditions, the conducting of research on problems of how to promote friendship among the peoples of the USSR and the clarification of the role and significance of economic integration among the union republics to the development of interethnic relations has been inadequate. Certain works of literature and art which do not offer the reader or viewer clear, convincing images of our contemporaries, the bearers of revolutionary thinking and examples of an active stance in life, are not helping promote restructuring. Timely present-day problems are often neglected.

The public, including young people, remains highly religious. In the consciousness of a segment of the intelligentsia and of some young men and women we are observing the equating and confusing of people's and religious holidays, rituals and traditions; the reactionary nature of religion is not fully appreciated. In recent years there has been an increase in the number of cases of self-immolation in a number of rayons, and work to counter harmful, outdated customs has slackened. The press, radio and television are not exerting an active enough influence with respect to correct interpretation and resolution of problems of internationalist and atheistic education. A resolution adopted by the Tajik CP Central Committee directed the attention of Central Committee departments, Tajik CP obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms, soviet organs, republic ministries and departments and public and ideological organizations and institutions to their unsatisfactory execution of the Republic Comprehensive Program of Internationalist and Atheistic Education. It was proposed that party committees and primary party organizations take steps toward absolute fulfillment of the tasks set by the Comprehensive Program and, through effective coordination of ideological influence and the efforts of ministries, departments, public organizations, labor collectives, families and schools, exert an ideological influence on all social groups. We must decisively, on the basis of party-like adherence to principle, oppose any and all manifestations of national exclusiveness, parasitism, attempts at isolationism, religious or feudal mores, which exert ajnegative influence on the growth of national self-awareness and foster conflict situations in interethnic relations. We must behave with respect toward the dignity, culture, language and history of all nations and nationalities residing in our republic and strive to satisfy their needs and wants as well as we can, at the same time working to resolve cadre-related, social, cultural, domestic and other matters on a just basis, taking labor collectives' opinions more fully into consideration. Party, soviet and economic organs, republic ministries and departments and the Tajik Trade Union Council are

assigned the task of bringing about a sharp increase in qualitative indices, maximally mobilizing internal resources and all capacities with the objective of accelerating the social and economic development of our republic and increasing its contribution to the performance of nationwide tasks, strictly abiding by contractual delivery stipulations, especially with regard to shipments to other republics, and developing the workers' patriotic initiative known as "All Shipments to Fraternal Republics—On Time and With Excellent Quality!," effective competition and exchange of experience with labor collectives, cities, rayons and oblasts in fraternal republics.

TaSSR Gosplan, the State Committee for Labor, the Ministry of Education, the State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education, other ministries and departments and the Tajik Komsomol CC should work consistently and persistently to strengthen and reinforce our national working class unit, particularly in the leading industrial sectors. Toward this end they should draw up and carry out specific proposals regarding the establishment in our republic of a unified system of vocational orientation and labor training for young people, designing that system to inculcate in young men and women, particularly those of native ethnicity, an inner drive to begin their careers in a real job, directly involved with the material production realm.

It is proposed that the TaSSR Academy of Sciences, the Tajik CP Central Committee Party History Institute and the TaSSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education set up a comprehensive program of research on the processes and tendencies existing in the area of nationalities relations and the problems of ever deeper internationalism in all areas of public life. They should increase scientific collectives' responsibility for our republic's social and economic development, focusing primary attention on problems of restructuring theory and practice, the dynamics of social-class and ethnic relations and on the development of democratization and self-government.

They should study the socioeconomic, ethnic and moral-psychological causes of out-migration from our republic by other nationalities, as well as the degree to which the cultural and intellectual needs of small ethnic groups are being met.

Party obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms, the Tajik Trade Union Council, the Tajik Komsomol Central Committee, the TaSSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, Ministry of Education and State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education and other republic ministries and departments have an obligation to take steps to improve the internationalist and atheistic education of young people, developing among them a high level of culture of interethnic relations, a critical attitude toward religion and the ability to evaluate historical facts and the changes currently taking place

in our country independently, on the basis of a class-oriented stance. In this regard they should place greater responsibility on the directors of educational institutions and on those institutions' party and Komsomol organizations and social scientists. They should bring about radical improvement in the teaching of the social disciplines, especially history, at secondary and higher schools, and also improve the corresponding curricula and textbooks. They should render effective assistance to young people in their study of matters relating to the formation of nations, the historical roots of national culture, the history of religion and the ethnic and territorial demarcation of the Central Asian peoples. Central Committee departments and the obkoms, gorkoms and raykoms of the Tajik CP must radically restructure party leadership of scientific and cultural institutions and creative organizations and unions, helping their primary party organizations in a practical manner to foster a morally healthy atmosphere and a spirit of good will and adherence to principle. They should encourage initiative and innovation in every way possible, display confidence in people, competently resolve questions relating to the creative process and resolutely oppose stagnation, complacency and intellectual immobility and dilettantism with regard to matters of culture and ideology.

Steps should be taken to expand the role of spiritual culture in the molding of workers' internationalist consciousness, and everything possible should be done to develop cultural contacts with fraternal republics, improve the forms of those contacts and improve the ideological and moral tone of events.

It was proposed that the mass propaganda and information media devote greater attention to clarification of matters pertaining to internationalist and atheistic education, improve the quality of their articles, television programming and radio broadcasts, and depict this process along with all its complexities and contradictions.

12825

CPSU Cencom Passes Resolution on Work of Kurgan Party Organs

1800377 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 May 88 pp 1-2

[Article, unsigned: "On the Kurgan Oblast Party Organization's Work to Promote Village Social Development" under the "In the CPSU Central Committee" rubric]

[Text] Implementing the resolutions of the 18th CPSU congress, the Kurgan Oblast party organization has been working to promote countryside social development. The share of total agricultural and industrial investment going to capital investment into areas other than production has increased somewhat. In the past two years, more demanding plans for residence, social club and road construction were fulfilled. Measures are being taken to

broaden the network of pre-school care centers, health care facilities, retail outlets and everyday services. Special plans have been developed for those sectors.

At the same, serious shortcomings exist in the organizational work of the party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms in the area of social development. Their activity has not been sufficiently dynamic; it lacks perseverance and businesslike qualities, some party committees do not feel fully responsible for utilizing to the full extent existing resources and possibilities in order to accelerate the social reorganization of the countryside. As far as everyday comforts are concerned, villages of the Kurgan Oblast are among the worst in the RSFSR: only one fifth of residential units have running water and one fourth central heating. Less than 40 pc of farm centers are connected to their rayon seats by paved roads. The workplace is poorly organized, there are no orderly work schedules, half of animal farms lack facilities to serve hot meals, showers and medical facilities do not exist. At many of them, only 50-60 percent of total work load is automated.

The development of facilities related to cultural activities and education lags behind. Over 1,000 of teachers' families need better living quarters. For many years, construction of schools, social clubs and medical facilities fell short of the plan.

Village consumer cooperatives have reduced their trading volume and have not been fulfilling their agricultural purchasing plans. Countryside residents get considerable fewer everyday services than city dwellers; cooperative forms of providing services have not been broadly used.

The solution of the problems of countryside social development has been held in check in a large measure by the poor economic performance of kolkhozes and sovkhoses. Total production has grown at an annual rate of less than one percent for the past seven years. In the first 2 years of the current 5-year plan, grain sales to the state have fell short by more than one million metric tons, and purchasing plans for potatoes, vegetables, milk and wool have not been fulfilled. The number of privately owned domestic animals have been declining.

This great lag in countryside reorganization is the main cause of the high rate of migration of the working-age population and of the worsening of the demographic composition of the countryside.

The serious shortcomings in countryside social development are the result of the poor work style and methods of the CPSU obkom and its buro, as well as party gorkoms and obkoms. Their activities are not properly oriented to the people; they do not conduct organizational work in the working collectives proper. They do not actively supervise the implementation of party directives or even their own resolutions. Insufficient attention is being paid

to staff training or to learning the methods of intensive production management; they assume insufficient responsibility for fulfilling agricultural production plans or raising efficiency.

The CPSU obkom is not demanding enough toward local soviets of the people's deputies, which have played a passive role in the process of countryside reorganization. The oblispolkom underestimates the gravity of the negative processes underway in the region and does not provide leadership in this extremely important area. Construction capacities developed in the oblast have not been fully tapped; only half of the prefab construction and brick and ceramic tile production capacity is being utilized. The "Kurganpromstroy" enterprise has been underfulfilling the plan for building residential houses for kolkhozes and sovkhoses. Participation by departments of the USSR Ministry of Urals and Siberia Construction and USSR Ministry of Transportation Construction has been ensured only on a partial basis. Work done for the agricultural sector does not exceed 8-10 percent of their total business volume.

Such entities as the USSR Gosplan, USSR Ministry of Water Resources, USSR Ministry of Construction Materials, USSR Ministry of Energy and RSFSR Council of Ministers have not taken the necessary measures to help accelerate the introduction on the countryside of gas line networks, improve the reliability of the electricity supply, improve the supply of drinking water, increase production capacities in nonmetal and construction materials and ensure broader participation by the USSR Ministry of Urals and Siberia Construction and USSR Ministry of Transportation Construction in the construction in the agricultural sector.

The CPSU Central Committee passed the following resolutions:

It termed unsatisfactory the organizational work of the Kurgan Oblast's CPSU obkom and oblispolkom in promoting countryside development. It noted that the CPSU obkom's buro has not been critical in evaluating the existing situation in agriculture and does not perceive the problems of lagging production and village reorganization, the problems which have grown more acute in recent years.

The CPSU Central Committee especially emphasized that the social factors have become decisive in the current period in ensuring more active and efficient work of working collectives, accelerated development of the agricultural sector and the very direction of perestroika on the countryside.

The Central Committee demanded that the party committees and soviet organizations change radically their work style and methods in the area of countryside social

development. They must view the task of creating normal working and living conditions for agricultural workers as a problem of the first order, a problem whose solution will be decisive in ensuring success for the Food Program.

The CPSU obkom and oblispolkom were asked to improve decisively their management of construction on the countryside, to raise its efficiency, to ensure the full utilization of the production capacities of construction firms and enterprises, to expand as quickly as possible the local output of construction materials and to persevere in restructuring and retooling existing enterprises. They must elicit the participation of the contracting departments of the USSR Ministry of Urals and Siberia Construction, USSR Ministry of Transportation Construction, USSR Ministry of Energy and USSR Ministry of Water Resources in the construction of residential and civil facilities on the countryside as well as agriculture product processing plants and storage facilities. They should consider the task of improving agricultural sector construction as a key goal of all soviet and management organizations.

The oblispolkom, rayispolkoms, countryside soviets of the people's deputies and agricultural committee must sharply redirect their efforts toward increasing the volume of construction of private and cooperative residences using private funds and credits. They must broaden retail networks, increase the volume of sales and delivery of construction materials to the population and provide all possible help in building homes and agricultural structure for private use.

Having noted the poor state of development of paved roads and the large social and production losses that it causes, the CPSU Central Committee expressed its view that highway construction must take a leading place in countryside reconstruction and become a central task for the entire party organization of the oblast.

The Central Committee ordered the oblast, city, rayon and local soviets of the people's deputies to assume a larger role and broaden their responsibility for the entire range of social redevelopment problems on the countryside, as well as for the quality of construction and architectural appearance of all settlements.

The party obkom, gorkoms and raykoms must concentrate the attention of party organizations and working collectives on the task of overcoming the lag in agriculture and of accelerating the rate of growth of agricultural output both at collective farms and at private plots; they must strengthen the economies of kolkhozes, sovkhoses and other production organizations in the agricultural sector, viewing it as a basis for social development on the countryside and for improved food supply in the near future.

Due to serious shortcomings in the work of local soviets in promoting social development on the countryside, the Central Committee recommended to the RSFSR Council of Ministers and the Kurgan CPSU obkom to consider strengthening the leadership of the oblast soviet of the people's deputies.

The USSR Gosplan, USSR Ministry of Urals and Siberia Construction, USSR Ministry of Transportation Construction, USSR Ministry of Energy, USSR Ministry of Water Resources, RSFSR Council of Ministers, RSFSR Ministry of Highway Construction, RSFSR Ministry of Construction Materials, RSFSR Ministry of Housing and Municipal Services, RSFSR Consumer Union and other ministries and organizations were asked to consider in the next two months the requests of the Kurgan CPSU obkom and oblispolkom to accelerate social reorganization of the oblast's rural settlements and villages.

12892

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Views Republic's Alcohol, Narcotics Problems

18300256 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 13 Apr 88 pp 2-3

[Speech presented by Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman Deputy A. A. Mokuanu at the 9th Session of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation: "On the Integrated Plan of Measures for Implementing the Resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Entitled 'On the Work of the Moldavian SSR Soviets of People's Deputies in Intensifying the Struggle Against Drunkenness and Drug Addiction'"]

[Excerpts] Let us be frank. Certain, if not many, party, soviet, state and economic management organs, labor collectives, and public organizations, being content with their initial achieved results, have shown self-satisfaction and complacency. They have not taken into consideration the fact that the struggle against drunkenness and drug addiction cannot be waged in a short-term campaign. Often they do not view alcohol abuse as the manifestation of amoral or anti-social behavior. They do not give a decisive rebuff to the established and inconsistent view of drunkenness as being an inevitable and insurmountable phenomenon. They exhibit a desire to solve the problem merely by administrative-legal measures, without an in-depth analysis of the state of affairs and without conducting extensive educational-enlightenment work among the population. At the same time, cases of the sparing application of legal force and public opinion to drunkards and drug addicts are quite frequent.

As a result, we must conclude that drunkenness and drug addiction continue to bear a widespread character in the republic. I will go even farther in saying that these phenomena have taken on dangerous tendencies here. They demand a well-thought-out evaluation today at the session of the republic's Supreme Soviet, as well as the

adoption of immediate comprehensive measures for the eradication of this evil, with mandatory personal responsibility primarily by the managers of the labor collectives, their public organizations, and ministers and chairmen of state committees and Soviets of People's Deputies.

Judge for yourselves the situation which has arisen. Moldavia is in second place among the other union republics in the number of people suffering from chronic alcoholism and alcoholic psychoses, with 255 cases reported per 100,000 persons. This is 1.5 times higher than the average union indicator. At the present time there are 82,000 persons suffering from these illnesses on the dispensary patient rosters. Their number increased by 16 percent in 1987 as compared with the previous year. The most alcoholics have been registered in Kishinev and Tiraspol and in Kalarashskiy, Kotovskiy, Novoanenskiy, Orgeyevskiy, Slobodzeyskiy, Sorokskiy, and Strashenskiy rayons. Out of every 35 juveniles suffering from alcoholism who have been placed on report, every fifth one is a woman, while in Kotovskiy, Chernenkovskiy, Chimishliyskiy, and Kantemirskiy rayons women comprise one-third of all alcoholics.

In 1987, 58,000 persons were detained for consuming alcoholic beverages or for being intoxicated in public places. Over 30,000 persons who were in a moderate or severe state of intoxication were taken off the streets, and around 15,000 persons were placed in medical detoxification facilities. Despite the prohibition, the drinking of alcoholic beverages in non-designated places is becoming more widespread. While in 1987 over 7,000 such incidents were reported, in 1987 this figure was 10,500. Altogether, around 100,000 persons were brought to responsibility for violating anti-alcohol legislation last year.

As before, drunkenness and drug addiction have a significant effect on the crime rate in the republic. Last year, alcohol-related crimes increased by almost 10 percent. One in every three crimes was committed by persons in an intoxicated state. The increase in the alcohol-related crime rate has been noted in 23 cities and rayons. A significant increase in the number of crimes associated with alcoholic intoxication has been noted in Oktyabrskiy, Sovetskiy and Dnestrovskiy rayons, in the city of Kishinev, in Tiraspol, Strashenskiy, Suvorovskiy, Rybnitskiy, Ryshkanskiy, and Komratskiy rayons.

Repeat alcohol-related crimes have increased. There have been more severe bodily injuries, assaults, robberies and thefts. We might add that the level of growth of these crimes in the republic significantly exceeds the country-wide indicators.

Misappropriations of alcoholic beverages have increased. In 1987 there were around 160 such cases reported. They occurred in particularly great numbers at the Krikovskiy, Tatareshkiy, Abakliyskiy and other wine making plants. Last year the sum of losses incurred

by the state from such misappropriations comprised almost 180,000 rubles. The speculation in wine and vodka products has increased significantly.

Bootlegging presents a real and rather impressive threat to the anti-alcoholic course. In 1987 the number of persons involved in bootlegging operations tripled. There were 470 persons brought to criminal responsibility for bootlegging, and 1,800 persons to administrative responsibility. We might add that some of them had engaged in bootlegging for a long time. They were not employed anywhere, but had turned their illegal business into their primary occupation. Last year, 1,400 stills, 12 tons of home-brew, and 40 tons of sour mash for which about 25 tons of sugar had been used were seized and confiscated. Bootlegging has increased in the Brichanskiy, Yedinetskiy, Sorokskiy, Floreshtskiy, and Rybnitskiy rayons, and in the city of Beltsy. Nevertheless, there is practically no active work on the eradication of this evil being performed in these and other cities and rayons of the republic.

Last year, as evidenced by court statistics, there were 16,000 families broken up, generally due to drunkenness. These families were raising over 12,000 children. In this same period, drunkenness also served as the reason for 186 fires which led to the deaths of 36 people and caused significant material loss.

About drug addiction. In the last 3 years the number of drug addicts has increased five-fold in the republic (from 67 to 336). Also, the growth rate for this illness is twice that of the all-union level. Three-fourths of the drug addicts are young people. One in every five is under age. Most of them (36 percent of the overall number registered in the republic) live in Beltsy. Many live in Kishinev, Tiraspol, Slobodzeyskiy, Kalgulskiy, Lazovskiy and Orgeyevskiy rayons. In general, there are reported drug addicts in 42 cities and rayons of the republic. Crimes associated with drug addiction have been recorded in 29 cities and rayons. There has been a noted tendency toward an increase in their number. While in 1985 there were 52 such crimes, in 1987 there were 186. Last year alone there were 6.6 kilograms of opium extract, around 8 kilograms of hashish, 42.6 kilograms of hemp, 225 single doses of narcotic medications, and 160 kilograms of poppy grass confiscated from illegal trade by various persons.

Despite the situation which has arisen, the struggle against this social evil is being waged without sufficient continuity, principle or effectiveness. In most cities and rayons it is reduced merely to placing the drug users on report, while the reasons and conditions facilitating the emergence of this problem are being eliminated very slowly. Rarely are the channels and sources for obtaining the drugs identified, as well as the persons engaging in the sale of narcotic raw materials. The Gosagroprom and the local Soviets of People's Deputies are not satisfactorily fulfilling the requirements set forth by law on eliminating wild-growing hemp. Measures of administrative

influence on persons responsible for performing work on its elimination are being weakly utilized. For example, large masses of wild-growing hemp have been found on the land of many farms in Rybnitskiy, Kaushanskiy, Slobodzeyanskiy and other rayons, including under the office windows of the chairman of the Kitskanskiy rural soviet, on the territory of the Parkansk secondary school and boarding school, as well as in other public places. The on-site law enforcement agencies are performing their work poorly in identifying drug dens and persons who get young people into drugs.

Such is the disturbing picture which is taking shape in the republic in the matter of organizing the implementation of party and state decisions on overcoming drunkenness, alcoholism, drug addiction, and the negative manifestations associated with them. It forces each of us to think and to be concerned—the deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet, and everyone who is responsible for unswervingly bringing to life the directive documents of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on these questions. The responsibility for this is borne primarily by the management cadres of the labor collectives, the party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations, the party and soviet organs of the cities and rayons, the ministries and departments, and finally—the MoSSR Council of Ministers and Supreme Soviet Presidium. If we do not understand this, we will once again deeply neglect the problem and will be satisfied with the measures which have already been taken almost 3 years ago.

In many rayons and cities the efforts of managers, of society, enterprises, managements, organizations, shops, farms, brigades, and even deputies, are not aimed at performing the appropriate work in their elective okrugs, and primarily—in their collectives and families, although the need for this work is irrefutable. For example, let us take Strashenskiy rayon. There are almost 2,400 persons on report here. Of these, around one-fourth are women. Almost 40 percent of the crimes on the rayon's territory are performed by persons in an intoxicated state. The number of crimes committed in the streets, in parks and in other public places has doubled. The number of serious crimes has increased significantly, among these are murders (from 3 to 14), infliction of serious bodily injury, rape, robbery, and theft of personal property. At the same time, the questions of overcoming drunkenness and alcoholism have not been discussed since 1985 in the sessions of the rayon Soviet (ispolkom chairman V. L. Syrbu), and in the collectives they have also practically not been discussed. The demands of the new legislation have not been applied to a single manager. Not one of those who had to organize the struggle against drunkenness was brought to either administrative or party responsibility for his poor work in this direction.

In Kalarashkiy rayon there is a different picture. The state of the struggle against drunkenness has been reviewed here at all levels around 200 times, including at

the sessions of the rayon and rural Soviets, by permanent commissions and deputy groups. There have been 25 plans submitted for various measures. But what has been the effect? There are 2,400 alcoholics on report, including 718 women. Forty-two percent of the crimes were committed by persons in an intoxicated state. This is almost double the republic average. The number of murders has tripled and the number of cases of infliction of severe bodily injury has increased nine-fold. These crimes, as a rule, are committed in a drunken state. Four times more incidents of bootlegging have been discovered as compared with 1985. The number of cases of alcoholic beverage consumption during work production has increased. In 1985 there were 27 such cases reported, in 1986—52, and in 1987—82. The home sale of alcoholic beverages is widespread.

Unfortunately, this is not a singular example. In the spring of 1986, a town meeting held by the citizens of Dzholtay Village in Chadyr- Lungskiy rayon proclaimed their territory to be a non-alcoholic zone. But already the following year practically all the village residents had made wine at home, including the chairmen of the village Soviet ispolkom, the primary organization of the society for the struggle for sobriety and the commission for the struggle against drunkenness under the village Soviet of People's Deputies. Isn't this blatant formalism?! It is not surprising that out of 1,635 persons of the village's adult population, 33 are on report with the rayon hospital for chronic alcoholism, 19—with the rayon psychiatrist, and 7 young men of draft age have been found marginally suitable for military service due to mental deficiency. And again—there is no evaluation on the part of the rayon Soviet of People's Deputies (ispolkom chairman G. Ye. Porchesku).

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has given a low evaluation of the work by the Commission to Combat Drunkenness under the republic's Council of Ministers. This Commission is not performing the functions placed on it and is not exerting proper influence on similar local commissions. The Commission is poorly performing analytical work and implementation of measures to prevent drunkenness. Recently it was headed up by M. S. Platon. We await energetic action from him, and most importantly—effective action.

The roots of the shortcomings and omissions in the work on eradicating drunkenness and drug addiction are hidden primarily in the insufficient economic provision of the anti-alcoholic measures which are being passed. We still have not been able to create a social alternative in this struggle. Extremes were allowed at the initial stage, which have been expressed in a desire to solve the problem in the shortest possible time by means of closing most wine and vodka stores and sharply curtailing the sale of alcoholic beverages. In 1986 these sales dropped by more than one-half toward the 1985 level.

At the same time, such a sharp reduction in the sale of alcoholic beverages which was not supported by the manufacture of sufficient quantities of non-alcoholic

beverages, foodstuffs and industrial goods, or by the expansion of cultural-household services, led to the spread in the republic of such negative occurrences as bootlegging, widespread manufacture of adulterated wines and other surrogates. A well thought out and strict approach is needed here.

The commodity resources have been replenished in a clearly insufficient manner in the republic. Last year the plan was not fulfilled for the sale of products in the sum of almost 200 million rubles as specified in the concluded delivery agreements. Also, the tasks for production of 9 out of 29 varieties of non-food items in their natural expression were not met. The quality and assortment of the manufactured goods and services rendered are slow in being developed. The trade organizations have not taken effective measures for ensuring the full supply of goods in accordance with the allocated market funds. Last year alone the supply of these goods for sale to the population fell short by over 30 million rubles.

Despite the fact that the plan for realization of paid services to the public has been fulfilled on the whole, the development of these services in the republic does not meet current requirements. By per capita volume of services we are in tenth place among the union republics. The reason for this situation is the insufficient utilization of the available reserves and capacities for increasing the volumes of paid services. In 1987, the plans for their realization were not met by 11 ray(gor)ispolkoms, 23 cities and rayons, and 16 ministries, state committees and departments. The Gosagroprom, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Trade, Ministry of Social Security, State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports, Moldavian Council of Trade Unions, and the Kishinev, Beltsy, Tiraspol, and Orgeyev gorispolkoms did not fulfill the plan for two years of the five-year plan. In 16 rayons (Dubossarskiy, Kriulyanskiy, Kutuzovskiy, Strashenskiy and others), the volume of per capita services was only $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{7}$ that of the average republic indicator. The capacities of the cooperatives and the individual trade activity of the citizens are not being sufficiently utilized for purposes of improving services to the public.

The formulation of the question of sugar sales deserves particular attention. In a number of places, no control has been implemented over the economical expenditure of this valuable food product. Proper attention has not been given to the significant tendency toward growth in the public demand for sugar which appeared in 1986. While in 1985 there were 117,800 tons of sugar sold through the trade network, in 1987 this figure was 148,900 tons. A similar tendency is also being observed in the current year. At the same time, many rayons in the republic have shown a direct correlation between the reduction in the sale of alcoholic beverages, the increase in bootlegging, and the increase in sugar sales.

The significant growth in the volumes of sugar sales has been facilitated by the shortcomings in the study of public demand, planning and distribution of market

funds, the sale of sugar primarily in large packaging exceeding the norms for sale to a single individual, as well as the allocation of sugar to kolkhoz workers as supplementary payment for harvested beets and the lower level of enlightenment work among the population.

In a number of places, cases of speculation in sugar have been observed. Its misappropriation from enterprises where it is used in the production process has almost doubled. Today there are again interruptions in its sale in the republic's cities and rayons. Such a state of affairs cannot be tolerated. MoSSR Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman V. K. Kiktenko is ultimately responsible for this entire set of questions. The Session is within its rights to demand of him more energetic measures and proposals for the solution of the problem of sugar provision to the population, as well as for the implementation of the Integrated Program for Development of Consumer Goods Production and the Sphere of Services to the Year 2000. The permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet should perform an in-depth analysis of the situation and submit proposals to the republic's Council of Ministers and Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Today as never before, it is important to shift the center of organizational and ideological work directly to the enterprise and to the labor collectives. After all, drunkenness in work production is not declining, but on the contrary, increasing. While in 1986 there were over 5,500 cases of alcoholic beverage consumption reported at work, last year this number had risen to around 7,500. Around 500 people have been sent directly from their work stations to medical detoxification facilities. Often administrators arrived at work in an inebriated state, including 40 engineers, 28 foremen and 28 work brigade leaders. Such incidents have become most widespread at the enterprises in Kishinev, Tiraspol, Bender, Kaluga, Ungenskiy, Glodyanskiy, Teleneshtskiy, Sorokskiy, and Grigorioposkiy rayons.

Many labor collectives exhibit complacency and even allow connivance in regard to drunkards, and do not conduct proper educational work with them. The managers of the enterprises and organizations of Gosagroprom, Ministry of Highway Construction and Maintenance, Ministry of Bakery Goods Production, Moldavian Consumer Union and other ministries and departments do not always react as they should to reports by police agencies regarding alcohol-related crimes committed by their workers. A third of such reports remain unanswered. A radical breakthrough has not been achieved in strengthening labor discipline. A number of enterprises do not employ decisive measures for eliminating losses of work time allowed due to drunkenness. Cases of covering up the actual state of affairs in labor collectives are coming to light.

We get the impression that all this does not concern the leading personages—the managers, much less the managers of ministries and departments and their deputies.

In this echelon of administration the struggle against drunkenness has long ago died down, and it would be justifiable to issue the challenge of responsibility from the tribunal of this session to this key category of cadres. The forthcoming administrative reorganization about which we have spoken in detail here today must also facilitate the eradication of drunkenness, alcoholism and drug addiction.

We must deal particularly with the problems associated with the work of transport organizations engaged in the transport of passengers and national economic cargo. The situation here is particularly alarming, and there is a noted increase in the number of traffic accidents. In 3 years, 17,000 people have been injured in such accidents. Drunk driving has become widespread. Last year alone, around 23,000 drivers were detained and found to be under the influence of alcohol. This is 5.4 percent higher than in 1986.

The enforcement of anti-alcohol legislation on the Moldavian railroad line is very poorly organized. There are 400 chronic alcoholics employed there, and of these 138 work at the Kishinev Railroad Station. Moreover, the drug enforcement service has identified around 500 people who have a tendency toward alcohol abuse. One out of every 11 persons here is either an alcoholic or close to it. Periodically during work-site inspections, railroad workers are found to be in an intoxicated state. Yet their work is associated with traffic safety. Can the Chief of the Moldavian Railroad Yu. M. Gerasimov and the managers of the public transport organizations tell us when drunkards and alcoholics will be excluded from railroad transport work?

Serious omissions continue to occur in the work with the youth, among whom drunkenness and drug addiction have become rather widespread. Last year the number of minors cited for violation of anti-alcohol legislation increased. The consumption of alcoholic beverages among students of vocational-technical schools has increased by 34 percent, among students of general education schools—by 57.5 percent, and among the working youth—by 91 percent.

During this same period, minors under the influence of alcohol committed 371 crimes (an increase of 2.5 percent). 862 juveniles were placed on report with the Inspections on Affairs of Minors for their tendency toward use of alcoholic beverages. An increase in the number of drinking juveniles has been recorded in Frunzenskiy, Dnestrovskiy, Glodyanskiy, Grigoriopolskiy, Kalarashkiy, and Strashenskiy rayons, and in Tiraspol. One out of every five drug addicts on report is under age. There are 7,000 broken families in the republic, in which 16,000 juveniles are being raised. There are 2,500 such families on report with the militia. It is they who generally supply the juvenile criminals.

The basic shortcoming in the work on preventing drunkenness and drug addiction among the student youth is that the "prophylactic" activity begins already after the law has been violated. It does not bear a permanent and planned preventative character. In Beltsy, for example, there are 1,850 vocational-technical school students living in 4 dormitories located in a single microrayon. However, there are no mass cultural or sports measures conducted with them, and they are left to themselves in their free time. This is why the work of public education demands immediate reorganization. The pedagogical collectives of the schools, institutes, technical schools, and VUZes and their managers must bear personal responsibility for affirming a sober way of life among the upcoming generation.

Moldavia is one of the leaders among the union republics in the spread of chronic alcoholism. This is associated not only with the more active identification of the afflicted, but also with shortcomings in the work of the public health organs on early diagnosis and increased effectiveness of performed treatment. The omissions in organizational work by Minzdrav [Ministry of Health] in treating alcoholics are evidenced by the fact that in 1987 the number of persons placed on report increased by 28.6 percent, while the number of hospital drug rehabilitation sections was reduced by 12.5 percent. Work-treatment preventative facilities are constantly working at partial load (last year there were almost a thousand vacant spaces). However, only one-fourth of the 10,500 persons who need treatment for alcoholism underwent treatment at the LTP.

Last year the effectiveness of forced treatment for alcoholism declined sharply. Of the number of persons treated at LTPs, in the first month after being discharged from them 13.4 percent had a relapse as compared with 4.7 percent in 1986. The material-technical base of many narcological institutions remains extremely weak. The problems of staffing the positions of narcologists with qualified specialists and the improvement of interaction with internal affairs agencies have not yet been resolved.

Public health workers are not properly engaged in the forced treatment of drug addicts. In a year-and-a-half, 8 people have been directed for treatment, while another 30 are in need of it. At the same time, the Minzdrav merely states these facts, but does not resolve the problem. This ministry and Minister K. A. Draganyuk must draw serious conclusions from this criticism. We must increase the demands placed on medical workers for the effectiveness of treating alcoholism and drug addiction and for the end results.

The shortcomings in the work on the struggle against drunkenness and drug addiction are explained to a significant degree by serious omissions in the work of the law enforcement organs. The organs of the militia, the procurator's office, the judicial system and the courts have not achieved a radical breakthrough in preventing lawbreaking and in ensuring inevitability of punishment

for violating anti-alcohol legislation. They underestimate the importance of a differentiated, individual approach and effect on lawbreakers. They do not interact sufficiently with the drug prevention service in the matter of bringing alcoholics to forced treatment.

The internal affairs organs have not organized their work well on identifying centers for bootlegging, drug addiction, and making of adulterated wine. The reasons and conditions which lead to crimes committed while under the influence of alcohol are not always exhaustively identified. There is not the proper coordination in the work of the militia and the [Main Administration for State Inspection of Quality of Goods and Trade in identifying those who violate the regulations for trade in alcoholic beverages.

In reviewing the cases associated with narcotics, the courts do not always determine and eliminate the reasons for their spread or identify all the participants in the crime or the sources where the drugs were obtained. Legal force is not sufficiently used in examining cases of bootlegging. Sometimes the legally prescribed additional punishment in the form of confiscation of property is not used without sound basis. When confiscation is ordered, its realization is not always achieved. For example, out of 66 cases of this category which were studied, the courts ordered confiscation from 31 convicted persons, but achieved implementation of the confiscation in only 4 of the cases.

12322

Vorotnikov Introduces Journal Issue on Siberia
18120082 Moscow SOVIET UNION in English
No 5, May 88 p 1

[Article by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation]

[Text] In response to letters from our readers SOVIET UNION has prepared for publication in 21 languages a special issue devoted to Siberia. We think this is a good idea, since without a knowledge of this enormous part of the Russian Federation, which occupies almost 10 million square kilometres and stretches from the Urals to the Pacific, it is hard to gain a good understanding of our country, its past and present, and its development outlook for the future.

The striving to understand what Siberia is all about is rooted deep in history. In the traditions of many peoples, the "promised land" lies in its vast expanses. The Slavs were the first Europeans who discovered the Siberian subcontinent and traded with its peoples. In their eastward drive "towards the sun" Arctic voyagers from Russian built, north of the Arctic Circle, the first town on permafrost, and called it Mangazeia, or "gold-seething."

Lomonosov's words to the effect that Siberia would make Russia mighty are well known. The record of Siberia's industrial development has shown that the hard work and boldness of Siberians are contributing to this might. As far as the Siberian character is concerned, we breathe special meaning into these words. Staunchness, modesty, courage, acumen, enthusiasm, a lofty sense of comradeship and responsibility—in short, everything that characterises a real patriot.

Soviet government wrought sweeping changes in the lives of the indigenous ethnic groups of Siberia, drawing them into the mainstream of the new life. The formation of autonomous republics, regions and areas on the territory of Siberia enabled these ethnic groups to effectively take part in running both their own affairs and those of the entire country.

What is Siberia today from the standpoint of the national economy? It is a million tons of oil and 1,000 million cubic metres of natural gas from Tyumen daily, it is coal from the Kuzbass and Krasnoyarsk, it is the hydroelectric power stations on the Angara and Yenisei rivers, metal from Norilsk, diamonds from Yakutia—the list could go on and on. By the end of the century Siberia and the Far East are expected to meet over two-thirds of the country's oil and gas needs, more than a fourth of its electricity needs and 40 percent of its timber needs. The merits of Siberia's natural resources are not only their abundance and diversity but also the fact that almost everywhere they are near mighty energy sources.

However, Siberia is already ceasing to be the country's raw material treasure-trove only. And this is becoming increasingly true as time passes. Various branches of mechanical engineering are developing intensively here, and the production of consumer goods is being stepped up. Industrial Siberia means tractors, harvester combines, airplanes, lasers, electrical engineering and chemistry.

Siberia is no less interesting from the standpoint of culture, a fact which may come as a surprise to some people. Once a land of penal servitude and exile, it has now become a land of universities and theatres. People here are coming to know classical and modern literature, music, ballet and painting. Prominent writers, directors and composers work here. A branch of the USSR Academy of the Art has been opened in Krasnoyarsk recently. Revealingly, many foreigners who knew Siberia from hearsay and, as a rule, harboured many prejudices have changed their views markedly after seeing for themselves what it is really like. Siberia attracts people with its dynamism, ebullience and orientation to the future.

Anyone who has been to Siberia knows that this is a multi-faceted land, but for all the diversity it has one common denominator—ecological vulnerability. Man's strength has augmented greatly, and in Siberia it has to

be used judiciously. Before something is built here, much consideration has to be given to the environment and to people living there, and only then should the machines be set in motion.

Our present management experience is leading to these conclusions, too. Regrettably, our experience has not always been well-considered and far-sighted. For a long time the mendacious premise of the supposed "inexhaustibility" of Siberia's mineral wealth had been taken virtually on faith. Little was done for the truly comprehensive socioeconomic development of the region. As a result, one-sided technocratic approaches became increasingly evident, disproportions holding back the development of the productive forces emerged, and transport and agriculture were progressing poorly. Most importantly, the key, social, sphere, was lagging.

Today a solid foundation for Siberia's future is being laid. As we implement the restructuring strategy and draw lessons from the past, we are mapping out guidelines for steadily improving living and working conditions in Siberia and for developing its economy and culture. These guidelines lie above all in overcoming expansionist, cost-no-object approaches, saving manpower in every possible way and boosting labour productivity by using sophisticated technology and better, dependable machinery. We are also pinning big hopes on improving the performance of Siberia's agriculture sector. Land under grain alone occupies several million hectares.

The prospects are vast, and Siberia's research institutions are to play a key role in their realisation. Siberia today boasts upwards of 500 research and design organisations with an aggregate workforce of over 200,000. The activities of the Siberian Branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences, including those within the framework of the Siberia programme, have made it possible to

solve a number of fundamental research problems over the past 10 years, the direct economic effect from the applied research and development topping 2,000 million rubles.

The intensive growth of Siberia's industrial, social and cultural potential is inconceivable without the rapid development of capital construction, whose volumes are to more than double by the year 2000. This is a difficult task, considering that construction projects in Siberia are much more complicated and costlier than in the European part of the Russian Federation. In winter there are often many-day-long frosts from which tyres break into small pieces and metal weld seams rip open, and in summer there are clouds of mosquitoes and impassable swamps. The difficulties encountered in building the Baikal-Amur Mainline, for example, are well known, and much still has to be done for the economic development of the railway's area. Ahead is the Amur-Yakutsk Railway, and fresh difficulties and fresh accomplishments. Of course, I am merely bringing up the problem of transport development—it will be dealt with in detail in this issue.

The strategic tasks of developing Siberia are extensive and complex. And all of them can be accomplished only provided the working people of its towns and villages feel like real, solicitous masters of the region, not like temporary manpower. The question today is to harness the Siberians' creative potential. This is the centre-piece of the broad-based democratisation and radical economic reforms taking place here as well as in the rest of the country. The development needs of Siberia and the Far East are a priority with the CPSU Central Committee, state bodies and the public at large.

In the early 20th century the famous Arctic explorer Fridtjof Nansen entitled his book "Through Siberia. The Land of the Future." SOVIET UNION will take you to this land.

/9604

IZVESTIYA Official Urges More Open, Bolder Foreign Affairs Reporting

18300227 Moscow ZHURNALIST in Russian
No 3, Mar 88 pp 14-17

[Article by Aleksey Kuvshinnikov, deputy accountable secretary of the editorial board of the newspaper IZVESTIYA, under the rubric "Learn Democracy"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Aleksey Kuvshinnikov was born in 1959. He graduated from the Moscow State Institute of Foreign Relations, worked in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs system, then in 1983 became a correspondent in the international information department of the newspaper IZVESTIYA. In 1988 he became deputy responsible secretary of the paper's editorial board.

When I open up the papers in the morning I study the pages devoted to domestic subjects carefully. But my own "professional" pages, that is the international sections, I usually just glance over by headlines and bylines.

Most of the time that is all I do. During the working day you get enough information about events anyway. And in most cases it is a waste of time to read the commentaries. The conclusions are always the same—a depressing monolithic kind of thought reigns in our international journalistic work.

There is no denying that you also find sparkling articles which boldly throw light on new aspects of some particular problem. But they do not set the tone on the page, for there are very few such writers, and articles like that are a find, nothing more.

There has been talk for some time of the need to renounce the stereotyped style that both the readers and we, the writers, are sick of. I can remember how heatedly we debated this subject when I was still in school. But the stereotype on the page is nothing more than a stereotype in the head, in one's thinking. And therefore, the way to break the stereotype is with an individual approach to analyzing international problems. Only the person who thinks in an original way can write in an original way.

But to judge by the newspapers, many people are still afraid to think in an original way. Maybe there is still something like genetic memory by which we pass on the sad collective experience of attempts to think independently, which often abruptly changed the fate of the journalist, at least. So the monolithic thought that continues to exist in international journalistic writing can be explained in large part by journalists' distrust of change; they continue to see a trap and hear the words, "You are distorting positions, we cannot write that way." How are we distorting things, why is it forbidden? "Oh no, you mean we have to explain it to you..."

For several years now I have regularly attended briefings and press conferences conducted at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center. Until very recently they were dull affairs which foreign journalists for the most part dropped in on while on their way to the bar or the restaurant.

The situation has now changed fundamentally. G. Gerasimov, who is now in charge of the information administration, has brought not just a new atmosphere, but also a new conception which the restructuring that has begun in the ministry system has made it possible to put into effect. Now they drop in at the bar to pass the time until the briefing.

The foreign journalists are happy. They receive adequate information, and moreover it is given in a form that is convenient from the professional point of view and attractive from the standpoint of the final audience, the reader or television viewer. It is given without pressure, with humor, and at the same time in a terse, laconic form. They no longer have to torture themselves squeezing something out of lengthy talk around the subject, not on the subject.

But publication of our own report, in the Soviet press, often involved some problems, especially at first. Either right there at the press center or later, by telephone, we would sometimes receive instructions: write about this, that should not be mentioned, and certain things must be noted. And these instructions had the force of law.

Certainly a responsible employee of the information administration has the full right, and is even obligated, to orient the journalist, to explain the reasons why a particular subject in the briefing receives priority. There are nuances in the diplomatic service that journalists do not know but which it is advisable, and sometimes really necessary, to take into account. I say this not only as a journalist, but also as a former employee of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

But on the other hand, the newspaper is not the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It has its own tasks, its own methods, and its own plans for treating the particular foreign political event or measure. And there is no way that I can believe it is necessary to force-feed the reader dried-up pellets of obligatory subjects when there is an extensive "menu" of excellently prepared propaganda dishes. Who needs such a diet?

The principle of unanimity in the conduct of foreign political propaganda is again being transformed into the principle of monolithic thinking. It would seem obvious that the expanded information on those briefings, containing elements of political intrigue or simply new information in "raw" form, would be interesting and useful to the Soviet reader too. After all, the purpose of

the newspaper report is not to drive the speaker into a corner and catch him on a misstatement, but to help him show the particular aspect of Soviet foreign political doctrine more graphically.

Ultimately, a harmonious combination of the interests of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the newspaper was found to be entirely feasible. But this only came after the two sides had finally become sure that they had a common ultimate goal and they gave each other an opportunity to make an independent choice of the optimal methods to achieve it.

The value of the activities carried on at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center lies not least of all in the fact that they make it possible to obtain information about the official USSR position on the particular problem. This means, theoretically, that its presentation in the report of the briefing precludes the need to repeat a set of platitudes in other articles, and thus it frees precious newspaper space for our own reflections and polemics. The employees of the press center took a new position, a reasonable and natural one under conditions of glasnost: Soviet and foreign journalists are equally free to choose the subjects for their reports. And this is where an unfortunate fact came out—the newspapers showed more conservatism and inclination to cover themselves than did the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is known for its conservative traditions.

But new problems arise here, because polemics are not yet a welcome guest on the international pages of newspapers. At one of the press conferences just before the Soviet-American summit meeting in Washington the question was asked: does it appear that the U. S. administration is accepting the treaty on elimination of medium and short-range missiles in large part because it is advantageous to it at the particular moment, isn't the foundation too shaky for such serious political decisions?

G. Arbatov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada, responded: I would not be so categorical. Of course there is some element of political calculation and needs. But I think that we have no grounds, and we will not have until we are convinced otherwise, to doubt that an important trend has taken shape in American political life. Today public opinion, the administration, and a majority in the Congress all understand the alarming character of the situation and do not want to allow a continuation of the uncontrolled arms race. If we were guided by a different assessment, the talks themselves would be something very strange. But we begin from the existence of great mutual interest, which breaks a trail through misunderstanding, through mistakes, and through the personal interests of some political figures.

V. Falin, chairman of the board of the Novosti Press Agency, responded: I do not agree with Georgiy Arkadievich in his assessment of how far the United States has

moved to realism. I recall the recent statement of H. Baker, White House chief of staff. He said, "The question of deployment of the SDI systems depends largely on the development of technology." Suppose that technology will permit the Americans to begin a program of deploying SDI. Does that mean that American policy will change? And if the technology does not permit it, then American policy will go the other way. And then after some more years a completely new military technology will appear which again turns everything upside down, and that will mean the whole human race along with American is turned upside down. Policy is becoming a hostage of technology. What is this, a manifestation of new thinking?

G. Arbatov: But look, the political leader in 1980, seeking personal success, trumpeted the need to achieve a position of strength in relations with the Russians, not to talk with them until America achieved military superiority, to increase weapons appropriations many times over, and to disregard signed treaties because they contained significant defects. But in 1987 the same political figure, against trying to strengthen his position, is acting entirely differently. He talks with the Russians, plans a trip to Moscow, and concludes an agreement with the USSR. That means that very major objective changes have taken place in the world.

This excerpt did not appear in the newspapers. But it was not because there was no space for such a lengthy quote. Of course, such an explanation would not arouse any feelings in professionals. It did not appear for very different reasons—probably shouldn't be run, some kind of polemic here, we don't know how we're finally going to stand on this, we'd only confuse the reader...

Does that mean that the problem is that polemics are undesirable? Not exactly, for in this area we observe a curious paradox. Many newspapers have started regular debate columns where the opinions of Soviet and foreign representatives on a particular problem are presented side by side. Our ideological enemies have an opportunity to state and document their point of view, and Soviet journalists get to evaluate it critically. But the evaluation is done without hidden assumptions or reviewing a set of citations; the final conception is what is reviewed, and it is presented right alongside. This is a very good idea.

But why isn't there something similar between Soviet journalists, scientists, and politicians? Is it really true that because we are unanimous in our support and approval of the foreign policy line of the USSR that we inevitably think the same in evaluating various facts of international life and their impact on it? What furious arguments rage over coffee at the end of the working day, how brilliantly professionals defend their points of view, what vivid sparks their collisions give off, and what unexpected, fresh interpretations there are for seemingly hopelessly unambiguous facts. But all this wealth, to our enormous misfortune, simply remains within a very

narrow circle. And it is not so much the editors who are to blame for this as it is the inclination to self-censorship that has become such a profound part of the creative style of the writers.

This hurts even more because our concern for the spiritual equilibrium of the reader, our fear of confusing him with polemics, is unfounded. As a member of a lecture group I have spoken in dozens of auditoriums and never have I been reproached because there is too much diversity in our press. But I have heard the opposite many times. The monolithic thinking of journalists conceals a key reason for the high level of reader distrust of newspaper material on international subjects. This is above all the opinion of the readers themselves.

All the same, the ice is slowly breaking up. Cases of diverging opinions in the newspapers when analyzing specific international events have not yet become the usual thing. But in this instance it is more important to note that they already exist in principle. As an example we can compare the commentaries on publication of the report of the special committees of the U. S. Senate and House of Representatives concerning results of investigation of the Iran-Contra affair.

In the opinion of the TASS correspondent in Washington, "The report observes that ultimately the responsibility for the events in the Iran-Contra affair should fall on the President, who is supposed to know what his national security assistants are doing." The material from the Washington correspondent of PRAVDA noted that "the report in the most unambiguous terms places full responsibility on the President of the United States. According to the conclusions of the lawmakers, the master of the White House stood at the head of those who tried to deceive America."

But here is the conclusion of the press service on this subject. It was run on the first page of IZVESTIYA: "The compilers of the report preferred to acknowledge only that which it was impossible to ignore—namely the direct responsibility of the President of the United States for the secret delivery of arms to Iran. For the other machinations of his 'point men,' they said he is only accountable 'because of his position.'"

I think that the difference in opinions on the position of Congress is apparent. The readers took note of it. Some of them supported the more radical assessment, some shared the IZVESTIYA viewpoint, and others expressed different views. Many letters gave arguments in support of their own opinions. And that is fine—the differing interpretations compelled readers to try to "digest" the information independently, to test its real flavor, and not to be content with propaganda-flavored "sausage."

Here is another example. "In the camp of those who are for common sense (in Soviet-American relations—A.K.) there are, incidentally, many conservatives who only recently were considered incorrigible, sworn enemies of

Soviet-American dialogue. Who do you think this quotation belongs to: "The conclusion of a treaty on elimination of medium and short-range missiles sets a precedent for cooperation and creates a more constructive climate for American-Soviet relations?" It was said by Jean Kirkpatrick, the embodiment of the rigid attitude toward the Soviet Union. No, we did not convert her to our faith. By our persistence, flexibility, and willingness to make mutual concessions we convinced her that it is possible to do business with Moscow."

This quotation is taken from IZVESTIYA. And here is what SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA wrote the day before: "The questions linked with signing the treaty on elimination of missiles are being discussed extensively by experts, who praise the document. But some have a different viewpoint. For example, Jean Kirkpatrick. On the pages of the LOS ANGELES TIMES she sets out a whole list of criticisms and doubts about the treaty and calls on Congress to take its shortcomings into account. That is the real point—the author hopes that the treaty will not be ratified."

I recalled a thought from the notebooks of I. Ilf to the effect that the fly sees the world in general, in large chunks, and does not notice such deadly details as the spider's web. I do not think that any of my colleagues want to be like the fly. But then why do we project its fate on our readers by generally depicting particular figures as either black or white? Only the clash of assessments which I cited above gave a sufficiently live political picture of Jean Kirkpatrick.

In my opinion arguments and debate are the language of restructuring. It is only possible to carry out fundamental transformations in the economy, politics, and ideology on the basis of broad discussion of alternatives. Will there be factories on Lake Baykal or not, where will the northern rivers flow, how can Leningrad be protected from flooding, what should the law on the socialist enterprise be, and how should we evaluate the intraparty debates of the 1920's—dozens of domestic political issues that have been hotly debated in the newspapers and journals could be listed. The polemical impact of the international pages remains insignificant.

Even a very minor remark taken from the teletype of the UPI press agency and published under the headline "Signal from the Capitol" still caused a sharp polarization of views among our colleagues.

"The U. S. Senate unanimously adopted a resolution censuring the Haitian authorities for the bloody provocation used as a pretext to halt general elections. As Senator E. Kennedy stated, 'This is not a government striving to restore democracy, but a band of criminals fighting to keep power.'"

Here is a sampling of the assessments that this modest information report received: "This is apolitical...a crude political error...we are helping the Americans wash their

hands...a propaganda trap...you cannot understand what our position is." In reality this report told how the American Congress, which has always been more critical of the Haitian regime than the administration, officially declared its refusal to support the White House policy. But the objectively debatable aspect of this report was negligible compared to the interview with President Reagan published a few days earlier! That story, however, drew no debate, because it came "from above." That is a very typical feature of the advocates of "principle."

As for the interview itself, I consider it the triumph of the year. For the first time diametrically opposed views were presented without commentary and the readers were able to figure out for themselves what was what, to separate the wheat from the chaff. The editorial mail showed that they met this challenge very successfully.

No one has the ultimate right to the truth. In questions of both practice and theory there should not be a monopoly of one person or group of people. That inevitably leads to fossilization of thought, which would be a death blow to restructuring—that is the point of view of M. S. Gorbachev, expressed by him in his book "Perestroyka i novoye myshleniye dlya nashey strany i dlya vsego mira" [Restructuring and New Thinking for Our Country and for the Whole World] and it should be our guideline and slogan.

And it should not be only or even mainly in "internal" debates. Purely theoretical polemicizing is not useful, for it only draws us away from practical work. We know that the more energy goes for talk, the less is left for work. That kind of debate would only be a mockery of business-like talk; it would be self-deception. In my opinion it is more important to let our colleagues judge our own actual experience—both positive and negative—with attempts that have already been undertaken to change the current state of affairs in the aspects that do not satisfy either the consumer or the producers of international information.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda", "Zhurnalist", 1988

11176

Azeri-Language CP Daily Runs Responses to 'Andreyeva Letter'

'Tragedy' of Stalin Personality Cult

18310428 Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri 17 Apr 88 p 4
[Article by Bakir Nabiyev, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Culture Fund and corresponding member of the Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences: "Truth Is Sacred"; first paragraph is KOMMUNIST introduction]

[Text] Views on the article "Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionism in Thought and Deed" connected with the letter "We Cannot Forsake Principles," which appeared in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on 13 March of this year.

"Innovation has always met with opposition. It is a law of life that the old does not abandon its position easily. As light overcomes darkness, so does progressive innovation continue its march of victory because life must be renewed. In the name of development, of a livelier, fresher, healthier future!—this is what our fathers would say in order to establish what we have created. Whenever I hear the word 'perestroyka' I recall this wise proverb.

"Three years ago our ears became accustomed to the words perestroyka and glasnost. They seemed to cast some light on the horizon. Then, as the months and years went by, this light became a new sun. Restructuring penetrated every people, every home, every heart. People ventured forth into more creative areas, breathed more freely. They thought that restructuring meant a Leninist renewal of the spirit of all the people, our entire country, and the building of our society.

"It is known that the USSR, as the first socialist state in mankind's history, passed through a major path of development in a very short time. From the wooden plow to spaceships! Much has been written about our vast successes and much will continue to be written. But we are not only writing to boast about our history. Conceit is foreign to us. The party also asks us to examine our shortcomings, and it is the duty of every communist and every Soviet citizen to act on this sacred appeal.

"We are the children of the time and must succeed in evaluating the road over which we traveled correctly. Our party's 20th Congress revealed Stalin's cult of personality by means of Leninist courage and principles. Those of my age, and especially the generation older than I, have witnessed the horrors of the 1930's and know the extent of the tragedy of the cult of personality. The attempt to justify such a tragedy in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA (albeit it in only one article) amazed me considerably. True, I am a regular reader of this newspaper. Necessary, problematic, and readable materials on the problems of restructuring appear often in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. I had never expected that an article so discouraging to the readers and so ideationally defective would appear on its pages.

"I would like to pose one question to the author of the article: Did she live through the horrors of Stalin's time? Although I was only a child in 1937, I still cannot forget one nightmarish night during that year. On that night my father and my uncle were taken from their beds and sent into exile. The tears from that night did not dry for decades. How can one justify such a tragedy?

"They say that the intellectual is the eye of the people. How can one justify the unjust torture of Azeri creative intellectuals like Mushfig, Javid, S. Huseyn, and Chamanzaminli in 1937? The cult of personality was the

enemy of truth, humanity, courage, principle, and honor. Fear and toadyism killed whatever was noble in the heart. Hearts and minds were turned into graveyards. Can this really be justified?

"The times of voluntarism and stagnation which N. Andreyeva defends did unprecedented damage to our country and the development of our economy. Lies and exaggeration turned into 'state policy.' 'Victory reports' were issued on fulfilling plans, and banners, medals, and gold stars were handed out. Without exposing and criticizing these monstrosities, how can one heal the wounds they inflicted? Are we returning to these empty claims and empty praise, to a period of managerial imperiousness? No, no, and no again!

"The April (1985) Plenum of our party's Central Committee showed the Soviet people the basic path of development. This path is illuminated by glasnost and democratization. This path is the path of the people's creativity and development. This path is the path of our country's strength and power, the path of the cleansing and purification of socialism—the path of Lenin. We will never deviate from this path!"

Labor Hero Praises Restructuring

18310428 *Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri 17 Apr 88 p 2*

[Article by Safar Abdullayev, hero of socialist labor and production instructor at the Bunyad Sardarov Machine-Building Factory: "There Is No Way Back"; first paragraph is KOMMUNIST introduction]

[Text] Views on the article "Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionism in Thought and Deed" connected with the letter "We Cannot Forsake Principles," which appeared in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on 13 March of this year.

"When reading the article "Principles of Restructuring: Revolutionism in Thought and Deed" which appeared in PRAVDA on 5 April, I became convinced once more that our party is standing on strong ideological ground.

"Three years ago the April (1985) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee laid the foundation for a qualitative renewal of Soviet society and a new stage in socialist development directed at restructuring. In the time that has gone by much work has been done. The concept, strategy, and tactics of restructuring have been prepared and its revolutionary principles precisely defined.

"As M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in his speech to leading workers at the Uzbek CP Central Committee, 'As in every revolution, restructuring demands a definitive, revolutionary change in the form of thought and consciousness.' Today, restructuring is penetrating every home,

every collective, and every Soviet person. The democratization of political life has turned upside down forms considered unchangeable at all levels of the life of society during the period of stagnation.

"Many of us have been witness to the bitter results of the cult of personality and the period of voluntarism and stagnation. People unable to free themselves from the atmosphere of those years and who are living with outmoded stereotypes do not wish to accept restructuring. They must be made to understand that the rejection of restructuring can result in the most serious shortcomings for the internal development of our society, for the international position of the Soviet state and, in general, for socialism.

"Restructuring has gotten off to a good start. Today glasnost and democracy are manifesting themselves in all our work. Now we can raise our heads, straighten up, and begin to discuss openly with strong voices questions whose time has come. Real advances have been made in fulfilling a number of social and economic tasks.

"The profound changes taking place in the life of society are revealing themselves clearly; we are unable to turn back. I will defend restructuring with my entire existence and wish it success."

Reader Accuses MOLODEZH GRUZII of Ignoring Komsomol Shortcomings

18300270 *Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian 5 May 88 p 2*

[Letter to the editor by P. Kobakhidze: "Who, If Not You?"]

[Text] Your paper is the organ of the republic Komsomol Central Committee. In my opinion, it follows that in the first place, all aspects concerned with the life of the Georgian Komsomol—its past and present—should be covered by you. This means both its achievements and its problems. But to be honest, I have the impression that you are interested in the achievements, but not so much in the problems. Both merit equal attention.

Of course, from time to time, critical materials regarding the Komsomol appears on the pages of MOLODEZH GRUZII, but the overwhelming majority of them are unusually one-sided, featureless, boring, and superficial. In general, they are of such a standard that one cursorily scans them and skips to other publications, loath to waste time on them.

But there are plenty of problems in the Komsomol, and who if not you, a youth paper, will raise them in print and organize a discussion? Let's begin with the most important thing: How has the process of democratization going on in our society today affected Komsomol organizations? Or do you suppose that all here is in order? I think not—especially, as one might say, at the middle echelon—the rayon and city committee levels.

The prim rosy young boys blow off specks of dust which have settled on their pressed uniforms as they walk from their private automobiles to their impressive offices. And they do not want to believe that a Komsomol leader's place is somewhere other than in a cushy arm-chair among stacks of telephones. Accounts of completed work are of more concern to them than the work itself. Try to approach one of these types with an idea and he's likely to wave you aside saying that you're wasting his time. But of course he is not the one you should be seeing—he himself should always be in the thick of

things, finding out what the youth are worried about. The notions of an "informal leader" and "informal associations" could appear only as a counterbalance to formal leaders and associations. We had hoped that after the 20th All-Union Komsomol Congress much would have changed regarding these questions. But so far no particularly tangible changes have been noticed.

Why are you hushing up the problems? In this age of glasnost it would be a real shame to lose faith in the press.

Lenin's Role in Collectivization Put Into Perspective

*18000401a Moscow NOVYY MIR in Russian
No 5, May 88 pp 162-189*

[Article by Vasilii Selyunin: "Sources"]

[Text]

1

My brother-in-law and I picked out the spot. A bulldozer operator of the lumber industry enterprise who was driving by turned about of his own accord and opened a way through the snow. He asked only: "Who are you burying?" Learning that it was my mother, he took nothing for the job and drove away. Mother had come in for a good spot—very tall birch trees and a fir tree, upright, as if at attention....

Three months before mama died I had been to call on her. She was born in 1900 (coeval with the century, consequently) and, in keeping with peasant custom, she would arise early and be on the go until evening—cooking, feeding the piglet his food and at odd moments knitting me mittens and for all that having the time to look after and pet her great-grandson. This home with its simple cares and its procedures laid down once for all was good for my thinking. Something thought over a hundred times was put to the test there. The petty and fanciful sifted itself out of its own accord: to the bottom of the heart fell the dry and bitterish precipitation of the truth.

Much of what would be recounted subsequently I had in different years read to mother. She was a good listener—a rare gift these days. From time to time she would put in: "True, son, true, that's how it was," although she could not have known for certain how it was—events of distant centuries were being contrasted and thinkers whom she had not read were being quoted. On another occasion, however, she would look almost reproachfully, with a desire to understand which was beyond her. This was a judgment on me here: abstruse, scrawl.

I loved this last parental roof because beneath it all were replete, shod and clothed. "Man is above satiety"—only he who has not known hunger could utter such a stupidity. No one survived the ordeal in our parts. The family had moved here, to the Murashinskiy Lumber Industry Enterprise, from the Vyatka hamlet of Fomintsy, so named after my great-grandfather Foma Andreyevich. I would have liked to have gone there, since it is not far, to make fleeting contact with the sources—at the end of life love of hearth and home, love for the paternal burial places, swallows up the heart, as the poet beautifully said. What a pity it is that there is nowhere to go—little is left of the village in those parts, and a birch grove covers the fields. The paternal hearth lives only in the memory of the heart. Much has been imprinted thereon

which it would have been more prudent to have forgotten, but which cannot be forgotten. I remember the first shock to the heart of those which mark the end of childhood. The rye was being threshed. We schoolchildren had been detailed to urge on the horses in the driving gear, while mama and the other womenfolk raked away the straw from the threshing machine. Those who had no one with whom to leave the "quailers" at home sat them down on the fresh straw near the threshing floor—watched over all the while. In Vyatka language these were called the sitters: they were about five, but could not yet walk. Their little legs were thin, their heads large and their bellies distended—in a word, rickets sufferers. And I saw how they would nimbly crawl toward the threshing machine and cram handfuls of grain into their mouths. But this was bad—the grain would swell and tear their intestines. Their mothers pulled them further away, but they, the damned things, would once again crawl toward the living food....

In our parts bread was baked with sawdust and with heads of clover, and when it was baked with mashed potato, this was a holiday. It became increasingly nasty in childhood to visit the throne room: the sawdust and undigested green matter scratched the rear passage until it bled.

Such were they, my sources.

Of course, not all years were alike, things were better also, but as of 1932 (that famine I remember distinctly) people could rarely eat until they were full. Harvest or crop failure, there was not much difference: the power had to be fed. And so until completion, until the bread-winners scattered in all directions. After the war, as I was completing army service, mother wrote: go where you want, only do not come home, you will go to waste here. It is surely difficult for mothers to write such epistles.

But she did not like to complain. Her whole life, it seems, I heard only one complaint from her: it was when I was back during the student vacation. "You are now a scholar, Vasenka," she said, "and you have spent many years in school, so explain why Stalin forbids the grass to be cut with the scythe. Pull it up with your hands, but the scythe is not allowed if it's for your own cow. Have we not deserved something from him? Look what will happen to my hands...."

There was indeed something to look at. About that time the writer Fadeyev was tastefully depicting mothers' hands—how kindly, tender, hard-working they were. Actresses with prize-winning insignia on satin dresses read these sincere words from the stage, schoolchildren inserted them in essays. My mother's hands were hard, like hooves.

Her question was simple, but the answer was not. I do not know whether I will live long enough to think everything through completely here, but it needs to be answered—lest it be too late. It was not, understandably,

a question of just one prohibition concerning the scythe, this can be explained without much difficulty. Authorized persons had not been sent to the kolkhozes for the haymaking, so young and old set out: nine piles to the kolkhoz, the tenth for oneself. This was not enough. And whoever did not look after his Zorka could, of course, hardly hibernate as a whole family through the winter and wait for the time of abundance, when from the still bare field horsetail would appear (the best food there was!). However, permitting each to cut for himself at will would have been no incentive to cooperative labor. Pull up the grass by hand, however, and then it would not be prohibited—what the eye can't see.... And at odd moments the womenfolk managed in a summer to lay in between whiles much small grass in their tucked-up aprons.

Why stir up the past? Educated people explain: it is enemies who are dragging us into a debate about the past in order to distract us. The enemy is, it stands to reason, cunning, he always will be. Only how can we learn from history if we once again cover up its lines with our finger: read this, but absolutely not this? And, what is most important, does all of what has been experienced belong to history?

...A whole era passed into nonexistence with my mother, passed, let us hope, never to return. Its generation dragged along with it over the ruts and potholes history itself, wherever was prescribed. And if their sufferings were, for all that, remelted down, as planned, in the might of the power, all the same, doubt as to the price which had to be paid will not let us rest. How was it that man, the crown of creation, represented merely the material and resource for social experiments, the dung which impregnated the soil for the contemplated universal prosperity? It is explained to us: it's all over, the leftist idea concerning the creative role of violence, concerning extra-economic compulsion to labor was always alien to our goals, and it was only under the impact of particular historical conditions and, more, owing to subjectivist mistakes and distortions that it for was for a certain time actually implemented. But the question is so important and of such practical significance that absolutely nothing can be taken on trust here.

2

Thinkers of distant eras, socialists of the senses justifiably waxed indignant: what kind of a society is it in which a glazier dreams of hail which would knock out windows, a gravedigger, of epidemics? It is different when property and the products of labor are common. One wonders, however, why would there be a sufficiency of these products. Wealth is created by labor and only labor. Thus what kind of force compels labor? Thinkers could not, of course, have avoided this fundamental question.

Let us take a look at Thomas More's "Utopia". A participant in the debate ponders: "...it will never be possible to live prosperously where everything is common. For how will there be enough of everything if everyone avoids work? After all, he has no expectation of benefit to himself, and assurance as to another's diligence will make him indolent." The answer is such: in the blessed society there would have to be permanent overseers or, as More calls them, (siphogrants). "The main and virtually sole business of the (siphogrants) is to make sure no one be in a state of idleness. But that everyone assiduously set about his craft...."

For all that he was a Utopian, the question was well-foundedly posed and answered to the point: benefit is replaced by extra-economic compulsion. This simplicity and clarity in tackling the problem are lacking in the founders of scientific socialism. In the dispute with Duchring Engels emphatically rejects the assumption that differences in pay would be preserved in the socialist society. In the celebrated example involving the barrow boy and the architect an unequivocal solution is adduced: both should receive the same. Why? Very simple: the higher skills of the architect are not his personal merit. "In the society of individual producers," Engels writes, "expenditure on the training of a worker is defrayed by private individuals or their families; for this reason it is private individuals primarily who come in for a higher value of trained manpower: the skillful slave is sold at a higher price, the expert hired worker receives higher wages. In a society organized in socialist fashion this expenditure would be borne by society, and for this reason the fruits thereof, that is, the greater values created by complex labor, belong to it. The workman himself has no right to claim extra remuneration" (1). For Engels, incidentally, differences in the remuneration of simple and complex labor are of no practical interest: in the new society there would be neither architects nor barrow boys, everyone would know how to do everything—the architect, say, would for 2 hours of his shift give instructions in his special field and would for the time remaining push a barrow or, we would add, sort vegetables at the depot. The question of with what to replace the former incentives and what kind of force would compel a workman to work is avoided here.

Marx's opinion is sounder. He allows of differences in pay depending on the quantity and quality of labor: "...each individual producer obtains from society in return after all deductions exactly as much as he himself gives to it.... For this reason the *equal right* here is in principle still a *bourgeois right*" (2). A bourgeois right under socialism? Clearly, such an unnatural thing may be permitted only for a very short time.

What, then, is a permanent stimulus? Many thinkers of the past believed that such would in time not be needed at all—labor would become the first vital requirement and a play of physical and spiritual forces. The power of such theories consists of their irrefutability. It can always be said: their turn has still to come, and if it has not come

as yet, then you and I are to blame—we have not learned to find the reward for labor in the very process of labor. An undoubtedly noble goal, however, even now we are hardly closer to it than 20, 30, however many years ago.

If the problem has not been satisfactorily solved today even, what difficulties the first builders of the new society must have encountered! In accordance with the bidding of the classics, everyone now had to work equally and receive equally.

Such experience was unknown to history. More precisely, there was purely negative experience: this problem had been wrestled with in the past by the Jacobins—"the fiercest and sincerest revolutionaries," in Lenin's words (3). In the search for practical solutions Ilich recalled them frequently and collated the French Revolution with ours, reflecting on the limits of violence in economic building.

The conscious participants in and leaders of that alien revolution were initially by no means supporters of violence, and of terror even less. Educated by representatives of the Enlightenment, they relied more on reason. Liberty, equality and fraternity seemed to them such obvious values that defending them was seemingly not necessary—it was necessary only to once establish them, and there would then be no madmen who would be opposed to these attractive things. "A few opportunely chopped-off heads..." Marat believed, "would spare our great nation for whole centuries the disasters of poverty and the horrors of civil wars." This was written at the start of 1790. But 6 months later the same Marat was demanding the chopping-off of 500-600 heads, after a further 6 months, 5,000-6,000, and in 1793, over a million. And these were not rhetorical exercises—the guillotine was in excellent working order. Read just the works of Gracchus Babeuf, recently published in our country. The evidence of this person is all the more important in that he was a participant in all stages of the revolution and occupied, what is more, the extreme left flank in the alignment of forces, and for this reason it is hard to suspect him of being an impassioned critic of Jacobinism. He recounts in the book, which was written hot on the trail of events, the activity of Carrier—one of Robespierre's closest associates.

I shall not refrain from quoting an extract from this work (I trust the reader will not be confused by the multitude of rows of dots—after each fact the conscientious author cited witnesses). "Was it really necessary," Babeuf inquires, "for the salvation of the homeland to carry out 23 mass drownings in Nantes, including one in which 600 children perished? Did we really need the 'republican marriages,' when young girls and boys, stripped stark naked, were bound in pairs, stunned by saber blows to the head and thrown into the Loire?... Was it really necessary... for 10,000 citizens to have died in Nantes prisons from emaciation, infectious disease and all kinds of misfortunes and for 30,000 to have been executed or drowned?... Was it really necessary... to have cut down

people with the saber in Department Square?... Was it really necessary... to have ordered army infantry and mounted detachments to shoot insurgents who had shown up voluntarily to surrender?... Was it really necessary... to have drowned or shot a further 500 children, of whom the oldest were no more than 14 and whom Carrier had called 'vipers who need to be smothered'?... Was it really necessary... to have drowned from 30 to 40 women in the ninth month of pregnancy and to have put on display the horrific spectacle of the still twitching corpses of children thrown into tanks filled with excrement?... Was it really necessary to have torn the fetuses from women near their time, carried them on bayonets and then thrown them into the water?... Was it really necessary to have instilled in the soldiers of Marat Company the grisly conviction that each should be capable of drinking a glass of blood?..."

Were we Hecuba even, it would nonetheless, seemingly, be better to stock up with validol before reading such stuff. It might be useful for today's critics of the red terror imposed in 1918 to refresh their memory of this testimony. It is important for the subject of our discussion, however, that a fundamental purpose of the violence were purely economic tasks. While having passionately condemned the celebrated terrorist, Gracchus Babeuf, a communist-Utopian by conviction, is disposed on one key point to exonerate him: "Among the crimes attributed to Carrier is the fact that he crushed petty trading in Nantes and fulminated against the mercantile... spirit... that he ordered the arrest of all profiteers without exception and all those who since the start of the revolution had engaged in this shameful business within the confines of the city of Nantes; and the fact that he ordered the arrest of all middlemen and all persons of either sex who had engaged in the buying up and resale of basic necessities and had derived infamous profits, selling them at prices in excess of the maximum established by law. There is no doubt that had democratic principles and the supreme law of the good of the people not been abolished, these facts, taken in themselves, not only could not have been brought as an indictment against Carrier but could by their nature have earned him laurels among the republicans."

The heart of the matter is concealed here by the telling expressions "infamous profits," "shameful business," "petty trading" and so forth. It is absolutely necessary to force one's way through this abuse to the meaning of events. The revolution, according to Marx, had wiped away "at once, as if by magic, all feudal ruins from the face of France" (4). Scope was afforded a new mode of production—capitalist—and development was not henceforward constrained by feudal shackles. And the most populous class of society, the peasants, availed itself of unprecedented opportunities for producing for sale to their benefit or, if you wish, for the sake of infamous profits. But the profit which was derived meant inequality. Motivated by the ideas of the men of the Enlightenment and, most, by pressing worries concerning food for the army and the cities, the Jacobins imposed savage

measures against profiteers (that is, against the market, without which commodity production is inconceivable) and controlled consumption by maximum laws. Confiscating without compensation from the peasants the fruits of their labor was possible only with the aid of violence. Terror gave birth to the Vendee, with which the revolutionaries attempted to cope by even crueler terror.

The Jacobins lay across the paths of life and thereby signed their own death warrant. They departed the historical scene, leaving behind them not only piles of corpses but also a new France adapted for the sole efficient mode of production at that time. The terror and violence for economic ends were a deviation from the tasks of the revolution, an episode.

Things are far more complex in socialist revolutions. The extermination of "infamous profits" and the eradication of commodity production and private enterprise are no longer a deviation from the goal here but, on the contrary, the goal. It was not, generally, all that difficult driving out the landowners and nationalizing the major enterprises, but this by no means solved the problem. "What is meant by suppression of the bourgeoisie?" Lenin went on to explain. "The landowner may be suppressed and done away with by the fact that manorial land tenure has been done away with and the land handed over to the peasants. But can the bourgeoisie be suppressed and done away with by the fact that big capital has been done away with? Anyone who has studied the rudiments of Marxism knows that the bourgeoisie cannot be suppressed in this way and that the bourgeoisie is born of commodity production; under these conditions of commodity production the peasant, who has hundreds of poods of surplus grain which he does not need for his family and which he does not surrender to the worker state on loan to assist the hungry worker and engages in profiteering—what is this? Is this not the bourgeoisie? Is it not born here?... This is what is terrible, this is where the danger to the socialist revolution lies!" (vol 39, pp 421, 422)

Truly a formidable danger. Lenin even permitted the thought of the recoil of the revolution from the socialist to the bourgeois phase. All would depend on whether it would be possible to get the better of petty bourgeois spontaneity: "If we do not conquer it, we will slide back, like the French Revolution. This is inevitable, and this needs to be faced completely unblinkered and without employing phrases to excuse ourselves" (vol 43, p 141).

The weapons in the struggle could be various. "Whereas 125 years ago," V.I. Lenin wrote, "the endeavor to conquer the profiteer by the execution of individuals and a few of the 'elite' and thunderous declamations was excusable in the French petty bourgeois and the fiercest and sincerest revolutionaries, now a purely phrase-mongering attitude toward the question among any left SR's evokes in any conscious revolutionary only revulsion or disgust. We know full well that the economic basis of

profiteering is the petty-proprietor stratum, which was exceptionally wide in Old Russia, and private-economy capitalism, which has its agent in *each* petty bourgeois" (vol 36, p 297).

On 10 November 1917 even profiteers were declared enemies of the people, and 3 months later a decree written by Lenin gave the unambiguous instruction: "profiteers... to be shot at the scene of the crime" (5). Understandably, given the unregulated state trade, any sale of food was considered profiteering. "Not one pood of grain," the authorities decreed, must remain in the hands of the holders, except for the quantity necessary to sow their fields and for food for their families until the new harvest.... All those with grain surpluses who do not bring it to the collecting points... to be declared enemies of the people and arraigned before a revolutionary court in order that the guilty parties be sentenced to imprisonment for a term of not less than 10 years, expelled from the community forever and all their property confiscated..." (6).

It is customary to believe that these severities were brought about by the starvation and devastation. But as we have seen, it was a question of a fundamental principle: if commodity production and its attendant market were not done away with, the October revolution would descend, so to speak, to the bourgeois level. There was, however, sufficient commonsense to understand that the food produced in the country would be eaten up by its population. It was not starvation which prompted the requisitions but rather the reverse: the consequence of the mass requisitions was starvation. It was proposed to the peasants that they feed the country for free, without any benefit to themselves. The muzhik responded to these measures at best with a reduction in the sowings, at worst, with a cutback to the absolute minimum.

The majority of historians, both Soviet and foreign, reduce the civil war to the confrontation of reds and whites, the difference consisting only of marks of appraisal. The facts show, however, that there was a third force, which suffered the main blow—the peasant insurgent movement. In different periods and with a varying degree of assertiveness it formed blocs sometimes with the whites, sometimes with the reds, remaining a relatively independent force. Long before the revolution, anticipating events, Lenin wrote: "We will at first support to the utmost, by all measures, as far as confiscation, the peasant generally against the landowner, and then (and not even then but at the same time) we will support the proletariat against the peasant in general" (vol 11, p 222). In the struggle against the landowner the interests of the peasantry coincided entirely with the interests of the new power, which was understood even by the white generals. A letter from Kolchak to Denikin, for example, has been preserved: the luckless admiral condemned the land policy, "which is creating in the peasantry the idea of the restoration of

manorial land tenure." No sooner had this danger disappeared than the gray host turned front. At the height of the civil war Lenin noted with alarm that "the peasantry of the Urals, Siberia and the Ukraine is turning to Kolchak and Denikin" (vol 40, p 17). As the white movement was routed, the resistance grew. The headquarters of the eastern front reported, for example, in 1919 from the Volga region: "...the peasants have become brutalized and are coming on to the machine-guns with pitchforks, stakes and handguns alone and in groups, despite the mounds of corpses, and their ferocity beggars description." The historian M. Kubanin has estimated that in Tambov Province 25-30 percent of the population took part in the uprising. He concludes: "Undoubtedly, 25-30 percent of the population of a village means that the entire adult male population had joined Antonov's army." According to archive documents made public in 1962, the peasant army in the Tambov campaign incorporated 18 well-armed regiments. The regular forces under the command of Tukhachevskiy had to fight a real war here, no less intense than previously against the Kolchak people. Lenin himself said plainly that petty bourgeoisie spontaneity had proven more dangerous than all the white armies together.

The logic of the struggle compelled violence to be met with violence. The difficulty was that the peasant uprisings were to be put down by an army made up mainly of peasants. What were required, consequently, were some forces unreservedly devoted to the revolution ready to carry out any order. One such force was cited in a brief communication on the smashing of the peasant uprising in Livny:

"The city suffered comparatively little. The dead and wounded are now being cleared away on the city's streets. Losses among the reinforcements which arrived later are comparatively few. Only the valorous internationalists sustained cruel losses. On the other hand, they literally shredded masses of white guards, bestrewing all streets with them."

It is a question of former POW's who had joined the Red Army voluntarily. There were up to 300,000 of them—specialists consider so large a number of foreigners in a combatant army a unique phenomenon for contemporary history. They showed themselves to be highly reliable when putting down the peasant insurrections and put a stop to attempts at desertion in the army itself when it was thrown into battle against the "third force". Special units operated successfully also.

It is easily understood, however, that the final solution of the peasant question could not have been achieved by military means alone. The goal was the elimination of commodity production in the countryside. But the strongest were the kulak commodity farms, which employed wage labor. The kulaks, as Lenin defined them, "are the most brutal, coarse and savage exploiters" (vol 37, p 40). "And if the kulak remains unaffected," Vladimir Ilich

said, "if we fail to conquer the extortioners, there will inevitably once again be a tsar and the capitalist" (vol 37, p 176). He issued to the agitators sent to the province the directive: "...the kulaks and extortioners must be cut down" (vol 35, p 326). The authorities could rely in the countryside in this cutting down only on the poor, but they constituted a negligible minority of the rural population (let us not forget that as a result of the revolution the peasants had acquired land). Poor peasant committees were set up in June 1918. With their help 50 million hectares of land were taken away from the kulaks. This was approximately one-third of agricultural land at that time. The material base of the kulak economy was thereby destroyed. The facts incontrovertibly show that the kulaks were wiped out precisely in the years of "war communism" and not on the frontier of the 1920's-1930's.

However, the middle peasant also wished to trade in the products of his labor, but trade, according to the notions of that time, led directly to capitalism. It was believed that grain not surrendered per the requisitioning, albeit cultivated with one's own hands, would be appropriated by the muzhik and that he would thereby become a class enemy. "If the peasant sits on an individual plot of land," Lenin maintained, "and appropriates surplus grain, that is, grain needed neither by him nor his livestock, and all the rest are without grain, the peasant becomes an exploiter. The more grain he reserves for himself, the more profitable to him it is, and let others starve: 'the more they starve, the more dearly I will sell this grain'. It is necessary that everyone work per a single common plan on common land, at common factories and plants and per common regulations" (vol 41, pp 310-311).

Consequently, the true accomplishment of the tasks of the socialist revolution was seen in the enlistment of the peasantry in work on common land. This was a program principle of the Bolshevik Party. Back in 1902 Lenin had explained: "The social democrat... should start propagandizing nationalization of the land only as a transition to the large-scale communist, and not petty individualist, farm" (vol 6, p 339). Shortly after October Vladimir Ilich took control of "the business of the gradual, but unswerving transition from small individual farms to the social cultivation of the land" (vol 37, p 364). In January 1918 even he took part in the formulation of the "Basic Law on Socialization of the Land". As S. Ivanov, member of the preparatory commission, attests, "it was in fact Comrade Lenin alone who worked in the commission, we merely voted." During the discussion a dispute arose—not as yet about kulak but only about manorial land. The SR's insisted on it being shared out among the peasants, which would have strengthened the economic basis of petty bourgeois spontaneity. Lenin, however, supported the creation of sovkhozes on the manorial land. It was this idea which passed.

In December 1918 Lenin set up a special commission to prepare the regulations governing the social cultivation of the land. One of its members, P. Pershin, recounts that

the finished draft was edited by Vladimir Ilich personally—in accordance with his instructions, the land was assigned primarily to collective farms, and the implements were alienated in their favor from the well-to-do peasants without compensation, and from the middle peasants and the poor, for a fee not exceeding stable prices, that is, for a symbolic redemption. The "Regulations Governing Socialist Land Use and Measures for Transition to Socialist Farming" were promulgated in February 1919. This document said that all types of individual land use should be seen as transitional and moribund—they would be replaced by sovkhozes, production communes and other associations for the joint cultivation of the land.

Despite the manifest benefits (better land, free transfer of implements), the peasant did not join these associations. Nonetheless, more than 5,000 sovkhozes and approximately 6,000 kolkhozes had been created in a short time. But, as Lenin acknowledged, "the kolkhozes are as yet so unregulated and in such a lamentable condition that they justify the appellation workhouses" (vol 42, p 180).

The best minds of that era attempted to elucidate why so advantageous an undertaking as collectivization culminated in complete failure. The course of the arguments ran thus: the simple addition of land and primitive implements is not enough to ensure a qualitative improvement in the development of production. Were we able to give the countryside 100,000 tractors, any peasant would say: I support the commune. But this equipment is lacking as yet—it will appear, according to calculations, no earlier than about 10 years hence.

From the height of historical experience today we cannot accept such an explanation as being sufficiently full. Mechanization, chemicalization, reclamation, intensive techniques—all this is hopelessly insufficient for success. Lev Tolstoy even understood that the main thing is "not nitrogen and not oxygen, which are in the soil and in the air, and not a special plow and manure, but the main tool, by means of which the nitrogen, the oxygen, the manure and the plow work is the muzhik-workman." But his interest was ignored—the emphasis was put on naked force. Here, it seems to me, are the deep-lying sources of many of the difficulties experienced by the country.

Incidentally, extra-economic compulsion was applied at that time not only in respect of the peasantry. Any revolution is only worth anything when it knows how to defend itself. This is axiomatic. Only the Pharisee would today venture to condemn the punitive measures against the counterrevolutionaries. Yes, the third day after the October revolution the opposition press was closed down, but the decree rightly said that this weapon "is no less dangerous at such times than bombs and machine-guns." Yes, a machinery of violence was created in the shape of the Cheka. But again Lenin was right: "Without such preemption, the power of the working people cannot exist" (vol 44, p 328). On 31 January 1918 the

government ordered "the adoption of measures to increase places of confinement." Somewhat later it was deemed necessary "to secure the Soviet Republic against class enemies by way of their isolation in concentration camps." Dzerzhinskiy's explanation is reasonable: "...the need for self-defense was so great that we might knowingly have closed our eyes to a number of our mistakes... provided that the republic was preserved, as was the case in the red terror era. This is why the law affords the Cheka an opportunity to administratively isolate the transgressors of labor practices, parasites and persons suspected of counterrevolution, in respect of whom the information for judicial punishment is insufficient and where any court, even the strictest, would always or for the most part exonerate them" (7).

The ear of the economist picks up, however, in this statement a certain dissonance: together with "those suspected of counterrevolution" transgressors of labor practices are to be accommodated in the concentration camp. In another document Dzerzhinskiy interprets the purpose of the camps very broadly: "In addition to court sentences it is essential to keep administrative sentences, namely, the concentration camp.... I propose keeping these concentration camps for the use of the labor of detainees, for gentlemen without occupations and for those who cannot work without a certain compulsion or, to take Soviet establishments, a measure of such punishment for a unconscientious attitude toward work, for slackness, for lateness and so forth should be applied here. We would with this measure be able to smarten up our own workers even" (8).

The limits of violence expand, as we can see, boundlessly—originally it was employed to suppress opponents of the revolution, then spread to potential enemies (the red terror) and, finally, became a means of tackling purely economic tasks. In 1920 Trotsky proposed that this business be put on a firm and long-term basis, converting the country into a giant concentration camp, more precisely, into a system of camps. At the ninth party congress he set forth a historically unprecedented program: the workers and peasants should be put in the position of mobilized soldiers and are to go to form "labor units approximating military units in type". Everyone is obliged to consider himself "a soldier of labor who cannot dispose of himself freely, if an order has been given for his transfer, he must execute it; if he does not, he will be a deserter who is punished" (9).

Would such labor be efficient? Capitalism had conquered the preceding formation by having put up in the place of the stick, serf dependency and droit de seigneur a more effective incentive to labor—personal benefit and the right to sell one's manpower. Camp labor law would have signified in practice a step backward in the history of mankind. Trotsky emphatically objects: "If we take at face value the old bourgeois prejudice or not old bourgeois prejudice but old bourgeois axiom, which has become a prejudice, to the effect that forced labor is unproductive, this applies not only to a labor army but

also to labor service as a whole, to the basis of our economic building and, consequently, to socialist organization in general" (that's candor for you: forced labor—the basis of socialist organization!). According to Trotsky, the "bourgeois axiom" was correct only with reference to the past: "We say: it is a falsehood that forced labor is under all circumstances and under all conditions unproductive" (10).

Contemporary historians maintain that the congress rejected Trotsky's military-bureaucratic line in economic building. But this is a manifest erasure of history (a customary business in Old Russia—even Herzer had wittily observed: "The Russian Government, like a providence in reverse, is arranging for the better not the future but the past"). Let us turn to the main resolution of the congress—"Priority Tasks of Economic Building":

"Approving the Russian Communist Party Central Committee propositions concerning mobilization of the industrial proletariat, labor service, militarization of the economy and the use of military units for economic needs, the congress decrees:

"...the registration of all skilled workers for the purpose of their enlistment in production work with the same consistency and strictness as this was and continues to be done in respect of persons of the command staff for the needs of the army.

"That every skilled worker must return to work in his special field....

"That it is essential from the very outset to correctly organize mass labor service mobilization, that is, establish on each occasion as far as possible a precise correspondence between the number of persons mobilized, their mustering point, the size of the labor assignment and the quantity of necessary tools. It is just as important to provide the labor units formed from mobilized persons with technically competent and politically stable instructor personnel and communist labor cells selected in advance per party mobilization, that is, to proceed the same as we proceeded in creating the Red Army" (11).

The resolution goes on to recommend "the application of a system of assignments, given nonaccomplishment of which there is a reduction in rations." And inasmuch as "significant numbers of workers, in the search for better food conditions and frequently for profiteering purposes, quit the enterprises without authorization and move from place to place, which strikes the severest blows at production," this must be cut short in a "rigorous struggle against labor desertion, specifically, by way of the publication of penal deserter lists, the formation from the ranks of deserters of penal work teams and, finally, their confinement to a concentration camp" (12).

Do not think that it was a question of temporary measures. The resolution "Transition to a Militia System" explains: since the civil war is coming to an end

and Soviet Russia's international position is favorable a militia system of the economy, whose essence "is to consist of the army being brought as close as possible to the production process so that the vital human force of particular economic areas is at the same time the vital human force of particular military units," will be introduced for the future period, "which could be of a prolonged nature" (13).

These documents are all the more instructive in that they lay bare to the utmost the connection of the economic mechanism with the rights of the individual. Commodity capitalist production means that whoever has the money is free to engage in a profitable undertaking, acquire property, take risks and bear the economic responsibility for his actions. Any person has the right to dispose of his property, even if such consists merely of a pair of workman's hands. A harsh system, undoubtedly, but it is not necessary under it to compel people to labor by threats and police surveillance. The state has no need, for example, to cut short strikes inasmuch as the losses from them are borne by the private employer. While not guaranteeing employment, the state is obliged to accord the individual full freedom of initiative to enrich himself or to vegetate, each as he is able. Individual rights are the other side of the ruthless economic liberties. On the other hand, given total state ownership of the means of production, there arises the temptation to expropriate the individual himself also and his physical and intellectual powers in order to organize work per a uniform plan and routine. Under these conditions it is permissible to see man as the cog of a giant machine preparing future happiness for all. It would be strange talking about the individual rights and civil liberties of a cog and, equally, of the screwdriver which drives it into the appointed place.

Trotsky's crude daydreams were not destined to be realized at that time—they were imperatively rejected by life. The economic results of "war communism" left no doubt that the "bourgeois axiom" concerning the inefficiency of forced labor was true, for all that. In 1920 the production of coal had declined by a factor of over 3 compared with 1917, the smelting of steel, by a factor of 16, production of cotton cloth, twelvefold, sugar production, tenfold, and so forth. Annual per capita steel production fell to 1.5 kg, and one pair of shoes was made per 50 persons. In the same 1920 the workers of Moscow employed in the heaviest physical labor obtained 225 grams of bread, 7 grams of meat or fish and 10 grams of sugar per day. The harvest failure of 1921 brought the country to the edge of the abyss.

3

In contrast to Trotsky, who saw as the root of the evil the general slackness and who planned to overcome sloppiness by police methods, Lenin swiftly understood the bankruptcy of the economic policy of "war communism": "...we made the mistake of deciding to effect the

immediate transition to communist production and distribution. We decided that the peasants would, per the requisitioning, produce the quantity of grain which we needed and that we would apportion it by plant and factory—and communist production and distribution would emerge here” (vol 44, p 157).

The Kronshtadt sailors mutinied on 1 March 1921. The Petersburg workers, and not only the Petersburg workers, struck simultaneously. “This is something new,” Lenin reflected. “This circumstance, tied in with all the crises, needs to be considered very attentively politically and investigated very thoroughly. Petty bourgeois, anarchic spontaneity with slogans of free trade and always directed against the dictatorship of the proletariat was manifested here. And this mood had a very extensive effect on the proletariat. It was reflected at enterprises of Moscow, it was reflected at enterprises in a whole number of provincial centers” (vol 43, p 24). The political demands put forward by the strikers evoked Ilich’s particular concern: “Ferment and anger among nonparty workers undoubtedly came to light recently. When non-party meetings were held in Moscow, it was clear that they were making from freedom and democracy a slogan leading to the ouster of Soviet power” (vol 43, p 31).

Lenin voiced these thoughts in March 1921 at the 10th party congress. It was here, on his insistence, that the key decision on the replacement of requisitioning by a fixed tax on the peasants was adopted. It was not at this time an integral system here. The measure was considered temporary. It was not fortuitous that it was introduced in March in order that there be time to notify the peasants prior to the start of the sowing: expand the sowings, there will be no requisitions this year. At the same time, however, the free sale of the grain remaining following payment of the tax was not envisaged. “Freedom of trade,” Lenin emphasized, “even if not initially associated with the white guards as was Kronshtadt, would nonetheless inevitably lead to these white guards, to the victory of capital and to its restoration in full” (vol 43, p 25). But these were already rearguard battles. The fixed tax constituted approximately one-half of the previously planned requisitions. Clearly, only the free sale of the products of rural labor could produce the bulk of the food. Literally 2 months later, in May 1921, the party conference defined the NEP as a system of measures and a policy adopted in earnest and for a long time. Within a year the entire economic mechanism of “war communism” had been dismantled and replaced by the new economic policy, which was in its main outlines similar to the new economic mechanism which is coming into being currently.

I see in this lesson support for our present perestroika. We are faced with changes no less revolutionary—the working people are unwilling to live in the old way any longer, the administrative machinery cannot administer in the old way. The directions of radical reforms are now, in general, clear, but even the ardent supporters of perestroika are saying in effect: the democratization of

social life and economic innovations need to be introduced gradually, over a period of years. This option would most likely not come off—there is simply no time reserve, it was used up and dissolutely squandered in the stagnation decades. If there are no abrupt changes, it is estimated, in the mid-1990’s our economy will collapse, with all the ensuing consequences—social, foreign policy, military and so forth. It would then be too late to worry about democracy—dictatorship is more in keeping with periods of economic disintegration. Until recently the facts testifying to this vector of the country’s development could only be observed with sorrow and alarm. In April 1985 a chance of salvation appeared here. The opportunities have now grown, and it would be criminal to pass them up. The experience of the start of the 1920’s is good in that it proves the possibility of revolutionary changes at the top in literally a matter of months.

And the second lesson for us is the striking speed of the trigger pulses transmitted to the economy. It was because the changes were rapid and radical that the old economic mechanism did not impede the new one. The 1921 harvest failure does not count here—this was a natural disaster and largely a consequence of the “war communism” experiments. But what is instructive is that in the terrible hunger the peasant uprisings ceased—there were no reasons to rebel since the family’s prosperity henceforward depended on its own labor. Economic measures were far more successful in lifting the social tension than executions. A good harvest was gathered in in 1922 even. The 12th party congress even gave instructions for efforts to be directed at the search for a foreign market for the grain (it is pleasant to recall, is it not, that such a thing happened in contemporary history in our country). The prewar level in industry and agriculture was achieved in just 4-5 years. In 1928 it was exceeded in industry by 32 percent, in the countryside, by 24 percent. Compared with 1921 national income had risen by a factor of 3.3, and industrial production had increased by a factor of 4.2, by a factor of 7.2 in big industry included. The workers’ real wages surpassed the prewar level. It is estimated that as of 1924 people were fed better than ever before. On a country average the worker consumed, for example, 72 kg of meat a year—impressive even by today’s standards.

The economic successes went hand in hand with the democratization of social life (this fact is very relevant at the present abrupt turning point). The limits of violence narrowed sharply, and legality was strengthened. Lenin substantiated this thus: “The more we embark upon conditions which are those of strong and firm authority and the further the development of the civic turnaround proceeds, the more insistently it is necessary to advance the firm slogan of the exercise of large-scale revolutionary legality and the narrower the sphere of the institution which replies to every blow of the conspirators with a retaliatory blow becomes” (vol 44, p 329). The country acquired criminal and civil codes. The revolutionary tribunals were replaced by courts, and a procuracy and

legal profession were instituted. The role of the unions changed. Whereas in March 1918 Lenin had unceremoniously declared: "The trade unions... must be state organizations" (vol 36, p 160), the party had now radically revised this position. The 11th party congress (1922) instructed them to deal with "defense of the interests of the working masses in the most direct and immediate meaning of the word." Defense against whom? Not only against the private trader but also against the "bureaucratic distortion" of the machinery of state (14). How far individual liberties extended can be seen if only from the fact that works of literature and art and works on sociology and politics, for the mere custody of which one subsequently usually paid with one's life, were published openly. But there were no social cataclysms.

Extra-economic compulsion was definitely not needed as an incentive either in the private or state sector of the economy. As regards the private trader, everything is clear. As of 1917 he had just about been laid to rest when he once again rapidly began to make his way. Without state investments and without the petty tutelage and bothersome efforts of the authorities he restored trade and services. The private peasant farms supplied the country comfortably. More, as of the mid-1920's until collectivization the country was exporting abroad 1.5 million poods of grain annually. The currency proceeds went to the treasury.

And even our money was the real thing. By the start of 1924 there were in circulation over R1.3 quadrillion, and the purchasing power of the ruble had fallen by a factor of 28 million. But in 1925 even, following the monetary reform, our chervonets was worth more on the London Stock Market than the pound sterling, which was a cause for perplexity and concern on the part of the arrogant British. Given the stable monetary circulation, the state no longer received, as before, in the form of taxes, piles of devalued Soviet banknotes but became the proprietor of actual resources, which could be invested in the development of desired industries, in heavy industry primarily. The celebrated GOELRO plan was implemented at that time. Having obtained from the treasury money for the construction of a station, the client purchased material and equipment on a contractual basis—the state did not confiscate them from the suppliers without compensation, as had been the practice at the time of "war communism" and did not transfer ownership for receipts, as was done subsequently. Upon completion of the construction, the power station switched to the customary method of commercial activity. Heavy industry developed at a preferential pace: according to official statistics, in the period 1923-1928 the production of producer goods grew by an average of 28.5 percent a year, and the production of consumer goods, by 21.4 percent.

True, the small urban businessman intuitively perceived the instability of the enabling legislation and was chary of investing his income in industrial enterprises. And if

some people did take the risk, they endeavored to "eat up" the profits as quickly as possible or convert them into a little gold for a rainy day. Trade was the field in which the private dealer really expanded: the original investments are minimal and are rapidly recouped—he has the money, let them shut up shop. The peasant also—the country's breadwinner—continually felt the inhibiting restrictions. But what if the obstacles were removed? Such an idea was presented by Bukharin—a curious personality, it has to be said. A "left communist" at the time of "war communism," the author of the first noncommodity concepts of the development of the economy in our country and a supporter of the abolition of money, he underwent a headlong evolution because he sought answers to the most important questions of the time in real life.

In a speech at a meeting of the Moscow party aktiv on 17 April 1925 Bukharin explained the NEP thus: "Certain vestiges of war-communism relations, which are hampering our further growth, persist here.... The prosperous upper stratum of the peasantry and the middle peasant, who also aspires to prosperity, are now afraid of accumulation. A situation is being created wherein the peasant is afraid to install for himself an iron roof because he fears that he will be declared a kulak; if he buys machinery, he does so such that the communists do not see this. The highest technology is becoming secret....

"By and large, the entire peasantry and all its strata need to be told: get rich, accumulate, develop your farm" (Bukharin would later be reminded of this call).

But what was the use of all this for industrialization? A dual use, according to Bukharin. A countryside growing richer would increase demand for the product of industry, which would lead to its rapid growth. The peasants' cash deposits in the banks would be an additional resource for the development of the economy.

Many of the restrictions were at that time lifted. Commodity production inevitably led to the property stratification of the countryside—some farms were ruined, others strengthened. The leasing of land and the hiring of manpower and all obstacles to free trade were removed at the start of 1925. Objectively this led to the formation of highly efficient farmsteads, like the American ones.

In accordance with Bukharin's idea, economic liberties are useful for more than just the countryside: "We must learn to manage in cultured manner under the difficult conditions of the reconstruction period.... The maximum of economic factors working for socialism must be activated and made mobile here. This presupposes a most complex combination of personal, group, mass social and state initiative. We have overcentralized everything unduly.... Should we not be taking several steps in the direction of Lenin's commune state?" This passage is taken from "Notes of an Economist" published in PRAVDA for 30 September 1928, that is, literally on the eve of day one of the First Five-Year Plan

(the economic year began at that time on 1 October, and it is this date which is taken as the start of the accelerated industrialization). By publication of the "Notes" Bukharin was still attempting to influence events.

Thus we have before us an integral plan of socialist building. Granted all its practicality, Bukharin's idea had one contentious point: how viable was the said "complex combination"? How would the private farms and state industry get along together? Is it at all conceivable inscribing the property owner in socialism? Of course, the author of the plan recognized this controversial aspect full well. He saw as the solution of the clash the fact that the countryside would arrive at socialism via the gradual voluntary formation of the peasant farms into cooperatives. He relied here on recent works of Lenin and his idea that under the conditions of Soviet power the simple growth of cooperatives was identical to the growth of socialism.

Yet from the very outset the NEP had been opposed by a formidable opposition. In 1923 even, at the 12th party congress, Trotsky, the theoretician of barracks socialism, had attempted to frighten people: "An era of the growth and development of capitalist chaos is beginning. And who knows whether we will not in the next few years have to defend every inch of our socialist territory, that is, each particle of the state economy under our feet, tooth and claw..." (15).

Another plan of the country's development, opposite in every respect to Bukharin's (that is, essentially to Lenin's concept of the NEP), was drawn up in accordance with these postulates. I refer to Preobrazhenskiy's article "The Law of Socialist Accumulation" (he subsequently reworked it into a booklet, a precis of which was with the author's knowledge passed around from hand to hand; Preobrazhenskiy vigorously propagandized his theory from the rostrum). Here is the course of his arguments. It is absurd to believe that "the socialist system and a system of private-commodity production... can exist alongside one another.... Either socialist production will subordinate to itself the petty bourgeois economy or it itself will be reabsorbed by the spontaneity of commodity production." Future industrialization and the country's accelerated development were conceivable only thanks to the "devouring" of the private trader by the state sector (according to Bukharin, as we recall, a complex combination of personal, group and state initiative is preserved). The resources for industrialization need to be derived basically "outside of the complex of the state socialist economy." Where specifically? "Such a country as the USSR..., Preobrazhenskiy declared, "will have to undergo a period of primitive accumulation, drawing very generously from sources of the presocialist forms of the economy.... The tasks of the socialist state are not to take from the petty bourgeois producers less than capitalism took but to take even more." More simply, it was proposed developing the economy at the

expense of the ruin of the peasantry. This was alright, according to Preobrazhenskiy, inasmuch as the individual farm is not inscribed in socialism.

A witness colorfully described the reaction of Rykov, chairman at that time of the Sovnarkom, to this plan. Raging and therefore stammering more than usual, Aleksey Ivanovich shouted: "Preobrazhenskiy's theory is disgraceful. It is the devil knows what!... Could anything be thought up more calculated to fatally compromise socialism?... For him the countryside is only a milch cow for industry."

Things went further than a clash of wits. Pyatakov, deputy chairman of the Council of the National Economy (Sovnarkhoz), a sympathizer of Preobrazhenskiy's, hereupon proposed a mechanism for exacting tribute from the peasantry: high prices for industrial products given a reduction in the prices of agricultural products. And not simply proposed. On 16 July 1923 he issued an order concerning a jacking-up of prices, which was carried out. For example, the profit in the price of cloth amounted to as much as 137 percent. Clearly, for both townspeople and the rural population cloth became unattainable. There was a sharp spurt in the cost of all agricultural equipment. The result proved paradoxical: given the commodity starvation in the country, the as yet feeble industry was hit by a sales crisis and production was paralyzed. F.E. Dzerzhinskiy, who had been appointed Sovkarkhoz chairman, immediately adopted drastic measures. At his initiative there was an abrupt lowering in 1924 of wholesale prices, which normalized the situation. This outstanding statesman had by this time moved far away from the nonsensical ideas concerning the camp compulsion to labor. A close Sovnarkhoz associate of his, N. Valentinov, who subsequently emigrated, published in the West a relatively objective book about those times. He recalls the fear with which the appearance of the formidable leader of the Cheka was awaited in the Sovnarkhoz, but that he was a charming leader and skillful proponent of the new economic policy. In conversation with Valentinov Dzerzhinskiy plainly dissociated himself from his ideas of the "war communism" period: "There can be no good work motivated by fear alone. What is needed is a desire for good work and every other incentive to it...."

There was, perhaps, no more fervent opponent of the leftist plan for the ruin of the countryside than the leader of the Sovnarkhoz. On 20 July 1926 (a few hours before his death) he shook with anger at a Central Committee plenum listening to the complaints of Kamenev and Pyatakov about the fact that the countryside was growing rich. "A calamity!" Dzerzhinskiy waxed ironic, "Our statesmen, the representatives of industry and trade, are shedding tears over the prosperity of the muzhik." He called the program for a rise in wholesale prices set forth by Pyatakov pointless, anti-Soviet and anti-worker. "Industrializing is impossible," Dzerzhinskiy insisted, "if we speak with fear about the well-being of the countryside" (16).

So, two plans clashed. It is pointless, of course, altering history with hindsight in the "what might have been if" argument. However, nor is there complete determinism and a foredoomed aspect either in the fate of the individual or in the destiny of peoples. This dangerous delusion has been instilled in virtually all times with benefit to themselves by the powers that be: events are predetermined, seriously influencing them is impossible, so be reconciled and submit. Such fatalism disarms man and paralyzes our sole reliable weapon—the intellect. Life is always a forking of the ways. History is realized opportunity—one of a multitude of unrealized opportunities, nothing more.

Can it be a matter of indifference in pivotal periods, when alternative development options are still possible, on whose side the machinery of power stands and into which cup of the scales it puts its lead weight? Does this machinery always express the interests of the country in the best way? Were this the case, we would have no right today to complain about the recent stagnation period.

In the 1920's unlimited power was effectively concentrated in the hands of a person who knew the value thereof full well—the unforgettable Stalin. The disputes at every congress and meeting were of little concern to him. He understood the main thing: the country is actually run by those who have in practice taken charge of the executive machinery of the state and who lead this machinery. He divined correctly something else also: it was best to take as the model for the hierarchical machinery the military organization with its discipline and sole responsibility. He had written in 1921 in an outline, rare in its candor, of the theme of the pamphlet "Political Strategy and Tactics of Russia's Communists": "The Communist Party as a kind of order of sword-bearers within the Soviet state directing the organs of the latter and animating their activity" (we would recall that the sword-bearers were the militarized religious detachment and predecessor of the Livonian Order). Any struggle of opinions within the order was impermissible, of course, and factionalism was a crime.

In accordance with a decision of the 10th congress, membership of any grouping entailed "unconditional and immediate expulsion from the party". Many worthy party members complained that a hierarchy of secretaries had arisen who were deciding all questions and that the congresses and conferences had become executive assemblies, and party and public opinion stifled. At the 13th party conference in January 1924 Stalin answered them to the effect that the party could not be an alliance of groups and factions, it had to be a "monolithic organization hewn from one piece."

In another speech Stalin declared all stable institutions (the soviets, unions, women's organizations and so forth) drive belts, "tentacles in the hands of the party with which it conveys its will to the working class, and the working class becomes, from an atomized mass, the party's army." That is, the soviets, say, are no sort of

authority, merely a drive belt. "The dictatorship of the proletariat," Stalin taught, "consists of the guiding instructions of the party plus the implementation of these instructions by the mass organizations of the proletariat plus their implementation by the population."

What kind of "guiding instructions"? Whose specifically? It is sufficient to pose such questions for it to become clear: the party itself was also becoming a drive belt—the main one in the transmission. The mechanism of power sketched by Stalin presupposes merely a single operator, who does indeed control the unit.

There were people who understood what this portended. In a private letter to Kuybyshev Dzerzhinskiy shrewdly predicted: "I have complete confidence that we will cope with all enemies if we find and adopt the correct policy in the running of the country and the economy in practice. If we do not find this policy and pace... the country will then find its dictator—the gravedigger of the revolution—whatever the fine feathers on his outfit...". However, it was not the farsighted who determined the course of events.

Of course, the plan of Preobrazhenskiy and other left figures did not contain direct calls for the physical extermination of the most active part of the rural population and extra-economic compulsion to labor. But just as all the attributes of the blockhead are contained in the stomach, here also this was contained in embryo. Having eliminated, as usual, the authors of this theory, Stalin put their ideas into practice. The corresponding methods of achieving what was intended were required, naturally. There were no differences, as there are not in life in general, between the end and the means. After all, the means are the end in action, in motion, in day-to-day practice; the end is incapable of manifesting itself in some aspect other than via the means.

The change toward industrialization began with the ferocious breakup of the NEP mechanism. In 1929 the machinery of power wound up all types of private enterprise. The private trader's route to bank credit was cut off, he was suffocated with taxes and he paid the highest rates for transportation. The authorities requisitioned or simply closed down private mills and canceled many contracts for the leasing of state-owned enterprises.

The machinery methodically and purposively ground the peasantry down, reviving typical methods of "war communism". Given the obviously nonequivalent exchange and the deliberately understated prices for grain, meat, milk and other products, the peasant was understandably unwilling to sell the fruit of his labor to the state. Stalin personally headed the procurement. At the start of 1928 a directive went out to the localities instructing grain to be taken from the peasantry "at all costs". Stalin himself traveled to Siberia. At meetings with local figures he accused the kulaks of thwarting the procurements and

demanded that they be arraigned for profiteering. The property of those convicted was confiscated. As at the time of "war communism," Stalin proposed giving one-fourth of the confiscated grain to the poor peasants (informers, in practice). Stalin ordered the party and soviet officials who failed to carry out these repressive measures to be dismissed.

A wave of general searches rolled over the country, just as at the time of "war communism". The authorities prohibited the sale of grain at the markets, and armed barrier posts were stationed on the roads in many places.

Forcible collectivization completed the smashing of rural commodity production.

By a series of energetic measures the commodity model was destroyed in state industry also. The 17th party conference in 1932 emphasized "the utter incompatibility with party policy and the interests of the working class of the bourgeois-NEPman distortions of the principle of financial autonomy expressed in the squandering of state resources belonging to all the people and, consequently, the thwarting of set economic plans." Wholesale trade and economic responsibility for the results of labor were termed distortion and squandering here. It is here that the system of the allocated distribution of resources, which has a ruinous influence on the economy to this day, has its origins.

It is said that you cannot argue with success. But a comparison of the results with the price paid for them is something that is mandatory in economics. Only by having investigated this can it be understood what was the case in reality—victory or defeat. Let us put at first eight simple questions: what were the plan parameters of the First Five-Year Plan, what were its economic results?

As of 1926 the Gosplan and the Sovnarkhoz began to prepare plan options. The planners of that time should not be confused with present-day planners, who do not predict the weather but prescribe how it is to be. No, the former did not then know how by way of discipline to pull with all their might the needle of the barometer to "fine," in defiance of the storm. They recommended in the plans the maximum proportionality and balance—between accumulation and consumption, between industry and agriculture, between industry groups A and B and between monetary income and commodity supply.

Tactful specialists headed by Krzhizhanovskiy composed two versions of the plan—minimum (or, as they called it, initial) and maximum. In accordance with the maximum, industrial production was in the 5 years to have grown 180 percent (that is, almost threefold!), including a 230-percent growth in the production of producer goods. Productivity in industry was to have risen 110 percent. Agriculture was set an increase in volume of 55 percent. A rapid growth in real wages and a doubling of the national income were programmed.

The targets by no means appeared fantastic—the actual speeds of development in the preceding years had been approximately such. Nonetheless, the planners insured themselves: in accordance with the minimum version, the targets were cut by 20 percent. This was understandable: as the authors of the plan cautioned, the maximum version proceeded from the assumption that all 5 coming years would have good harvests, equipment would be supplied from abroad on credit and that defense spending would diminish. But Stalin intervened personally. In accordance with his orders, only the maximum version was to be considered.

In May 1929 the plan was confirmed by the Fifth All-Union Congress of Soviets. In practice this act was of no significance—the plan was already deemed to have been in effect since 1 October 1928. But matters could not be allowed to rest there—the plan came to be carved and recarved. Stalin issued the cry: "The 5-year plan in 4 years." In the second year of the 5-year plan it was planned increasing industrial production 31.3 percent, which exceeded the maximum original outline by a factor of approximately 1.5. But even this appeared too little. Stalin declared that in respect of a whole number of sectors of industry the 5-year plan could be fulfilled in 3 years.

It ended in Stalin announcing on 7 January 1933 that the 5-year plan had been fulfilled in 4 years 3 months. Since that day, seemingly, nobody has checked the targets and the results. Let us do so. The increase in industrial production amounted in the period 1928-1932 not to 180 percent, as the specialists had estimated, but 100 percent. The average annual increments compared with the NEP period fell from 23.8 to 19.4 percent in industry as a whole, and the rate of development of light industry declined by a factor of almost 2. Such are the official statistics.

People may take issue with me: so the plan was not fulfilled, so the industrial growth rate had slowed compared with the preceding period, nonetheless, a striking success. Is it really that bad doubling industrial production in only 4 years? It would not be bad, but the question is how this figure was arrived at. Everything manufactured in industry is expressed in rubles (otherwise you cannot add up a small loaf and a tractor, an airplane and electric power) and then the production volume by year is collated and the rate of development obtained. This method is reliable only if the cost of one and the same product is computed for all the years in identical prices. But in the First Five-Year Plan wholesale prices galloped, which was not taken into consideration. Therefore the summary production increments which were announced were overstated.

It is simplest estimating fulfillment of the First Five-Year Plan in physical indicators. It was contemplated raising the smelting of pig iron to 10 million tons, actual result, 6.2 million. Power generation amounted not to 22

billion kilowatt-hours but 13.5 billion, fertilizer production, 900,000 tons instead of 8 million and so forth. If we make a comparison with the NEP period (1923-1928), the average annual increments in the smelting of steel declined in the period 1929-1932 from 670,000 to 400,000 tons, and the manufacture of footwear, from 8.5 million to 7.2 million pairs a year. The production of cloth had previously grown by 400 million meters annually, and of sugar, by 179,000 tons, but in the First Five-Year Plan the manufacture of these commodities, like a number of others, declined absolutely. How are we to understand here Stalin's statement about fulfillment of the 5-year plan by the end of 1932?

In the Second Five-Year Plan it was originally planned raising the generation of electric power to 100 billion kilowatt-hours, coal production, to 250 million tons, and the smelting of pig iron, to 22 million tons. These frontiers were attained only in the 1950's. In the period 1938-1940 industry altogether ran in place—there was practically no increase in the production of pig iron, steel, rolled products, cement and oil, and regression was observed even in a number of sectors.

The economist G. Khanin recently reassessed with new methods the most important indicators of the development of the economy in the period 1928-1941. It turns out that national income grew in this period not by a factor of 5.5, as statistics maintain, but by 50 percent, social labor productivity, not by a factor of 4.3 but by 36 percent, and so forth. Enterprises were built rapidly and new sectors of industry arose at that time. Fixed production capital in the national economy almost doubled, but simultaneously output per ruble of capital declined by one-fourth. The consumption of material per unit of end product grew 25-30 percent, which appreciably devalued the increases in production in the raw material sectors. It was at that time that the disproportions which are tormenting our economy even today arose: between heavy and light industry, between transport and other sectors of material production and between monetary income and the commodity counterpart thereof.

The grimmest legacy of the 1930's was the ruin of agriculture. In 1929 Stalin had promised: the Soviet Union "will in some 3 years be one of the most grain-abundant countries, if not the most grain-abundant country, in the world." Three years later, as is known, a famine erupted which carried away millions of lives. Only in 1950 did the grain harvest finally exceed the level reached at the time of the NEP. In 1933 the head of livestock had declined approximately twofold compared with 1928. Only at the end of the 1950's did the numbers of cattle and sheep reach the 1926 level, and that thanks to the private subsidiary plots.

Simultaneously with the destruction of commodity production there was an objective need for the replacement of economic incentives to labor by crude compulsion and for a considerable intensification, as the journal *BOLSHEVIK* wrote, of the aspect of the dictatorship

"which is expressed in the application of violence not inhibited by the law, including the use where necessary of terror in respect of the class enemies." Much has already been written about the forcible nature of collectivization. In March 1930, when it had become clear that the kolkhozes would frustrate the sowing campaign, Stalin came out with the article "Dizzy With Success". Heaping, as usual, the blame for the "exaggerations" on the performers, he authorized departure from the kolkhozes. However, the livestock and implements were not returned to those who left, and the land which they obtained was the most unsuitable. Stalin announced in the summer of 1930, incidentally: "There is no going back to the old ways. The kulaks are doomed and will be eliminated. There remains only one way, that of the kolkhozes." Years later he said in a discussion that millions of peasants had been physically exterminated in the collectivization process. The true figure is still unknown.

As one wise man observed, 1929 was rightly called the year of the great break, mention only being omitted of the break of what: the backbone of the people.

There was an essential revival in economic building of the "war communism" methods. The choice of actual methods was undoubtedly influenced by the personality of the leader. By the stamp of his nature Stalin was distrustful of all innovations and had no wish to implement the scintillating Trotskyian plan of the militarization of labor. More to his liking was the classical form of violence—the work of the convicts under armed guard. They developed Kolyma and the Polar Urals, Siberia and Kazakhstan, put up Norilsk, Vorkuta and Magadan, built canals, built northern roads—an incalculable amount all told. On one of my tours of the North as a journalist an eyewitness, who had miraculously survived, told me how the Kotlas-Vorkuta road had been built. In the polar region a workman has to be given, at a minimum, a quilted coat, felt boots and mittens. None of this was available. A prisoner was used for 2 weeks here—experience had shown that he was capable of working for this length of time in the clothing in which he had been arrested. After that, frost-bitten, he was sent (word illegible) to the camp, and new "pioneers" were brought in in exchange. Even mentioning this was impossible until recently. Now, fortunately, times are different. The dam of silence has been breached. However, behind the tragedies of Sergey Mironovich and Nikolay Ivanovich we should not forget the sufferings of Ivan Denisovich. A people which forgets its history is condemned to repeat it.

There was no shortage of camp manpower. In accordance with the law of 7 August 1932, execution was the punishment for theft of kolkhoz property, with mitigating circumstances, 10 years' imprisonment. At the end of 1938 deductions from wages were imposed for lateness on the job, for being late three times in a month—

arraignment. As of June 1940 no one could arbitrarily change his place of employment and refuse overtime work on pain of imprisonment.

After the war I worked at a blended yarn works in Barnaul. The bulk of my hostel comrades had spent time in prison—for the theft of a scrap of cloth, for fighting, for whatever. My fellow student at evening classes, a person who worked in the city military recruiting office, communicated to me as some kind of big secret the fact that approximately one-half of the conscripts had a record. And the conscript was just a young boy....

However, the life of the "free" was frequently little different from the daily round of the prisoners and those in exile. The Vyatka backwoods, which are dear to my heart, were for many years a place of exile. Before the war and after we were brought people from parts of which many people had not even heard. A neighboring kolkhoz was thus called "Natsmen". I will always be grateful to my lesser homeland for the fact that the heart was simply and naturally imbued there with the precious sense of internationalism. One's own people and exiles worked identically, starved identically and were identically careful with regard to the authorities, and the deceased were taken to one cemetery. The young people intermarried, and it was of no interest to anyone what kind of cocktail was in the blood of the offspring. There were no reasons for national hostility, as there are not today also. We are bound by both troubles and victories in our common fatherland.

I recall that a solitary muzhik had been ordered to be lodged in the village. He had the appearance of a Tatar, but who he was and where he had come from, it was not the custom to try and elicit: since the authorities were not driving him on further, the man was, consequently, within his rights. But he went and died. He was buried, but an argument began among the muzhiks: should a cross be put up? It was somehow not right—an empty grave, as if a firebrand had been stuck in the ground. They put one up, nonetheless, reasoning fairly that if whoever his god was was with our God up there, they would understand....

It is no pleasure writing about all this—it makes me grimace. But it is necessary. Necessary because even now many people are nostalgically lamenting: what order, ah, what order there was under the great and wise—could it only be repeated! I bear witness: it was not like that. Forced labor has at all times and among all peoples been unproductive. In 1937, when the country was frozen in fear, millions of kolkhoz members failed to work the obligatory and, generally, feasible minimum of labor-days. Later such people came to be banished to places which had not been rendered habitable, which was not that intimidating—it was the same all over. So we should not in today's quest be glancing back, there is little that is good there, those sources will not slake our thirst, they have become dried up or polluted.

4

We are now seeking different incentives to labor, rightly believing that personal interest is more dependable than fear and crude compulsion. But how should personal interest be understood?

It is now permitted, it would seem, to make a living off one's own resources. An exotic subject, and no less has been written in the newspapers about the opening in the capital on Kropotkinskaya Street of a cooperative fast food outlet, perhaps, than about the startup of the Bratsk GES. But here's the sticking point: before accepting and recognizing material values, we have, it turns out, to ascertain by what motives their creators were guided. It is assumed that personal interest is one thing, but public, state interest is quite another.

That is right, it would seem. It is not for the private trader to decide what should be produced where and in what quantity. Individual plots are useful as a support for big production, but the state must dole out private initiative and strictly determine the limits thereof lest too great forces be diverted from work of an all-state scale. And what about personal interests? Is there room for them? There is. They are incorporated in the execution of the plans: it is necessary to pay generously in both money and social benefits the outfits which produce the planned product with the least costs and of the best quality and supply it to the consumers exactly on time. Deviations from the plan for the worse are punished once again by the ruble. Large deductions from the bonus fund are stipulated for the frustration, say, of obligatory supplies, products rejected by state approval or the consumer are not paid for at all and the treasury does not reimburse losses if the outlays on a product have proven higher than the cost determined at the top. In these cases there will be simply nothing with which to pay for the labor—slipshod workers, careless suppliers and spendthrifts are obliged to straighten themselves out, otherwise it could be a question of the closure of the enterprise.

Such is one concept of perestroyka. There is another also. According to it, historical experience has not revealed the particular advantages of directive planning. The pitiful losses which society incurs strictly in accordance with the plan are there for all to see. For example, billions and billions were spent on the construction of the Baykal-Amur Main Railroad, but there is nothing to carry on the new line, and it is falling into disuse, having done us no service. Or once again: for decades the treasury generously allocated resources for an increase in the manufacture of combine harvesters. We now produce more than any other country. And? At least one-third of the new machines are unnecessary—the kolkhozes and sovkhoses are refusing to buy them even at half-price. These are not some isolated cases. Hundreds of billions of rubles' worth of every conceivable product are frozen in surplus stocks—there was no need for it,

although it was manufactured according to the plan. But, on the other hand, the accursed shortages of both production and personal consumer commodities.

The examples could be multiplied. And it is not a question of the errors or inexperience of the planners here—they have had time to gain experience. It is the idea that it is possible to assign from the top in more or less detail quotas and priorities in the development of the economy and the scale of production of a product, even if the most important, which has failed. This is confirmed not only by the results but the very methods of planning. When determining prospects, the planners take thoroughly into consideration world trends of economic development. If there, over the hill, chemical industry is developing rapidly, let us then undertake chemicalization, if electronics is held in esteem there, it is time we took it up. We are continually looking around to see what hats the bourgeoisie is wearing out. But “with them” quotas and priorities are not shaped by way of a plan. And since we take them as the model, we are thereby tacitly acknowledging that there is a more efficient method of regulation or self-regulation of the economy than ours. Let us then be consistent: directive planning is not either an obligatory token nor advantage of our system of management. And if this is the case, what will stimulation of exemplary plan fulfillment do? It would certainly stir up the zeal for labor to some extent, but this is not enough.

What is needed here is new economic thinking. Let us agree on a simple matter: any product, any service satisfying the reasonable requirements of an individual or an enterprise is a good thing, regardless of whether it was produced in accordance with a directive from the top or an initiative from below. The national economy should represent a combination of three equal structures: financially autonomous state enterprises, cooperatives and private trades. The working people themselves should choose in which sector they wish to work. It is particularly emphatically necessary to admit the private trader to the unprofitable spheres of production and services (given the regulated use of wage labor). Trade, service and small-scale industrial enterprises may be leased to the cooperatives. Machine-operator cooperatives could live in the countryside alongside family farms—they should be given as much land as they are capable of cultivating. The implements of labor would be made available to them on lease or for redemption, as they wish.

The main sector of the economy would, naturally, remain the state sector. It also should work on the basis of commodity production conditions. This means compliance with several very simple rules. The production program is not set from above but takes shape from consumers' orders. It would no longer be necessary to allocate products—it would be clear from the partners' contract for whom they were intended. The wholesale price would not be fixed—the seller and buyer would agree thereon between themselves. All expenditure,

including that on the development of production, would be made by the workforce from its own income. Taxes have been paid, accounts settled with regard to credit—the rest is yours, decide for yourselves how much to deduct into the upkeep and expansion of production, how much to hand out.

In short, the new economic thinking presupposes that each will live as he is able, as long as he has paid his taxes from personal or collective income. Anarchy? Not at all. It is in this model that real centralism is possible. It consists not of total directive planning but of the fact that the state in practice channels the development of the economy in the necessary direction.

A small example, from which much will become clear. In socialist Hungary the state supports, inter alia, the Ikarus bus program. However, it does not dictate to the manufacturer directly how many vehicles the latter is obliged to manufacture in a year or 5-year period. Roundabout methods are employed: for a certain period taxes to the treasury are reduced, cheaper credit is provided and nonreturnable subsidies for plant capital investments are not ruled out. Everyone can see for himself that such methods work—the Ikarus is increasing on our streets also. This is centralism in practice: the contemplated increase in the manufacture of a given commodity has been achieved, and the structural shift in the direction of production of a product beneficial to the country scheduled in advance has occurred.

In such a situation we would, as is our wont, plan an increase in the units and instruct the construction workers to install new capacity, and the engineers, to supply additional equipment.... All taken into consideration, seemingly, but the deadline approaches, and it is ascertained that the plan has a life of its own, life goes its own way. This is not an abstract assumption. I would give the reminder that the last three 5-year plans were not fulfilled and that the degree of deviation from the plan was until recently growing. Given the formal dictatorship of the plan, the economy develops increasingly anarchically, real centralism in management weakens and we have lost control over events. Today the American economy, say, is controlled in more centralized manner than ours.

These opinions sound quite strange, you will agree. Why? Changes in life have to be preceded by changes in consciousness. It would seem that it is here that the danger to perestrojka lies. It is difficult as yet getting its radical version, the sole one capable of restoring the economy to health (and not only the economy), into people's heads. The prejudice that the power of the state over the productive forces is an unreserved good thing and direct imperative demand of the historical process is too deeply rooted in us.

This prejudice is not 70 years old, it far older.

5

On the eve of the world war even Russia had moved into second place in the world in terms of grain exports. In line with the economic successes public opinion inclined increasingly toward Stolypin's policy. The well-known commentator of that time, A. Izgoyev (an author of the celebrated "Vekhi" digest), wrote optimistically: "The argument has now been weighed by fate. Communal law has been condemned irrevocably, and all attempts to restore to it its predominant position in life are doomed to fail.... Russia has to be reformed on the principles of personal property, and it will depend on the energy, erudition and ability of democratic public figures for this reform to be accomplished with the greatest benefits for the peasant masses."

But history judged otherwise. The argument was far from having been weighed by fate as yet. Following the October Revolution, the gaze of the transformers who had rejected for Russia the capitalist development path turned once again to the commune. In the years of "war communism," as we recall, 50 million hectares were confiscated from the kulaks. This land was not shared among the peasants but went for the most part for communal use. Thus were the results of Stolypin's reforms reduced to nothing and the forms of land use characteristic of Old Russia essentially restored.

Of course, it was not conveniences for carrying out the requisitioning which attracted people to the commune—it was believed that it contained in embryo the future collective socialist economy. I am not making this up. Even at the 10th party congress, at which the question of the new economic policy was decided, Lenin insisted on the transition of the small farms "to socialized, collective, communal labor" (vol 43, p 26). Subsequently experts have repeatedly emphasized the successive relationship between the commune and the kolkhozes. For example, S.P. Trapeznikov, the Soviet scientist and organizer of science, bluntly maintained: "The Soviet revolution has prepared the land communities for transition to a higher form, converting them into strong points of the socialist transformation of the country's agriculture."

In a word, the utopian hopes of the thinkers of the last century for the commune were not that utopian. Having suddenly grown wiser as an emigre, Prince V. Lvov (who had been for a certain time head of the Provisional Government) wrote in a pamphlet published in 1922: "...the old Slavophiles and the new Soviet authorities are extending their hand to one another.... While idealizing the commune, the Slavophiles did not themselves live in a commune. Had they been consistent, they would have arrived at soviet power, which is communal control by the state...."

"How did the Slavophiles conceive of Russia's state system?"

"In the form of self-government, in which all political and party struggle has been overcome and all are united by common practical work in the name of a single common ideal. Is this not the goal which Soviet power sets itself?... Thus having cast off the armor of European-patterned cloaks, Russia arises before the world in the new clothing of its national existence and service of all mankind."

There, you see, even Prince Lvov sees the same sources as venerable contemporary scholars. In addition, the ex-premier rightly deduces from communal relations the moral and political unity of society as the antipode of "patterned" bourgeois democracy....

History teaches that it has never been possible to secure zeal for labor and economic success by means of a commune; equality and communal-type social justice have invariably resulted in the suppression of the individual. Nor have the advantages of "socialized, collective, communal labor" been proven now, although every conceivable and inconceivable version thereof has been tried, it would seem.

6

In one exceptionally important walk of life the legacy of the ages has been superimposed particularly squarely on post-revolution history and formed a monolithic wall which it has not as yet been possible either to break through or surmount. This is bureaucratic administration, which represents the main obstacle in the way of changes.

It is customary to believe that Peter I transferred to Russian soil Western bureaucratic models. This is not entirely so. State enterprises are, of course, in all countries administered by civil servants, but inasmuch as under Peter industry was for the most part state-run, the range of the powers of Russian government officialdom was from the very outset wider than in the West. The Berg Board and the Manufaktur Board (the predecessors of economic ministries) directly dictated the list of products and set prices. This is understandable, after all, industry worked mainly for war. Nor were the petty craftsmen left outside of the sphere of centralized administration. By an ukase of 1722 they were united in shops for the sake of their organized use for the manufacture of products required by the army and navy. The authorities even made their way into economic matters in which they were manifestly incapable of influencing events. A ukase of 1715 ordered a doubling of the sowings of flax and hemp and the cultivation of these crops in all provinces of the country (there was as yet no question of corn). The state circulated instructions concerning the tending of livestock, the timeframes of agricultural operations, fertilization of the fields, use in the grainharvesting of scythes instead of sickles and so forth behind the backs of the nominal owners to the stewards of the manorial estates.

When the state is excessive in expanding the number of facilities of administration, the bureaucratic machinery grows. In Peter's times there were 905 bureaus and offices. Following the death of Peter, four of his associates (Menshikov, Osterman, Makarov and Volkov) testified: "There are now over the peasants 10 and more commanders instead of the one formerly, namely, from the military, from the soldier through the staff and generals, and from the civilian, from fiscals, commissars, waldmeisters and others through governors, of whom some may be called not shepherds but wolves which have burst in among the herd." Given such complex structures, precisely dividing spheres of influence and delineating the bounds of authority is inconceivable.

Frequently one and the same field would be in the charge of three ramified state organs independently of one another: military, civil and secret police. Under these conditions a supreme arbiter, whose unequivocal instructions would be equally binding for any component of administration, was objectively essential. Call him emperor, dictator, father of the peoples or whatever, this does not alter his place in the administrative structure. Even simple questions have to be decided at the top of the hierarchical pyramid. It is this singularity of an inordinately centralized administration which explains the fact, which has delighted his descendants, that Peter himself delved into all the nuances of life and wrote instructions for each occasion.

The break with the old machinery of state after October 1917 did not mean that the roots of bureaucratism had been pulled up. The danger had increased, perhaps, even inasmuch as the entire economy was once again incorporated in the sphere of administration. The colossal work to regulate the economy which, albeit with imperfections, is performed in commodity production by the market needed to be transferred immediately to a managerial apparatus. The situation was complicated by the fact that the economic model of "war communism" precluded any independence of the economic cells. Industry, for example, essentially represented one superenterprise managed from the center.

It was necessary for the solution of urgent problems to create a countless number of organizations. A well-known economist of that time, Yu. Larin, called the system of economic management of that time the All-Russian Chekvalapstvo—from the name of the Extraordinary Commission for Felt Boots and Bast Shoes (Chekvalap). It is important to understand that, granted all the improbability of such establishments, they could not have failed to have arisen. The army and the labor camps required footwear. But imagine the emissary of the center with special powers in this connection. He has a specific target and in order to fulfill it he tries to take people from another industry, who are, in turn, causing another manager anxiety. As a result the need for a new, superextraordinary commission is declared.... Extra-economic compulsion to labor required a body of overseers.

And added on here are the organs for collecting the requisitioned products, for distributing life's blessings and a multitude of others.

V.I. Lenin was the first to understand the danger and declared war on the bureaucracy—otherwise the revolution would have drowned in ink. Ilich's great merit is that he abruptly turned the country in the direction of the NEP, whereby the objective conditions for limiting bureaucratism arose. By the summer of 1922 there remained of 35,000 employees in the central economic authorities 8,000, in the provincial sovnarkhoz, 18,000 out of 235,000.

But at the end of the NEP even, in 1927, the status of the enterprise was legislatively changed. According to the new regulations, the purpose of the enterprise was fulfillment of a plan sent out from the top and not the making of profit, as determined by the 1923 regulations. The higher authority henceforward issued construction quotas, appointed and dismissed administrators and dictated prices. A managerial vertical (people's commissariat—main administration—enterprise), which was ideally adapted to command management, began to take shape rapidly as of January 1932.

With the destruction of the economic mechanism of the NEP the place of interest was once again occupied by the directive. Let us open at random a digest of decrees on economic matters. Here we have a decree of the All-Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) and the Sovnarkom of 1 August 1940 "The Harvesting and Agricultural Produce". Section VII of this document regulates in the most detailed manner the harvesting of tobacco:

"1. To establish that the tobacco must be harvested given complete industrial ripeness strictly by row, preventing the overripening of the tobacco and also the harvesting of unripe leaves.

"2. To ensure the timely and consistent performance of tobacco-harvesting operations (breaking, stringing, drying, curing), preventing a gap between these operations....

"4. (sic) To conduct the tobacco and makhorka harvesting within the following timeframes:

"makhorka—no later than 10 September in all areas, except Altay and Krasnoyarsk krays and Novosibirsk Oblast, where the harvesting is to be completed no later than 1 September." And so forth.

The instructions were signed by Stalin himself, and he knew what he was talking about when it came to tobacco harvesting. The directive had to be duplicated and conveyed to each kolkhoz, and the fulfillment of each point (and the entire decree was a whole pamphlet) had to be monitored and reports compiled regularly.... Note also that point 1 could contradict point 4: it was commanded that the harvesting be completed prior to 10

September, but what if by that time the tobacco had not ripened? The agent would surely begin cutting on time, the kolkhoz chairman, however, would be inclined to wait. An arbitrator was needed, it turned out. It is easy to imagine how many people close by lived on... no, not the tobacco harvesting but the paperwork in this connection. We should not see this example of *neochekvalapstvo* as a Stalin eccentricity. Without a paper signed by him, without an army of inspectors, the kolkhoz member of that time would hardly have thought of tobacco plantations at all.

As of the 1930's the administrative machinery has grown more rapidly than any other group of working people. Ten years ago there were 5.5 million planners and tally clerks in our country. Reporting this figure in the press, Academician N. Melnikov added proudly: "No country in the world has such personnel...." Today, possibly, the whole of the rest of the world does not have "such personnel"—in the period 1976-1983 alone managerial personnel grew by 3 million and passed the 17 million mark.

When the economic mechanism incorporated as an obligatory component extra-economic compulsion to labor (a "subsystem of fear," as management specialist G. Popov put it), command management influenced life to some extent, although even then operated with horrifying inefficiency. Today, however, this is a machinery which knows about shortcomings, but does not know how to remove them.

Management theory has such a concept as the self-perpetuating system. When an organization assumes excessive managerial functions, the number of administrators sooner or later reaches a certain critical value and the machinery begins to operate for itself: the top wites, the bottom writes a noncommittal reply, all part and parcel. Real life is ignored for it only impedes the well-oiled mechanism. This is something like the black holes: there are in the Universe blobs of matter of such monstrous density that no signals are capable of breaking in from outside.

The management sphere annually produces hundreds of billions of sheets of documents, that is, approximately a sheet per capita daily. Of these, at least 90 percent of the papers are useless—simply no one reads them.

This machinery, unique in its numbers and feebleness, is occupied with transcribing party decisions on *perestroyka* into the language of circulars, instructions and regulations. It is not difficult to predict the result for government officials are most concerned with self-preservation or, which is the same thing, the preservation of administrative methods of management.

The bureaucratic machinery which has taken shape is not inscribed in *perestroyka*. It can be broken (this happens given revolutions from below), it can be abolished (revolution from above), but cannot be restructured. In any event, changes of a revolutionary character

are needed. Attempts to drive S&T progress and the development of the economy under the benumbing control of the bureaucrats threatens stagnation of the economy and the decline of the power.

When it comes to the bureaucrats, things are more or less clear. But the rest, all of us? The instruments of analysis employed in this article are rather crude for investigating how stable external circumstances have been reflected in man's inner world and his behavior stereotypes. Yet this is most important of all. Not having learned to look after the bureaucratic (let the authorities worry about that), we have forgotten how to look after ourselves. A type of social independent has taken shape.

Theoretically, everyone understands that the talk about the state according the people such and such a benefit is only rhetorical. It does not in its offices, among its own, produce material values, and it is not the state which provides for man but, on the contrary, the worker who keeps the state. But in practice, let us have a free apartment, let us have as much cheap butter as we want, let us have this, let us have that, and at the same time out of my sight with the neighbor who resolved to provide for himself independently and now lives, the son of a bitch, better than me.

Social inertness is the other side of bureaucratism. From the viewpoint of the bureaucrat individual or collective income belongs to the treasury, which may return it to the owners in full or in part, but may not return it also. Hoping for kind superiors has become a behavioral norm.

The conservatism of the bureaucracy has linked up with the mood of the masses, that is, you and I. There—sentimental reminiscences about the past, a yearning for a master and order, an instinctive preference for the customary and the traditional and attempts to close up the embrasures through which innovations are filtering; here—fear of independence and an expectation of manna from heaven. There and here—fear of life and of the harsh realities of economics. In this atmosphere one serious failure—economic, foreign policy, it is immaterial which—is enough to morally isolate the reformers.

This is the main danger for *perestroyka*. To lose time is to lose everything. Making haste slowly with regard to changes is no good if only from purely managerial considerations: any economic mechanism possesses tremendous inertia and rejects alien elements, however progressive they may be. For this reason it is useless introducing to an evolved system new rules one after the other. This could only discredit *perestroyka*—they have wasted years on talk, but we see no change.

History will not forgive us if we once again let slip our opportunity. The abyss can be overcome with a single bound, not with two.

Footnotes

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 20, p 207.
2. Ibid., vol 19, pp 18, 19.
3. V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 36, p 297. Henceforward when V.I. Lenin's works are quoted the parentheses after the quote will indicate only the volume and page number.
4. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 4, p 299.
5. "From the History of the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission. 1917-1921," Digest of Documents, Moscow, 1958, p 95.
6. Ibid., pp 114, 115.
7. Ibid., p 386.
8. Ibid., p 256.
9. "Ninth Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) Congress. Minutes," Moscow, 1960, pp 92, 94.
10. Ibid., pp 97, 98.
11. "The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Central Committee Plenums," Moscow, 1970, vol 2 (1917-1924), p 153.
12. Ibid., pp 161, 162.
13. Ibid., p 176.
14. "Eleventh Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik) Congress. March-April 1922. Stenographic Report," Moscow, 1961, pp 535, 529.
15. "Twelfth Russian Communist Party Congress (Bolshevik). 17-25 April 1923. Stenographic Report," Moscow, 1968, p 351.
16. F.E. Dzerzhinskiy, "Selected Works in Two Volumes," Moscow, 1977, vol 2 (1924-1926), pp 504, 505, 507.

COPYRIGHT: Zhurnal "Novyy mir", 1988

8850

Lithuanian Church, State Leaders View Current Changes]

*18000368 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
15 May 88 pp 1,3*

[ELTA report: "Meeting With Roman Catholic Church Leaders"]

[Text] On 13 May the LiSSR Supreme Soviet held a meeting with republic leaders and prelates of the Roman Catholic Church.

V. Astrauskas, chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, noted that such meetings are becoming a regular occurrence and a tradition of mutual benefit. This time there was one other important reason for a meeting. Lithuanian bishops in charge of dioceses recently traveled to the Vatican to make a periodic report. Archbishop A. Povilonis at his own request for reasons of age was relieved of his duties as chairman of the Episcopal Conference of the Lithuanian Catholic Church. A number of other changes were made in the church leadership. V. Astrauskas noted that Archbishop A. Povilonis had done much to improve the relationship between church and state, and he wished him good health and long life. V. Astrauskas congratulated on their appointments Bishop V. Sladkyavichyus, apostolic administrator of Kayshadoris Eparchy, as chairman of the Episcopal Conference of the Lithuanian Catholic Church; Bishop Yu. Preykshas, apostolic administrator of Kaunas Archeparchy and Vilkaivishkis Eparchy; and A. Vaychyus, apostolic administrator of Telshiy Eparchy and deputy chairman of the Episcopal Conference of the Lithuanian Catholic Church. In future, said V. Astrauskas, we will try to work together in a fruitful manner and to support the positive steps taken by the church. While remaining faithful to one's own world view, it is necessary for us all to look for useful points of contact. Nevertheless, we will always oppose efforts to use houses of prayer for political purposes and extremist attacks by certain priests, which do not strengthen the authority of the church.

V. Astrauskas described in detail the economic and social situation in the republic, noting that all elements of the population, including believers and non-believers alike, support restructuring. The atmosphere of glasnost and democratization as well as new forms of work are helping the people to express themselves more fully. There have been many fine social initiatives. The Peace Fund, Cultural Foundation, and Children's Fund have been doing noble work. There is great concern for the strengthening and well-being of the family. At the request of the public, Mother's Day has been restored.

Not everything is proceeding smoothly. The restructuring of people's ways of thinking is progressing more slowly than it should. Much remains to be done by common efforts to better exploit the potential of our system, so that life may become better and more beautiful, said V. Astrauskas.

L. Shepetis, chairman of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet and secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, noted that not all had gone smoothly during a decade of soviet life with respect to relations between church and state, due both to historical conditions and to positions taken by church representatives. Dramatic events had occurred, and mutual mistakes had been made. Today they are being corrected. We are speaking more openly and objectively. The state is undertaking to re-establish Leninist principles with respect to attitudes towards religion, the church, and believers. New laws are being drafted with regard to freedom of conscience which reflect more deeply the interests of religious organizations.

The duty of scholars is to reveal more objectively and persuasively the role of the church in the history of the Lithuanian people, the development of the interrelations between religion and morality, and the historical interaction of religion with culture and art.

The church does not stand apart from the vital concerns of the people. Some of its representatives play an active part in measures for peace carried out in the republic, in the country, and abroad, in the humanitarian efforts of the Tevishke Society, the Cultural Foundation, and other social organizations. An absolute majority of the clergy, as has already been noted many times, are local to the soviet order, A. Shepetis recognized. But a spoon of pitch can spoil a barrel of honey. There are priests seeking pretexts for making political attacks in the churches, the church yards, and cemeteries, and the church authorities do not always respond to these activities. We cannot refrain from speaking of these facts.

Differences in world view do not prevent us from looking at life and at our surroundings realistically, continued A. Shepetis. We have a common history, a single motherland and future. Each spiritual person has concerns of his own. How many people still extend a hand to either socialist or to personal property. How many parents raise their children poorly, turning them into acquisitive consumers and even into parasites. Why, for example, should a spokesman for the clergy not speak out, not only from the pulpit but on the radio or television, and describe how believers live? Why should a priest or church official not share his thoughts through the mass media, indicating how believers exercise their constitutional rights? We must figure out together how to make life nobler and spiritually richer.

A Chesnavichus, deputy chairman of the LiSSR Council of Ministers, described how issues raised at previous meetings were being resolved and how the lawful wishes of church representatives are being implemented.

As previously announced, the premises of the Korolevy Mira Church in Klaypeda will be turned over to a religious order in the middle of next year. There will be two religious orders in Klaypeda and two houses of prayer. Following a fire, the Buyvidzhay church has

been entirely restored, and regular maintenance has been arranged for the churches in Shalchininkay, Radvilishkis, and Kretinga. The churches in Ignalina and Garzhday will be rebuilt.

The request to open a workshop for the repair of religious property in Vilnius is under consideration. The gorispolkom is at present seeking a location for it.

V. Butkus, rector of the theological seminary in Kaunas, said that he wished to raise the matter of increasing the size of the seminary and its enrollment. For the present, he said, he was simply expressing the hope that the matter would be acted upon favorably as soon as possible.

A Gutayskus, the prelate in charge of the Vilnius Archeparchy, expressed his gratitude for the authorization to restore the Buyzhvidzhyay church and to rebuild the Shalchininkay church. He also raised the problem of the tactics of atheistic propaganda, pointing out that the publication of certain types of anti-religious literature was continuing. It was acknowledged that the State Committee for Publishing, Graphic Arts, and the Book Trade was at fault.

The request of Bishop Yu. Preykshas for the reregistration of two religious orders received an immediate favorable response.

Bishop V. Mikhelyavichus stated that it was important for clergy to participate in discussions of draft legislation concerning freedom of conscience as soon as it was ready.

Bishop A. Vaychyus commended the effort to clarify activities of believers in Klaypeda, expressed his approval of the struggle being waged by soviet leaders against drunkenness and other harmful habits, and praised the present meeting. He raised the question of whether it would not be possible to send priests abroad to study. In reply he was told that no obstacles would stand in the way.

Bishop V. Sladkyavichyus also spoke well of the meeting and expressed his confidence that the other believers would reflect their approval in a fitting manner. It is heartening to hear a high assessment given of the efforts made in our archdiocese, he said. The bishop expressed the hope that tensions between state agencies and the church would diminish. All concerned, he said, are duty-bound to contribute to the moral education of the people.

Certain other matters pertaining to relations between church and state were discussed briefly.

L. Dulksis, prelate in charge of the Panevezhis Eparchy, also took part in the discussion.

P. Anilenis, authorized representative of the Council for Religious Affairs for the Lithuanian SSR, under the USSR Council of Ministers, also was present at the discussion.

12889

Writers Speak Out at History, Literature Conference

18000324 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 5 May 88 pp 4-5

[Report on conference under the rubric "Restructuring: Mode of Thoughts and Actions": "Conference of Historians and Writers: Pressing Problems of Historical Science and Literature"]

[Excerpts] The problems of history and literature have never before had such, as one might call it, pressing social significance as in our days of the revolutionary renewal of our society. Historians and writers are today focusing their attention on the main stages of our Motherland's past in order to lay out the road to the future. Joining forces and checking positions on this path was the goal of the scientific conference organized by the USSR Academy of Sciences, the USSR Writers' Union, and the Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee which opened in Moscow on 27 April.

Taking part in the conference's work were member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee A.N. Yakovlev and department heads of the CPSU Central Committee Yu.P. Voronov and V.A. Grigoryev.

V. Karpov, the first secretary of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union, opened the conference. The task of moral and spiritual normalization of society and the task of each person's conscious active participation in the creative processes of life, he emphasized, cannot be performed without uniting all intellectual forces—science, literature, and art. The great indoctrinational force of history is realized in practice both through scientific works and artistic creations.

Many of those who spoke, among them the critic A. Lanshchikov, dwelled in detail on the causes and effects of the Stalin phenomenon. The writer V. Astafyev began his speech on this theme:

"Of course, I have my own attitude toward both this historical period of time and toward this individual. And I do not think that it is so simple and ordinary as it is being presented now. This latest lightning rod in our history, including in the history of literature, is being used to heap all our troubles on this individual and in that way look more pure ourselves.

"I do not know what has been more terrible and more damaging to our history and to us than Brezhnev's times. I think that against the background of this person both our society and we look simply indecent! Any period of time, any day past is already history. Khrushchev is already history. And Brezhnev, no matter how much we wanted to get rid of him, is history. And, I believe, this

history is very disgraceful. And it is especially disgraceful for us frontline soldiers, most of whom managed to conduct ourselves worthily in war and very unworthily during that period.

"I was at my friend's house one time, he was a frontline soldier too. At that time Brezhnev had been awarded the order of Victory. My friend, formerly in the landing forces and then an artillery man, had great courage and was most honorable; after the war he made his way to become an important manager in metallurgy and raykom secretary. He asked me: 'Vitya, when will they stop humiliating us?' I answered him: 'They'll humiliate us as long as we permit them to do it.'

"Now people are always talking about collectivization and the excesses. The subject is a complicated and tragic one. But people almost never talk about the fact that somehow we contrived to invent a war without history. Or at least I can say as a soldier that what was written about the war was unlike anything I ever had to do with. I was in another war. And yet trains full of such literature were created! They created 12 volumes of history.

"Our history, including the history of literature, has never known a more cunning document, a falsified, slapped-together, simply fabricated document. Very cunning, highly-paid people who knew what they were doing made this volume after volume. Not long ago two historians, Kazantsev and Samsonov, were squabbling, arguing about some detail in this history. I wrote the editor that most of our historians, especially the historians who fabricated this history of the war, have no right to go near such a sacred word as truth. They deprived themselves of that right by their lives, their actions, their falsehood, and their duplicity.

"We still do not know how many people we lost in the Patriotic War. Perhaps someone knows—tell me. I have heard many different figures. But still I would like to know, as a soldier of the Patriotic War, how many people we lost.

"When will they stop talking in half-terms, half-hints, and half-truths to those of us who are living out our days? Half-truths have worn us out and brought us to nervous exhaustion.

"That Russian literature at some stage managed to right itself and create some direction and a number of marvelous books was not due to the works of historians but despite them, I think.

"We are now beginning, with difficulty, to rise up and look around. Not to correct things yet, corrections are a long way off! What we are doing in the provinces, let us say, and how the new word "restructuring" is being met there. Society is restructured slowly, our society is ossified and stagnant. Local leaders have stopped and are

waiting calmly until all this ends and everything goes back to the way it was. A great many words are being spoken, all kinds of beautiful, official words, but very little is being done.

"Literary figures and scientists are obliged to, we must, once again muster our strength and courage and some kind of tranquility so as not to make a fuss but put things right. After all, someone promoted the way things were. Stalin promoted it, Brezhnev promoted it, and we ourselves promoted it. But there were people who behaved decently both in Stalin's time and in Brezhnev's time.

"We must somehow redeem our shame and our guilt and fit ourselves to the purpose which the people have defined."

D. Urnov, the chief editor of the journal *VOPROSY LITERATURY* said: "I received a note regarding the plays of Mikhail Shatrov recently at one of the mass lectures on contemporary literature. The question in the note was put very simply: 'Why aren't they banned?' But, comrades, the times of bans are over! Those times are over when phenomena could be evaluated by silence and bans, that is, essentially put out of existence.

"But if one tries to define my attitude toward how the character who bears Lenin's name in these plays is portrayed in one word, in keeping with the duty of my profession and my own understanding I would define it as modernization. I would say that this is modernization moving in the direction of Lenin's liberalization as a political figure. This liberalization begins with the stylistics of Lenin's speeches. His manner of speaking in the play reminds one more of the endless empty words of those very utopians from the revolution with whom Lenin always argued. It seems to me that the statements and entire monologues put into the mouth of the character with Lenin's name consist of what he considered to be empty phrases and barren rhetoric.

"These comments of mine are in no way intended to diminish at all the innovative significance of these plays, their author's boldness, and the need for the creative work that he is doing. But I do not agree with those who think and say, why follow the nuances? The main thing today is to eliminate the old dogmas and the old stereotypes. No, we know that if we eliminate certain dogmas and stereotypes without understanding them, they will just be replaced by new dogmas and new stereotypes."

The dramatist **M. Shatrov** uneasily posed the question: "How would this conference have gone if it had been assembled, let us say, seven days after the alarmingly celebrated article in the newspaper *SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA*? And reflection on this should," he said, "deprive all of us of moral tranquility. In mid-March a drama occurred in the country, I could not call it anything else, when not just a letter from a woman reader but a serious program document which blasted restructuring appeared in the CPSU Central Committee

organ without comment. And one could not read a different viewpoint in a single newspaper. Glasnost found itself narrowed. I know of only one creative union—the cinematographers—which immediately protested what we read in *SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA*; the rest were silent. Why?

"And where were our historians and social scientists who now are so closely in solidarity with the article in *PRAVDA*? Could you really, you historians of Soviet society, the whole Academy of Social Sciences, could you really not call a conference or a party meeting to give this article its proper evaluation? What did you lack—knowledge or a clear ideological position? Did we all really have to wait until 5 April?

"Why did we absolutely have to wait for impetus from upstairs? Why are we so consistently afraid to think for ourselves? It is an enormous reproach to all of us and evidence of the fact that the old and customary ways have a firm hold on us. It is a question of the fate of every individual person, but once again we are waiting for permission from the leaders!

"These 20 days have shown that the readiness with which other workers on the ideological front almost rushed to embrace the author from *SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA* should alarm all of us; behind the oaths of loyalty to restructuring is heard a yearning for other times when everything was so clear and understandable.

"I am one of the few living heroes of the article in *SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA*, an article which has become the apogee of the press campaign against the play 'Onward, Ever Onward!' Instead of analysis there is distortion, instead of criticism—ready-made labels and verdicts. And antisocialism, and emigration, and Menshevism, and, of course, statements against the line of the 27th Party Congress.

"Where are all of these labels coming from again? All of them come from that time when there was no place for a real history of the party, real social studies, and real historical literature.

"In 30 years I have written only six political dramas about the revolution, even though I could have written substantially more. Each play—each one!—was banned and made it through with enormous difficulty. The history of the appearance of each play could be the subject of a new drama. But that is not the point, the point is that in 1988 I am hearing again all the same motifs that have pursued me all my creative life.

"Here is an eloquent example. On 27 January 1982 A. Yegorov, the director of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CPSU Central Committee, sent a letter to the chairman of the Committee of State Security, Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, regarding my play 'That Is How We Will Win!' A.G. Yegorov enumerated serious ideological flaws and deviations from historical truth in

the play and directed attention to Lenin's political isolation, his confrontation with the Central Committee, and to the assertion that the play does not show the constructive creativity of the masses under the party's leadership. 'On the stage faceless peasants, soldiers, and workers complain about their harsh fate and proclaim their disagreement with the party's policies.' Despite the title 'That Is How We Will Win!' the play, he said, just does not provide an answer to the question of how we will win. 'In the play the real problem of the possibility of building socialism in our country... is replaced by another, contrived problem: what kind of socialism should be built.' The problem of the correlation of spontaneity and deliberateness is resolved in a very unusual way: it is precisely the peasants' dissatisfaction which supposedly forced Lenin to introduce the NEP. The play idealizes the NEP itself.

"But what suggestions did Academician Yegorov make? The play 'should be quietly, without noise and commotion, eliminated from the MKhAT's repertoire.' 'The appropriate ministries and departments... should set up a strong barrier against such works and cut off all channels of their possible appearance.' 'The attention of newspaper and journal editorial offices must be directed to the fact that hasty, superficial, and self-promoting reviews are being published .. In accordance with L.I. Brezhnev's directives at the 26th CPSU Congress we must promptly and skillfully correct those who slip to one side or the other and be uncompromising with those who defame our socialist reality. The CPSU Central Committee decision on the accountability of editors of newspapers and journals... must be rigorously followed.'

"This is what our literature and history has suffered from—the activities of those very specialists in esthetics like Academician Yegorov who until recently headed historical-party science and sowed his own ethics and his own methodology there, and as a result that same falsified history which Viktor Astafyev and many others justifiably spoke of here has flourished.

"I would like to respond to all the particular comments in the press regarding the play. But it is a bit too late. It seems to me that today we have something more important: we must sense that if restructuring does not come off it is not the Andreyev's and others of his ilk who are to blame, but all of us who now swearing allegiance to restructuring but were silent yesterday. We alone and no one else are to blame. And I am certain that if we think about the development of our literature, then, of course, each of us needs the historian's friendly hand rather than that of the guardian of the canons of stagnation. And I believe that here today we writers are putting out our hands and most likely historians are putting out their hands to us. The most important thing is that these hands do not hang in midair."

"Twelve years remain," said the poet A. Markov, "before we turn over our century, as construction workers turn over a house. What will this house be like? It

seems to me that the greatest danger in this house is forgetfulness. We must erect monuments to the oppressed and we must erect monuments to those who died of hunger if we want to be good fathers and good sons."

"The old thinking counteracts the new thinking sometimes in an aggressive and sometimes in a hostile way," said the critic V. Oskotskiy. "The columns of many newspapers and journals are evidence of that.

"Let us recall the comments on Yu. Afanasyev's article published in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 'From the Positions of Truth and Realism' and other articles of his; there the boundary between the old and the new positions is clearly manifested. It is precisely because of the opposition of the old thinking to the new that we still have not managed to fundamentally change the development of real historical consciousness. The devices of restraint in social practice and in the consciousness of people who have been compromised but not consigned to the oblivion of the realities of the past have simply become more diverse and refined. Moreover, certain new standard models for protecting the past have taken shape.

"I am not going to include myself in the debate which F. Kuznetsov proposed concerning when the present renewal of literature should be said to have begun. But Anna Akhmatova's 'Requiem' is appearing and we are hearing the statement that it is an expression of political egocentrism and that it is a monument to herself. Dudintsev's novel 'White Clothes' is appearing. Following it grumbling is heard from the journal MOLODAYA GWARDIYA that exposing the Lysenko phenomenon is of course necessary and useful but does not enrich national culture. Daniil Granin's story 'The Reactionary' is also coming out and reproaches have begun against the author that he poeticizes a 'defector.'

"Finally, Mikhail Shatrov's play 'Onward, Ever Onward!' is appearing. And we read in an article by Andreyeva that the author violates the principles of socialist realism. What kind of art is this which puts the immutability of a principle above everything and puts the known above the unknown?

"'Only the Truth Cannot Be Judged' the article in the newspaper PRAVDA is called. But I have a question: just where were these champions of truth when history was falsified under Stalin right before their eyes? We must not approach works of art addressed to history from the standpoint of an illustrated history textbook. The dramatist, obeying the creative laws of art, has the right to bring Lenin and Stalin onto the stage after their deaths and has the right to leave Stalin on the stage, no matter how much we might want him to leave."

"Genuine communists," the writer N. Shundik said in his speech, "who took the burden of 10 people onto their own shoulders, people with their own thinking and with

a sharpened sense of accountability, were essentially beheaded under Stalin precisely because they did not want to hide their heads in the sand. And they were replaced by those who knew how to hide their heads in the sand and not only did not take on the burden of 10 but adroitly switched their own personal burden to others. It was from their ranks that the so-called manageable, the so-called disciplined, the so-called trustworthy ones were selected for years. But in essence they were extremely untrustworthy, more than that, absolutely untrustworthy, since they ruined everything they were supposed to be absolutely responsible for.

"Those who assume that such people appeared much later than the Stalin age are mistaken. They say that embezzlers of public funds and frauds could not emerge in such a severe time. No, that is a lie! It was precisely then that the destructive process of the natural selection of these untalented but very dangerous people arose. They are the offspring of Stalinism, precisely.

"One often hears that the whole Stalinist period was a period of primitive people, of people mechanically carrying out orders, of infusoria, a period of absolute lack of spirituality.

"Yes, the natural selection of those whom I called people with their heads in the sand began in that period. But it was not they who were the essence of our society. It was not they who were our conscience and honor. It was not they who were the creators of the unquestionable victories, one of which was the victory over the Nazi fascists, and it was not they whom history raised to the rank of saviors of mankind. These feats were accomplished not because of, but in spite of everything that Stalinism engendered.

"Recently persistent demands have rung out in certain periodical organs of the press that everyone who at one time signed a letter stating their disagreement with certain trends in the journal NOVYY MIR should repent. But what should I personally repent of? That I disagreed with the position of Sinyavskiy and others like him which was stated in NOVYY MIR? With the position which is in no way different from the one which people there in the West are taking now? Or should I forget that this journal trampled on, for example, such a remarkable writer, veteran, soldier, and citizen as Vitaliy Zakrutkin? And not just him. So I understood and I do understand that in many respects Tvardovskiy was not the point—but the Sinyavskiy's with whom I argued and I will continue to argue, despite the mockery of those thirsting for blood.

"I realize the fire I am drawing on myself and how I will be wildly misinterpreted outside this hall. But I still hope that those who are so harsh and stern with me, if they really are for consolidation, will be able to overcome their possible bias."

V. Kostrov, a poet, focused attention on the following position: "We must understand that certain, admittedly conservative ideas possess the masses and the masses take them very seriously. That must be taken into account. There are people whom we as writers and scientists and as political figures must convince how things should be." V. Kostrov dwelled on the question of the method of socialist realism. "Theory or definition is justified to the extent that it works. I believe that the term 'socialist realism' was working when it was necessary to reproach and humiliate our major writers. But why is this term which reflects the cult of personality necessary?"

The writer S. Zalygin said that there are probably no closer fields of activity than history and literature. If a literary work is a serious one, then it is already a historical one for it reflects the time. But that does not mean that history as a science must dictate its rules to literature. We have already fallen to the extreme more than once by subordinating an artistic work to the historical conception and as a result neither one of them turned out. Illustrations replaced depth and the truth itself suffered from it. We must recognize the artist's right to freedom in interpreting living material.

"I would like to dwell on a work which we have only just published—'Doctor Zhivago.' It is really a historical narration. However, we do not find factual information on the civil war in it. The bearing there is something altogether different—lyrical when the historical facts pass before the poet's eyes and are passed before his internal spiritual vision. One can by no means judge such works about the civil war as Sholokhov's 'Quiet Flows the Don' and Pasternak's 'Doctor Zhivago' according to the same law. Altogether different approaches are needed here if we want to understand the essence of the depth of these two very different novels. For Pasternak did not at all strive for precise detail. I will cite an example. You remember how every day Zhivago rode horseback 40 kilometers to the town—during the muddy road season. But a horse will not go 40 kilometers a day—not to mention there and back—during this season. So the details of real life do not interest the author at all, but it is keenly interesting to follow how the lyric poet sees reality and how he views such an enormous event as the civil war. There are two types of facts: a fact of life and a fact of the writer's attitude toward that fact. And that attitude is no less interesting to the reader.

"If we return to the sources of the emergence of humanitarian thought, we will discover that in Ancient Greece every writer was a historian. Incidentally, even mythology is the same history expressed in images and symbols. What is the reason that literature and history are so close? I think that the reason is that literature tells about a person and history tells about mankind. It is here that the source of our mutual enrichment lies. Billions of people are absolutely the same reality as an individual person. But literature at present does not reflect this

reality—mankind. Literature may rise to that if it summons history as an ally. Perhaps I am fantasizing but we sometime shall return to the method of the ancient Greeks who found the secret of this unity: man and mankind. Let us return to the new spiral of development of our civilization.”

“We argue a great deal about history,” said the literary critic **G. Belaya**, “essentially the history of literature has already been written. ‘Kotlovan’ has been written, the novel ‘We’ has been written, ‘Doctor Zhivago’ has been written, ‘Razgrom’ by Fadeyev has been written, ‘Quiet Flows the Don’ has been written. This history of literature does not have statistics and its discoveries lie in an altogether different sphere, but it is in those spheres that we find the portrayal of the dramatic path of our people. And historians will find a great deal here when they write the real history of our society.

“But we have quite a few fundamental questions for historians. We want to have a concrete, historically precise definition of the social structure used today by those who defend ‘Doctor Zhivago’ and those who lash out at this novel, by those who believe that the novel ‘We’ is a warning and those who consider it slander against the revolution. These questions must be explained so that we do not stumble against those false, opportunistic evaluations which have not yet been at all reexamined.

“Very often the history of literature of the 1920’s is portrayed as a kind of golden age of our art based on the diversity of literary groupings. But I will dare to say that from the beginning two models of the future art were at odds in our society: the idea of art, in the first place, as an appendage to ideology and, secondly, the idea of art as a special, specific method of cognition of reality. These models of art did and do correspond to the two models of socialism which fight among themselves: ‘levelling socialism’ and socialism according to Marx.

“But I want to pose a question: did these models of art have equal opportunities for development in the face of the social reality being deformed? I think they were unequal. An orientation to the theme, the present day, the topicality of the material, to literature which served a given idea, predominated.

“So as not to go off into the distant past, I shall cite as an example D.M. Urnov’s article on the novel ‘Doctor Zhivago,’ printed in PRAVDA. Why does Urnov analyze the novel outside the artistic context of B. Pasternak’s creative works, outside the historical context of the reality reflected in the text, and, finally, outside the poetics of Pasternak? This article has no scientific argumentation. What we get is an ideological tract; it performs the task of a priori refutation of the novel, and the novel’s ideological meaning is drawn from the opinions of the hero rather than from the author’s position.

“But after all, there was also another method of analysis and another model of art. It was oriented to the assertion that art reflects life through its own specific image and that by preserving his own internal freedom the artist is able to create an objective picture of reality. It is precisely in these ways that the best there is in our culture was created, and it was created despite the circumstances rather than because of them. The history of Russia is the history of the moral and spiritual stoicism of its artists.”

“The word ‘history’ has rung out here often. I would like to say another word—‘memory,’” the writer **A. Kazintsev** emphasized. “But tell me, what names should our critics call out? Stalin and in part Sasha Pankratov in ‘Children of the Arbat’ or Timofeyev-Resovskiy in ‘The Reactionary’ can still make claims to artistic sovereignty. The rest are faceless cogs with whom the authors of these popular works deal as the dictator that they dislike dealt with his subjects.

“I understand Mikhail Shatrov, who wrote the answer to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. But I cannot understand the dramatist when long after the publication of the editorial article in PRAVDA he demands that his colleagues join his opinion. But why does the writer think that everyone should express their ideas in his words?

“Recently there has been a great deal of debate about Shatrov’s historical dramas. Historians have found inaccuracies in them. Of course, specialists know more about that. But for me, one of the millions of readers, something else is important—‘The Brest Peace’ and ‘Onward, Ever Onward!’—are not historical dramas of that Shakespearean heat of passions which the revolution deserves; they are shorthand reports. And if something is falsified in them, that is all to the worse. There has also been a great deal of debate about Anatoliy Rybakov’s last novel. In this case too historians are lodging complaints about the work. I am not going to enter into these debates. Something else concerns me—the artistic side. When one reads, for example, the Siberian scenes in ‘Children of the Arbat,’ the question involuntarily arises: did everyone manage to overcome the arrogant haughty attitude toward simple laborers?”

“We have been experiencing an extremely difficult and even dangerous time for our future. Now this danger has somewhat eased up, but it would be a delusion to think that the path of restructuring will be easy,” said the critic **Yu. Burtin**. “There is too much against it. Our empty words, carping, insincerity, and falsehood, which have taught people not to believe in the printed word, are against it. We must abandon this legacy for good.”

Yu. Burtin critically analyzed the letter of the leaders of the USSR Writers’ Union published in PRAVDA and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA.

“We say: Soviet writers have done quite a lot to insure that socialist society becomes aware of itself and comes to the conclusion that revolutionary changes are needed.

But what was the position of the leaders of the Writers' Union regarding writers? I do not remember even one case where a person was expelled from the Writers' Union (or even criticized) for embroidering on reality and for servility before some leader or other. It was not that. There was always a single motive—slander, that is, that very truth in whose name our respected leaders now swear."

Yu. Burtin made a number of sharp critical comments against LITERATURNAYA GAZETA which provoked a no less sharp response from A. Chakovskiy:

"I have been working at LITERATURNAYA GAZETA for over 25 years. Starting with the 20th Congress it has always fought against bureaucracy, stupidity, and greed. Who led the campaign for Baikal? Who led the campaign for ecology in general when this word was still hardly used in our daily practice? Zalygin, Cherednichenko, and others led the campaign. Where? In LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. Whom has LITERATURNAYA GAZETA ever insulted? When the question involves such sacred things as moral categories, I believe that no honorable person would say that."

12424

Leningrad Writer Provides Text of Stalin's Censorship of Zoshchenko

18000371a Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 May 88
p 3

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Yezhelev, Leningrad: "The Stifling Summer of 46. How the Decree on the Journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD Was Passed"]

[Text] Many of us remember this stern document from as far back as our impressionable school days: the All-Union Communist Party (bolshevik) Central Committee Decree of 1946 "Concerning the Journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD."

A major satirist who was read all over the country, Mikhail Zoshchenko was charged with depicting reality in a "maliciously hooligan manner" and "preaching putrid ideas devoid of principles, banality, and political indifference, designed to disorient our young people and poison their consciousness." The same was said of the verses of Anna Akhmatova: "They damage the cause of bringing up our young people," and therefore "they cannot be tolerated in Soviet literature." These statements hardly constituted evaluation; they passed sentence.

Hence, contrary to the Russian Communist Party (bolshevik) Central Committee Resolution of 1925 "On the Party's Policy in the Field of Artistic Literature," which stated precisely and clearly that "the party must eradicate all attempts at arbitrary and incompetent administrative interference in matters of literature," the 1946

Decree officially fixed in place an approach which was methodologically opposite. Arbitrary rule became the decisive feature of cultural policy.

The devastating Decree on the journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD marked the beginning of a new, post-war wave of "unmaskings" and persecutions. After literature, similar "measures" were taken in the field of cinema (such films as "The Great Life" and the second series of "Ivan the Terrible"), music (the opera "The Great Friendship"), and theater (the Decree "The Repertoire of the Dramatic Theaters"). The next stage was the repressive "Leningrad Affair"—a grave drama in the fate of Leningrad, which had yet to get on its feet after the fascist blockade.

Today we are reviewing many historical evaluations. In autumn of 1987, the journal KOMMUNIST, No 15, published an editorial titled "The Calling of Socialist Culture," which in regard to the Decree on the journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD stated that "in terms of the structure of all its ideas and its perception of the phenomena of literature, this was a direct deviation from Leninist principles of cultural leadership."

As is clear from readers' letters, many are wondering whether Stalin took direct part in drafting the provisions upon which the "devastating" Decree concerning the Leningrad journals was based. Is it true that N. S. Tikhonov and A. A. Prokofyev took part in discussing their work in the Orgburo of the All-Union Communist Party (bolshevik) Central Committee? What did they say? What did A. A. Zhdanov say, and what was his role anyway in heating up the atmosphere of suspicion and ideological intolerance during the post-war years? As is known, after the murder of S. M. Kirov—that is, after the end of 1934—Zhdanov headed the Leningrad Party Organization, and after the summer of 1944 he was a secretary of the All-Union Communist Party (bolshevik) Central Committee, in charge of questions of ideology, and it was the Leningrad literary figures who were the first to be subjected to organized hounding and persecution. Is this just a coincidence?

Today we know definitely that Stalin was the one who inspired the pogrom campaign against the creative intelligentsia. The events of 1946 reflected his inherent one-dimensional, superficial, authoritarian perception of the world, which was projected upon literature as well. In his way of thinking, the world of the human spirit was a sphere of bureaucratic administration. Today we are printing books which an acquaintance with in previous years could cost the inquisitive reader his freedom.

Nevertheless, the metastases of authoritarian thinking do not die out easily. Yet to be relegated to the past are bureaucratic interference in the creative life, absurd prohibitions, and a fear of the truth of life and its critical interpretation in the press and in the arts. There are places where "Repentance" has been cut. There are places where directors have been "persuaded" to refrain

from staging a new play by Shatrov. There are places where "slandorous" documentary films have been put on the shelf. Every such instance reflects the same deadening spirit of authoritarianism which was so openly manifested in the events of 1946.

At whose initiative was the issue about literature raised in the Central Committee? On 15 Aug 1946—that is, the day after the Decree on the Journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD was passed, Zhdanov, who had come specially to the city on the Neva to "explain" things, spoke before the city party aktiv. He said: "This issue was submitted for discussion by the Central Committee at the initiative of Comrade Stalin, who is personally keeping track of the work of the journals...and proposed that the question of shortcomings in the management of these journals be discussed; he also personally took part in this meeting of the Central Committee and issued instructions upon which the decision was based." (A stenogram of the report is kept in the party archives of the Leningrad Institute of Party History, an affiliate of the CPSU Central Committee's Marxism-Leninism Institute.)

Thus, the matter was discussed at the meeting, and in a collective manner....

All right, there is someone who can tell about this meeting.

The Leningrad writer and journalist D. A. Levonevskiy was present at the meeting. In fact, he made a record of it which, after returning from Moscow, was read and corrected by other writers who had been at the meeting in the Central Committee. A former newspaper reporter, he knew shorthand and could not fail to realize the significance of what had happened.

Dmitriy Anatolyevich recently turned his original notes over to the manuscripts section of IRLI, and the complete text of it is to be published in one of the summer issues of ZVEZDA.

Here is what D. A. Levonevskiy has to say:

I spent the entire blockade here: I fought on the Leningrad front and worked on the division newspaper STALINSKOYE ZNAMYA and even as a deputy to Boris Likharev, the editor of the journal LENINGRAD. I was not demobilized but rather "seconded." I didn't take off my army uniform until the spring of 1946. And in early August came that memorable summons to Moscow.

We traveled in a party of six: V. Sayanov, who edited ZVEZDA for many years, A. Prokofyev, B. Likharev, P. Kapitsa, N. Nikitin, and I. For what, no one knew for certain. When they issued the travel orders in the obkom, they said only that the Leningrad journals were to be discussed.

At the Central Committee we were immediately conducted into Zhdanov's waiting room. With Zhdanov was a comrade named Aleksandrov, who as I understood it was head of the department of agitation and propaganda. But even here we did not find out anything specific about the forthcoming discussion. We only answered a few questions about the authors of our journals.

Aleksandrov's words made us prick up our ears: "It is requested that you not leave the Hotel Moskva. Do not speak to anyone on the telephone. Do not invite any Moscow writers to visit you. Do not get in contact with anyone."

For two endlessly long days we languished in ignorance. On 9 August the phone rang: "Report to the pass office at 19:30 hours."

So there we were in the foyer of the meeting hall of the Central Committee Orgburo. Alesha Surkhov came upon the scene all cheerful and out of breath, said hello to the Leningraders, and gave everyone an OGONEK Library booklet with a sad portrait of Mikhail Zoshchenko on the cover.

"Read it, boys. Front-line soldiers respect laughter...."

A bell sounded and we were invited into the hall, where little tables were arranged in a checkerboard pattern.

In front, behind the presidium table, were Stalin, Zhdanov, and Aleksandrov. The other leaders were in their places in the hall.

Zhdanov opened the meeting (speeches at the meeting are here published in abridged form).

Zhdanov: Lately the Leningrad journals LENINGRAD and ZVEZDA have been publishing works that are weak, for example Leonid Borisov's "Volshebnyk iz Gel'-G'yu". It is a very arcane fantasy which reflects the writer's departure from the present....Another writer, Knekht, describes some icon collector....In a play published in ZVEZDA, writer Yagfelt writes at the ideological level of a schoolboy philistine....

The journal's works of poetry are suffused with depression and pessimism....Akhmatova writes of nothing but nostalgia for the past....

Exceptionally harmful is M. Zoshchenko's work about a monkey jumping on the shoulders and heads of persons standing in line. The monkey is bored with the people and their stupid rules. This concerns the distribution of goods in a food store and officers of the militia. Society is depicted in absurd terms. "I raised this monkey like a human" says the boy in the narrative. Hence, the monkey is an example for humans.

Stalin: What's the author like? To what category of beasts does he belong?

Zhdanov (continuing): Leningrad is printing weak material. For example, the poet Selvinskiy sees nothing in burned-down Sevastopol...except a woman....

Stalin: The material lacks....

Zhdanov: What is the cause of these errors? The errors of writers such as Zoshchenko and Akhmatova? A group of our writers has fallen under the influence of petty bourgeois ideology and literature that is hostile to us. In addition, the editors have slackened their vigilance.

What conclusion can we draw? The work of ZVEZDA's editors must be improved. In view of the lack of sufficient literary forces to publish two journals, the publication of Leningrad is to be stopped.

I solicit your opinions.

The first to speak was V. Soyayev. He spoke of the difficulties of the first post-war year. Then he confessed: "I believe my major personal mistake was to publish Zoshchenko's story." To this, Stalin retorted: "It is a vacuous piece which offers nothing to the mind or the heart. It is a shallow story, a stupid thing."

B. Likharev, the editor of Leningrad, also excused himself by reference to unavoidable difficulties, although he agreed that "we are being criticized correctly, too mildly even."

The one who spoke after him was A. Prokofyev, the chairman of the board of the Leningrad Writers Organization. According to Levonevskiy, Prokofyev managed somewhat to defuse the tense atmosphere of the meeting by quoting funny rhymes at appropriate places. Stalin asked him a number of questions about the work of ZVEZDA's editors and the advisability of having two journals in the city. Prokofyev assured him that the Leningraders had the necessary forces to "raise up two journals." Stalin interrupted him abruptly.

Stalin: How about Akhmatova? What does she have besides old things?

Prokofyev: She's old herself; you can't make her over....And ZNAMYA is even printing verses of Akhmatova which we rejected.

Stalin: We'll look into those too.

During the speech of I. M. Shirokov, a department head in the Leningrad Gorkom, Zhdanov reproached him, saying that the Leningraders "themselves put Zoshchenko down during the war years and then suddenly brought him onto the editorial board of ZVEZDA." By "put down" they were referring to an article written by four Leningrad authors in the journal BOLSHEVIK No 2, 1944, which dealt with Zoshchenko's story "Pered voskhodom solntsa" [Before Sunrise]. At the Orgburo this "motif" also resounded in V. Vishnevskiy's speech.

Vishnevskiy: We Leningraders were the first to strike out at Zoshchenko, who was always dragging out old dirty linen. He would write about invalids, beer halls, militia officers, and so on.

Stalin: He's a preacher of lack of principles....

Aleksandrov: A ranter....

Stalin: Writers think they're not involved in politics....Just write nice and that's all. Yet there are bad, dangerous places, thoughts which poison young people's minds....Why am I not overly fond of people like Zoshchenko? Because what they write is like an emetic. Can we tolerate in posts of leadership people who allow such things to be printed?...In this country, a journal is not a private enterprise....It has no right to cater to the tastes of people who do not want to recognize our system. Those who do not want to reform themselves, Zoshchenko for example, let them go to hell. It is not up to us to refashion our tastes, to accommodate our thinking and feelings to Zoshchenko and Akhmatova. Is Anna Akhmatova capable of instructing people? Is that fool, that stupid storyteller, that hack Zoshchenko capable of instructing people?...

Zhdanov: We now turn to the second item....

...The second item at the meeting of the Orgburo of the All-Union Communist Party (bolshevik) Central Committee was a discussion of the "ideological errors" committed in the films "The Great Life" and "Ivan the Terrible" (second series)....

Zoshchenko and Akhmatova were expelled from the Writers Union. No longer published, they were deprived of an income. Zoshchenko tried to earn a little working by in a shoeshop. The persecution which began in the newspapers and on the radio turned into a protracted campaign; it touched many literary figures, not just those mentioned in Zhdanov's remarks.

In the articles in our press now the post-war "unmaskings" and persecutions are viewed as a well laid-out system of measures to protect and consolidate Stalin's regime of authoritarian rule. It was already possible to do away with the intellectual "freedoms" which Stalin was compelled to grant during the difficult war years. Under the circumstances, Akhmatova and Zoshchenko, naturally, could hardly fail to bring trouble upon themselves. The well-known Leningrad critic and literary expert I. Eventov recalls that Akhmatova, who had not been published for almost two decades, who had been declared an exponent of the moods of "an obsolete world," suddenly rang out during the war years with wonderful patriotic verses and soon her lyrics of years gone by were published widely in various editions. Moreover, in 1946 poetry soirees were organized for Anna Andreyevna in Moscow; according to Konstantin Simonov, these soirees came off in "dizzying, almost demonstrative triumph." Yet it was a triumph of a

literary person completely devoid of conformity! Nor was Mikhail Zoshchenko a conformist; after all, he was a satirist, he came not to praise but to scourge! And for all that, he became a most popular author. He was published abundantly in the journals and newspapers, his works were read on the radio and on the stage; his plays were performed in theaters. A satirist could not be forgiven such a thing! Worth noting is a fact, unnoticed by anyone so far, that the unbridled tone and unjust gist of the article against Zoshchenko in BOLSHEVIK (No 2, 1944) were, as Zhdanov declared at the party aktiv, inspired by the Leningrad Gorkom—and it was when Zhdanov himself was the head of the gorkom and obkom....

In addition, both Zoshchenko and Akhmatova were a part of Leningrad—a city which personified intelligence, a favorite of the people for its wondrous beauties, its revolutionary character, its special role in Soviet culture and science as well as industrial development—in short, a city which, like it or not, in terms of its significance to the life of the state rose above the provincial level and rivaled the capital city as a spiritual center of the nation. This is something that could not please Stalin, whose undivided power required only strict state centralization. The Leningraders' valor, which astonished the whole world during the blockade, exalted the City of Lenin even more.

To Stalin, however, Akhmatova, Zoshchenko, and Leningrad formed as it were a single line, and this obstinate straight line must be made to curve and brought to heel. It is no accident that two years later an insignificant anonymous letter was used to unleash the bloody "Leningrad Affair," in which thousands of officials, leading specialists, scientists, and cultural figures were repressed. It was no mere massacre of cadres; workers from other places were sent to Leningrad to take over key posts in party and soviet apparatuses. Thus was the "dangerous" Leningrad spirit extirpated and cauterized.

And, of course, it all started with the intelligentsia. The writers, the journals. With simple criticism, it seemed.

What was done to Leningrad at Stalin's initiative in those years after the war and the blockade, which took a million of the city's lives, inflicted upon its spiritual traditions a severe loss which, many believe, is still felt today. And it is not Leningraders alone who suffer this loss!

But let us not forget how this post-war drama began.

06854

Kaverin Defends Zoshchenko as First To Describe Fear During Stalin Era

18000371b *Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian* 21 May 88
p 3

[Commentary by Kaverin. Peredelkino, 16 May 1988]

[Text] No one (or practically no one) remembers the swift flight of glory of M. M. Zoshchenko in the 1920s.

Back in 1929, the Academia Publishing House dedicated to him a collection of articles in which eminent critics and literary experts took part. Now that new books have been written about him, now that the equals sign between him and his heroes has finally been erased and the truth has been restored in the clear light of day, the truth which returns Zoshchenko to the narrow circle of first-class Soviet writers, there is no need once more to prove it by means of historical and theoretical analysis. But neither can we consign to oblivion, to darkness and muteness, the shocking circumstances which overtook him in 1946 and pursued him to his death. We cannot ignore the imposed silence of the years of insults, abuses, treachery, and destitution.

He was enormously successful with his readers; his words and expressions entered the spoken language early on. But the chorus of praise was also penetrated by an unconscious lack of understanding. For this, only one thing was necessary—lack of a sense of humor. And not to get Zoshchenko's humor required complete deafness.

To this lack of understanding, suspicion and rejection were gradually added. In every line he wrote, Zoshchenko wittingly or unwittingly derided the eulogies that increasingly resounded in literature. His laughter rang strange at that time, when the name of Stalin was heard every two or three minutes on the radio, when even in the minutes of a routine meeting in some section of the Writers Union Stalin was called a genius.

In 1957, the almanac LITERATURNAYA MOSKVA (2) printed Yashin's story "Levers."

Meetings in the Writers Union immediately fulminated against the story; and then the almanac itself, whose appearance was linked to a new, encouraging phase in our literature, was itself banned. But for now I'll only say that Yashin's story, which made the author famous, was denounced because it adroitly and cleverly depicted a social phenomenon prevailing in our country: the fear that gave rise to a double life. One was the personal, natural, ordinary life. The other was the bureaucratic, official life which instantaneously transformed honest, sincere, kind people into the "levers" of state apparatus.

This bifurcation was predicted by Zoshchenko back in the 1920s. In his best stories, in fact, Zoshchenko depicted the "new" man, for whom this bifurcation was a deliberate, vigorous means of existence.

Zoshchenko was the first to sense the menacing force that went side by side with the lowering of the intellectual level, the multi-stage assault on the unprotected arts. This force consisted of unlimited, ramified philistinism. Such philistinism alone could survive by persisting in advance to bifurcation, to transformation into "levers," for which morality was only a burden.

Zoshchenko himself sensed that no one may laugh at philistinism, which by the early 1930s had taken a dominating position.

All of a sudden, this widely known writer was in complete isolation. Even those whom he considered his closest friends turned away. It was the beginning of a new, tragic phase in his life, one which demanded the utmost exertion of all his spiritual and physical powers.

Until now, then, one could only conjecture as to the reasons for the Central Committee's 14 Aug 1946 Decree "On the Journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD." As to the reasons for the sudden attack on Zoshchenko, Akhmatova, and the "Serapionov Brothers" one could only guess—the immediate and particular reasons, at any rate. These particular reasons meant nothing compared to the general and even the universal reason. And I think this latter can now, after 42 years, be named. Not with complete certainty, but nevertheless. The general reason was that immediately after the war, after the Victory which cost millions of lives, a time of vague hopes arose in society. These were hopes for "indulgence," deserved trust, long-awaited humaneness, a natural gentleness after all the sufferings. These hopes were the target of attack, and since Russian literature reflected the soul of the people in all times and all circumstances, it was decided to plunge a poisoned knife into this soul.

The very choice of the writers, who were left at liberty on purpose in order to prolong the effect of the attack for years, proves this assumption.

In Zoshchenko's first books the distance between the author and his heroes was so vast that only a person who could not distinguish music from street noise would fail to notice. But it could, of course, be deliberately ignored! And this is undoubtedly what was done, in 1944, after the BOLSHEVIK article, when they stopped the printing of Zoshchenko's book "Pered voskhodom solntsa". He was already being called "a ragpicker" who "wanders around human rubbish heaps selecting the worst." They wrote that "obeying dark desires, he drags freaks by the hair onto the stage," that he "propagandizes a scornful attitude toward people and relishes scenes that inspire profound loathing."

Yet "Before Sunrise" was motivated by the desire to take part in the Great Patriotic War. For reasons of health (and his age), Zoshchenko was honorably exempt from military service; he could not serve as a military correspondent like the others, although he did go to the front. Later, when he was attacked with unparalleled libelous accusations, he was called a coward who had run away to Alma-Ata from blockaded Leningrad. That was a lie. He flew out of Leningrad in September 1941 along with Shostakovich; some gorkom leader had the good sense to take care of the country's great citizens. Zoshchenko was one of the bravest persons I have ever met.

Zoshchenko hated fascism primarily because of its contempt for the individual, for the particular features of individual temperament and for the uniqueness mankind has developed through the millenia.

We spoke to him about this back in Leningrad, after two of his short trips to the front. Perhaps that was when his book "Before Sunrise," which he had thought about a long time, took shape. It is divided into two parts. Part I, published in OKTYABR in 1943, consists of stories which reveal to the reader a panorama of life which seems ordinary at first glance but is in reality psychopathological. The review which appeared in BOLSHEVIK made it impossible to publish Part II. Here is a quote from the review: "What is it that has shaken the imagination of the writer, a contemporary of the greatest events in mankind's history? In answer to this, Zoshchenko submits to the reader 62 filthy events which 'inspired' him at some time or other between 1912 and 1926. The whole story is suffused with the author's scorn for people. Almost all the people Zoshchenko writes about are drunks, petty thieves, and perverts. It is like spitting in the face of our readers. How could Zoshchenko write this rubbish, which only benefits the enemies of our Motherland?"

Yet Part I was written for the sake of Part II. In it Zoshchenko tries to explain the psychological essence of fascism, and then the 62 stories—examples from his own life—prove essential and fall into place.

In a letter to Stalin on 25 Nov 1943 he attempted to explain the essence of the matter. Mikhail Mikhailovich, of course, did not get an answer.

Yevgeniy Zamyatin wrote to Stalin that he refused to work "behind bars." Unrepentantly, Mikhail Bulgakov insistently argued his innocence. He had not been published since 1926, but he kept on working on "Master and Margarita." Anna Akhmatova's poetry, concealed deep under ground, was the basis of self-assertion—and it triumphed. Isaak Babel kept silent rather than lie. Though widely separated under siege, they were linked by profound internal ties.

Although "Before Sunrise" got a very negative reception, until 1946 Zoshchenko remained one of the most respected writers of the older generation. Then in August 1946 came the Central Committee's Decree on ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD, and a different climate was installed in society and in literature. The Central Committee's Decree was no [?] legal article. In it, entirely unsubstantiated accusation acquired the form of a law. It was officially decreed that Zoshchenko was a hooligan, a slanderer, a vulgar person and scum of the earth. Today we find it depressing to read this kind of invective in such a document....

Fear and philistinism—these are the two sides of the social phenomenon which Zoshchenko first revealed and against which he wielded his merciless sharp weapon.

That weapon was laughter, which has served mankind faithfully in all eras. But when this was understood by those at whom this fearless writer was laughing (rather, they did not understand but merely sensed, because they were not up to understanding), they unleashed upon him the full force of state wrath.

But while these considerations may help us in our attempt to account for the street language and abuse heaped upon M. Zoshchenko in terms of the "formulations" of 1946, they in no way account for the attacks on Anna Akhmatova, who was called "a mad mistress," "half nun and half whore," whose works, which had taken their place at the heights of world poetry, were defined with the single expressive word "trash." And the fact that this "half nun and half whore" was the faithful daughter of her people all her life, who during the war years wrote immortal verses making Akhmatova kin with her people forever, was ordered to be forgotten. The Decree was passed in August 1946, yet in May this "half nun and half whore" had published her verse "To the Victors," dedicated to the heroism of Leningrad's defenders.

Who among the Russian and Soviet people was not amazed and touched by these lines of genius in 1942?

It is not frightening to lie dead under the bullets,
It is not hard to be without a roof,— And we will
preserve thee, Russian speech, Thou great Russian
word.

What is there to say? It is not only in verses born of calamities, humiliation, valor, and fear that every line written by the hand of Anna Andreyevna speaks, affirms, and sings of Russia, is linked with the Motherland, sees man through the prism of love for the Motherland, and is inseparably linked to Russian literature.

That whole report, in which the understanding of literature by no means reaches the level of Chekhov's telegrapher Yat', is infused with a blunt, strained hatred for the intelligentsia—for it is so clear that the report is "given," "ordered," preordained.

Indeed, these days it is bitter and laughable to read Zhdanov's "report." It wrecked hundreds of lives. Thanks to the self-perpetuation and spinning in place that were characteristic of both the Terror and the period of stagnation, this nonsense, far from being rescinded, was deliberately retained for decades.

It is also laughable to read this report these days because in the unequal skirmish between literature and telegrapher Yat', it was literature which triumphed, literature tattered yet radiant with the steady glow of the light of pride and worthiness. Literature crowned with world glory, appreciated and deeply loved in Akhmatova's Motherland. Likewise victorious was Zoshchenko, who "overcame death with death" and gained one of the

preeminent places in our literature. But how many sacrifices, how many hardships he had to endure for the sake of that victory! We have no right to keep silent about them.

If we are people of honor, we must not forget the past. And it is not becoming to us, who have created the most conscientious literature in the world, to act as if that infamy never was. Why? There is nothing easier than answering that question: so that we will not be ashamed to look our children and grandchildren in the eye.

06854

BSSR Writers' Union Chief Advocates Elevating Position of Belorussian Language

*18000335 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
30 Apr 88 p 3*

[Article by Belorussian Writers' Union Board First Secretary Nil Gitevich, under the rubric "The Times, Culture and Us": "The Mother Tongue"]

[Excerpts] At last we have enthusiastically agreed on the necessity for perestroika in this sphere of the country's social life as well—the sphere of international relations. True, we had given it last priority, but—we have agreed. And right away we had to admit that there are unresolved national problems, and a lot of them at that. And yes, it would have been strange if the area of national policy had turned out to be an exception—that it had not been caught up in the distortions and deformations which had occurred in all other spheres in the "period of the cult," the "period of voluntarism," and the "period of stagnation."

The national and international problem in the life of our society is a major policy question which is exceptionally complex, voluminous and many-faceted. In these remarks I would like to touch on only one of its facets; only one, but one which is very, very urgent: the position and role in one's life of one's native language. Naturally I will be making use of certain information and facts of local, that is, Belorussian "origin," but facts which, according to my information, pertain to one degree or another to the language situation in other union and autonomous republics as well.

The common feature of this situation is the true bilingualism, which has evolved for practical reasons, wherein the citizens have mastered Russian along with their native tongue, and use Russian as the language of international intercourse. The problem of bilingualism is rather complex, both in a theoretical and in a practical respect. It would seem that for theoreticians as a whole everything is clear: bilingualism is a blessing; for it provides for the vitally necessary capabilities for intercourse not only with citizens of any nationality, but also for introduction—through the medium of the Russian language—to the riches of world culture, science, literature and art, not to mention assimilating the treasures of

the great spiritual, moral, and artistic culture of the Russian people. Practical experience in this area affirms this. And yes, we are grateful, and give thanks for our good fortune while we enjoy this obvious blessing.

But in practice there are also things which are not only confusing and give rise to doubts, but are also deeply alarming. In Belorussia, for example, the linguistic processes are developing in such a manner that bilingualism is in fact changing into monolingualism. In all spheres of social life, the Belorussian language is very intensively giving way to the language of international intercourse. The sphere of use of Belorussian has narrowed to a dangerous degree—that is, if this process is not halted, in the not-too-distant future one of the most magnificent Slavic languages may disappear. And with the disappearance of a language... Perhaps it would be better at this point to give the floor to the great Russian pedagogue K.D. Ushinskiy: "Language is the most vital, the richest, and the strongest tie that unites the past, present and future generations of a nation into one great, historic, living whole. It not only expresses the vitality of a nation; it is that vitality itself. If its language disappears, a nation ceases to exist..."

The conception of K.D. Ushinskiy—that language is the very life of a nation; that it is the living soul of a nation; that it is the nation itself—has been expressed in one form or another by a great many major figures of native and world culture, such that it has long since become a truism. Thus it is very strange that some educated comrades act as if they had never heard of anything of the sort. And perhaps in fact they have not heard of it. After all, our studies of the humanities—at all levels—are extremely badly organized. And as far as instruction in one's native language is concerned—the situation is even worse. How many schools have you, esteemed reader, found—from the River Bug to Sakhalin—in which the words of K.D. Ushinsky are displayed on banners hung in the most prominent places? I personally know of no such schools, and have not managed to find any.

Moreover, a culture thrives only when it thrives within the heart of the nation, among the masses and by the masses. If it is not used by the popular masses (the people) in production, in state and local offices, in school and in science, in trade, in domestic life, and so on—can it develop as a living organism? It cannot. There will be no development. The processes of impoverishment, atrophy, and dying out, will continue. It is a natural process in a state of doom. Is this what we want? In saying "we," I have in mind not only those nations among whom the linguistic situation is very unfavorable today, but the entire family of fraternal nations in our country. And I repeat, is this what we need? Is it good for us that one culture, whichever, in our country should decline? Of course not! Under no circumstances!

We will, however, recall that there are quite a few conscious and unconscious (by way of ignorance) enemies of bilingualism, and zealous proponents of the idea

of blending all languages into one. As Rasul Gamzatov recently said of them, "At one time the blending of national languages was presented to us as the imminent apotheosis of the friendship of nations. Today this sounds rather 'absurd.'" A nation, having awakened and having begun to speak, cannot permit itself to part with its own soul. But there is an enormous amount of work to be done among the trends, in the nations, and with the nations: because the nation toward national nihilism has gone too far. It is as if in those far-off pre-October times that the people, and not only educated people, began to be ashamed to use their own native language in public. And no one is trying to help them overcome this false shame; no one says to them, "People; good people; dear people; you must not be ashamed of that! On the contrary; it is shameful for a person not to know his own native language and not use it even at home, in his native land!..."

Every time one hears Belorussian radio or television correspondents talking with workers from the rural areas, one wants to weep from anguish and sorrow, witnessing the simple-minded pretensions to culture of a tractor driver or milkmaid—that is, not to their own native speech—witnessing how they struggle, not finding the right Russian word, and how terrible their awkwardness sounds on the air, or from the TV screen. If you had heard it, you would want to scream, "Speak then, my countrymen, in your own language—the precise, graphic, expressive speech you use among the family, at home! The moreso, since after all, they are addressing you in Belorussian." But can you really reproach these good people for having such a conception of culture, if only correspondents or traveling writers speak with them in Belorussian, and all others—educated comrades with diplomas, and especially the "bosses," hardly ever do so? (Do they not, in their hearts, in a burst of emotion, when their acquired language is insufficient, involuntarily express themselves in their native tongue, until then forgotten?)

And you see, here I cannot but express my own great sorrow that educated people in the city—the administrators of organizations and enterprises, party and soviet officials, the technical and intellectual intelligentsiya, and so on—do not set an example to the simple workers from the villages of a respectful attitude toward their native language. (More precisely, they virtually do not, because there are still some exceptions.)

And so we write and heap praise in the press and on all sorts of screens, on the administrators of certain kolkhozes and leading sovkhozes, Heroes of Socialist Labor; and we give them their due for the "production indicators" they have achieved; and at the same time we show absolutely no interest in what their situation is with regard to their native language in school, with Belorussian books and magazines in the library, or with the Belorussian repertoire in amateur artistic activity. And if you did inquire, you would see that both with the one and the other, and with the third—it is poor, simply

poor. And it is hard to know that you are in Belorussia, or in a Belorussian village—because of the extent to which all national originality has been estranged, removed, and effaced.

If you honestly and seriously take things into account, then such an attitude toward one's native language and national culture can be explained either by the narrowness of one's world view, or by political and civic irresponsibility. And do not take offense with me for the bluntness of my words, Comrade Leading Lights and Heroes. It is unforgivable today not to understand the simple things, as if high material well-being demands a high degree of spiritual support as well; and the latter is not possible at the expense of imported or borrowed "means" alone. It goes without saying that one must make use of the spiritual values of both native and world cultures, and the treasures of art and literature as well, but make us of them for the development and flourishing of one's original national culture, in which not only your people, but all humanity is interested.

It must be very firmly assimilated, that in the complex and contradictory process of building a national culture, the native language has the principal and the leading role; that the impoverishment and subsequent bogging down of one's native language inevitably leads to the dying out of national traditions and the entire spiritual creativity of a nation; the result is degradation of the culture in general and, consequently the moral degradation of the people.

For myself, personally, for example, I have no doubt that among the reasons which have lead and are leading to drunkenness, narcotics addiction, sexual promiscuity, cynicism, cruelty and so on—the dying-out of the roots, the pollution of the sources of national self-consciousness, and trampling upon spiritual, or otherwise, historical heritage—occupy a prominent position. But in order not to be divorced from this heritage, one must begin to read as a little child the books which were written over the centuries by the writers and scholars of this land; and these books were written in the language of this land, which, alas, you have not been taught, neither in school nor at home. And so it turns out, that no matter how hard you try, without our native language nothing good will come of us.

How many times have I had to watch the following scene in a Minsk bookstore: A child, still a pre-schooler, begs his mother to buy a beautiful children's book; but the little mama from Minsk flings the book away as if it were contaminated, and loudly and not without a little horror

explains, "That is Belorussian! No, no, that is forbidden!" Thus the little fellow begins to understand that Belorussian is something bad, is something forbidden. Apparently the little mother also received a similar reprimand in her time. And so the Ivans come on the scene and grow up, not understanding their heritage.

Everything begins with the cradle, with the nursery, with the kindergarten. As it says in one of the poems by Belorussian poet Sergey Dergaya: "The tooth has just about broken through, and he bites his mother's breast." It would be well if this little fellow who was frightened by "Belorussian-ness" later learns that it is not nice to bite the mother's breast of one's native culture, one's native language. And if he does not learn? All his life he himself may frighten off someone. Especially if he finds himself somewhere close to ideological work. All his life he will remember only one thing: one must fight nationalism. And who are these nationalists? Oh, those are the ones who speak Belorussian in Minsk (or in Brest, or Gomel, or any city in the republic). Do I exaggerate? Not a bit. Recently Pimen Panchenko, Poet Laureate of Belorussia, wrote with sorrow and disappointment, "Speak Russian, and you're an internationalist. But speak Belorussian and you're a nationalist."

But if these same people demand opening Belorussian schools in Belorussian cities and even make the Belorussian language the working language of the republic Ministry of Culture, then they are inveterate, double-dyed nationalists. I expressed my lack of understanding or indignation over why two oblast and even certain rayon newspapers are not published in the native language of the local populace—and I'm a nationalist! I expressed the desire to return the Belorussian language to the republic "Rural Newspaper" and to certain republic magazines—and I'm a nationalist! I said or wrote that it is not good, and it is disrespectful to the people and its culture to have only three Belorussian-language theaters in such a large republic—and I'm a nationalist! And so on and so forth; I could cite many examples.

In a word, the concern for the culture of international relations and for affirming a spirit of true internationalism in our lives must become a nation-wide concern, and a primary concern for each and every one of us. Not a single one of us has the moral right to any other attitude toward the Leninist brotherhood of nations which was born in October, to this truly magnificent achievement of socialism.

09006

**Inter-Ethnic Tensions in Estonia Outlined by
Prominent Cultural Figure**

*18000419 Tallinn MOLODEZH ESTONII in Russian
13 May 88 p 3*

[Article by Ein Pyldroos: "We Have More Things in
Common Than Differences"]

[Text] By stagnation we mean keeping quiet about problems. During that period we tried not only verbally to include in the category of the nonexistent everything that really existed, but did not correspond to the bureaucracy's idyllic ideas of our society.

We began to think like citizens. The phosphorite problem became the organizing factor in people's fight against the threatening danger. The movement in support of the idea of transferring the republic to full cost accounting played a similar role. People began to see themselves as a force in the fight against bureaucracy. Recently, all these problems have been quite widely illuminated on the pages of the republic press, but not in all editions. One of the greatest dangers for the process of renewal originates from here. For quite a long time the republic's Russian-language editions did not participate in the discussion of problems, which disturbed all the population of Estonia and continue to do so, or even presented the situation in a somewhat distorted form. Tendencies toward an improvement have appeared only quite recently. Nevertheless, the Russian-language population continues to experience a shortage of objective information on many problems concerning the republic's population as a whole.

The fact that, owing to variant reading in the information reaching population groups differing in the national criterion, there is a danger of emergence of two different public opinions evokes concern. This introduces tension, which inevitably is transferred to international relations. It is obvious that for the most part these frictions are generated by a lack of information, as well as by recently disseminated oral disinformation. Such an artificial introduction of tension is only of benefit to the bureaucracy that opposes restructuring.

Of course, it was a hypocrisy to assert that in our country there are no problems in the area of international relations. They are very acute in some spheres. They should be discussed. They can be solved under conditions of mutual frankness, goodwill, and a constructive approach. In any event, full mutual information is needed for this. We call upon all inhabitants of Estonia to engage in such an exchange of views.

The psychologies of big and small nations differ from each other. In the consciousness of the representative of a big nation there is no concern about a possible disappearance. Nothing threatens a big nation. There are quite many factors threatening the fate and very existence of a small nation. The centuries-old history of the Estonian nation is the history of its fight on the brink of life and

death. Therefore, a keen sense of concern for self-preservation and distrust of everything that can put the nation in danger in the future is foremost in the national consciousness of the Estonian nation. Hence the strong attachment to native places and nonacceptance of all those that do not have proper respect for these places. As a result of stormy migratory processes, the share of Estonians in the republic's population was reduced to 60 percent. If the process continues, for the first time in the history of their nation Estonians could be in the minority on the land of their forefathers. It is clear that most Estonians take such prospects tragically. It is also clear that the frictions arising on such a basis can serve as a detonator for highly undesirable conflicts, which we condemn in every possible way and do our utmost to avoid. We are deeply convinced that problems of international communication cannot be reduced to the level of relations among individual people. The attitude toward a person cannot be built on the basis of his national affiliation. At the level of relations among people personality characteristics, knowledge, spirituality, and character should play the decisive role.

However, a nation is not a mechanical sum of individuals. It is a distinctive organism, a structure. The fact that the present ratio (60 to 40 percent) places the structure of the Estonian nation on the brink of danger evokes fears. Language and culture are in danger, the system of customs and norms of communication formed for centuries are being destroyed, and roots are being torn. All this brings in its wake an erosion of human qualities, a decline in the standard of labor, and indifference both to oneself and to one's land.

It should be noted that mass migration introduces not only national problems. The influx of manpower produced by extensive methods has made it impossible to fulfill social programs, be it programs for the construction of housing and projects for cultural purposes, development of the infrastructure, or supply for the population. Therefore, the limitation of the process of migration and even to a certain extent the stimulation of departure from the Estonian SSR meet the interests of all the republic's inhabitants irrespective of their national affiliation. We protest against the rumors that, allegedly, the joint plenum of boards of Estonia's creative unions recommended the application of some measures of coercion for the attainment of this goal. In whose interests are such rumors disseminated?

In our opinion, the solution can be found in something else. Now our republic represents a distinctive yard with a through-passage. In the last few years the difference between the number of those that have arrived in the republic and those that have left it (that is, a positive migration balance) has amounted to about 10,000 people. Such a movement of people causes a marked weakening of both society at large and undermines the stability of individual collectives. An atmosphere of constant changes arises, which, ultimately, prevents people from establishing stable ties with the collective. Let us imagine

that we have succeeded in reducing the number of those that arrive if only by one-half. It can be assumed that at least for the next few years the flow of those that leave would remain at the previous level. As a result, in such a case we will get a negative migration balance. This would facilitate the fulfillment of social programs to a significant degree. To be sure, those for whom the republic has become their native home, who have struck their roots here, and who want to make their contribution to the construction of our common home will remain here.

The problem of citizenship is also connected with migration. We believe that, in order to receive citizenship, a person should reside and honestly work in Estonia for a certain number of years. Only after this can many benefits, for example, a permanent residence permit, as well as the right to participate in the solution of the republic's problems, apply to him.

The Council for the Culture of Creative Unions had already earlier raised the problem of bringing representatives of different nationalities closer together through language. We consider an improvement in teaching the Estonian language to those that arrive especially important. At the same time, however, we assert that all the groups of nationalities living in our republic should be able to maintain contacts with their national cultures and freely develop culturally.

Although problems of international relations need the fullest explanation, this is not the only thing that disturbs people's minds.

We must solve many problems, which concern all the people living in the republic irrespective of their nationality. Owing to the mass movement, we succeeded at least in stopping the construction of a phosphorite mine in Rakvereskiy Rayon. If we take into consideration the characteristics of this region's geological structure, the laying of the mine would mean an ecological catastrophe for the entire republic. Unfortunately, new foci of danger from the ecological aspect arise more rapidly than we manage to extinguish the old.

On the basis of ecological and demographic reasons we consider the construction of new industrial giants in Estonia inadvisable. Subsequently, we should follow the path of production intensification.

We also consider it necessary to make construction more philanthropic. The appearance of new microrayons should be changed radically. It is inadmissible that new rayons are built up without a parallel development of a network of domestic service and trade enterprises and cultural projects. Hence the demand to change the present construction policy. In our opinion, many complications in the area of ecology and disproportions in economic development are brought about by the arbitrary rule of departments and their disregard for the republic's interests. In connection with this we consider it necessary to return to Lenin's principles concerning

the rights of the Union republics. Republic bodies should have absolute power in their hands. Only in this way is it possible to ensure the republic's truly harmonious development and to meet the interests of all the people living in it.

The presently developed program for the republic's transition to full cost accounting sets for itself the task of attaining greater independence in the solution of economic problems and of ensuring an equal partnership between republics and central bodies based on economic mutual relations. We must also reorganize the political structure of our society and develop a truly democratic electoral system, which would guarantee full power for elected bodies and the public's sufficient control over the activity of executive bodies.

All these problems can be solved only as a result of joint actions by all inhabitants of Estonia, that is, Estonians, Russians, Ukrainians, Armenians, and representatives of many other nationalities—all those to whom this land is dear and who consider it their homeland.

11439

Differing Views of Perestroika Debated at Social Science Seminar

18120083 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 21, 29 May-5 Jun 88 p 9

[Article by Vladimir Gurevich; first paragraph introductory]

[Text] Notes from a seminar on social problems and problems in social sciences at the Akademgorodok in Novosibirsk

Everything has become simpler and more complicated at the same time. Simple in a sense that you sit in the Scientists' Club and listen to the most earthshaking speeches without breaking into a cold sweat: you're not worried that among 200 participants in a seminar some will speak up enthusiastically, only to have other rebuke them and even fire them for their daring remarks and unlawful judgments.

Such things did happen at a seminar in Novosibirsk five years ago. In April 1983, Academician Tatyana Zaslavskaya read the first paper—on social mechanisms of development. Then heated discussions followed and the report aroused great interest. But don't forget that it was in April 1983 and not 1985. Therefore, those who were in the Big Boss's way were put in disgrace. Zaslavskaya was summoned to the regional authorities and given a Party reprimand. And rumours were rife.

Now it is simpler, but much more complicated. A sociologist said: "Investigations are still much more daring than they are profound."

This year's seminar began on a superficial note. Too much time was wasted on choosing a name for the system established in the prewar years: command-and-bureaucratic, administrative-and-pressure, barrack-and-socialist, authoritarian-and-despotic...though I appreciate the need for accurate definitions. I was disappointed: is this all?

There is a naive conviction nurtured by long silence that as soon as a "taboo" is removed, the truths will pour forth as if from a horn of plenty. But the truth is that our social sciences must now begin practically from scratch. Which is what the seminar was doing.

What is the social structure of our society? The wording inherited from the past ("two classes, one stratum") obscures rather than clarifies. The head of state in the same stratum with a rural doctor's assistant. What are the real social groups and strata, their frequently contradictory interests? This is no idle question, especially if we want to build a system of management "based on interests".

Is it possible to distinguish in society those social forces which are ready to a greater or lesser extent to back up the economic reform? Are the 18 million administrative workers, including ministers with their drivers and plant directors with door-keepers, so strongly united?

There are a host of questions as to how it was before, and just as many about the present, and most of all about how it will be, many be and must be.

It was this point—the difference between the likely course of perestroika and the necessary, desirable course—that became the centre of attention. If there is only one version of perestroika, why worry about its fate?...

The system of coordinates—with "versions" charted on a graph on the blackboard—looked strange. A drawing of not yet experienced reality. It is pretentious according to one person, inadmissible according to another (they have just drawn "the wrong" perestroika), but quite clear.

Maybe we should stick to social determinism: all that is planned will be fulfilled and nobody can make us deviate from the road of a radical reform and democratization. In which case we had better erase all those versions....

Regarding the increasingly active anti-perestroika forces, Prof. Leonid Gordon said: "This is the usual tendency when, using Lenin's expression, the blame for these views cannot be placed on these opponents personally. They reflect real interests." One can argue regarding the "blame" but it is difficult to contest the reality of such interests. Besides, different people see perestroika differently.

The seminar would convince anyone of this. Young Leningrad scientists, for example, said that perestroika will require a strong government. To carry out reform resolutely there is a need for a "strong police force" capable of suppressing the bureaucrats who put up resistance to the reform as well as all sorts of spontaneous actions preventing realization of reforms.

This "version" of perestroika did not arouse any enthusiasm among the participants: "It will mean a return to the past", "democratization cannot be postponed", they said. But it did produce a certain impression, having been put forward by young people who were, I believe, quite determined. Their approach could hardly be called new but it could have received a more favourable response from a different audience: indeed, isn't it time we dealt with those who try to hinder us?

The simplicity of the idea of "putting things in order", and the accessibility of the means to do it make it attractive. It is much more complicated with democratization, the formulas are more contradictory, and it's difficult to arrive at a perfectly balanced concept:

"With the present political structures there are no guarantees of democratization", "we must have referendums", "in history referendums have meant violations of democracy", "we must deprive ministries of the status of government bodies and make them bodies of the people's government", "what will they become—a social service?"

Social science is still going through a "publicistic" stage. We need it, as we need air, but it can be dragged out too long, if such of its problems as those discussed at the seminar are not solved. Exceptionally poor material and poor financial backing for serious social projects are just two of the problems, then, much information remains inaccessible, as before, and the stamp "for official use" is still applied, whether needed or not. To this I'll add what I heard from a sociologist who came from a large Siberian city: "We compile questionnaires for an opinion poll and send them for approval to the higher authorities, who raise certain objections to this question, then that question...even the poll itself may be questioned: "Why should you poll Party functionaries? If needed we'll do it without you."

So, there is hardly any need to put the blame for the sociologists' troubles on them. Besides, they are more than self-critical. Rozalina Ryvkina, D.Sc. (Economics), colleague and co-author of T. Zaslavskaya, noted: "I would compare our readiness today to give society recommendations with the readiness of a three-year-old girl to give birth to a baby."

Is there any hope for acceleration? At any rate, there is a need. If, formerly, social science received social orders, then it is a reminder of today's state order in industry: everything planned, and limited, from above. "Today," said Yuri Markhashov (Institute of the International

Labour Movement), "the orders that come 'from below', especially from work collectives, help us organize, adjust and innovate. We cannot conduct discussions about democratization, if we turn away from its manifestations."

/06662

Estonian Law Expands Public Input in Decision-Making

18000365 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 4 May 88 p 1,3

[Law of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Regarding Discussion by the People of Important Issues of National and Public Life in the Estonian SSR]

[Text] The further expansion of socialist democracy and development of popular self-government presupposes an extension of real opportunities for realizing the constitutional rights of each citizen of the Estonian SSR to participate in the direction of national and social affairs, in the discussion of proposed legislation and decisions of all-Union and republic as well as local significance, and in the consideration of major issues of public life submitted for discussion by social organizations in accordance with their established tasks.

The present law is designed to facilitate the extension of participation by citizens in deciding important issues of national and public life on a broad basis of glasnost, considering and comparing the various opinions and proposals of the workers.

I. General Provisions

Article 1. Public Discussion of Important Issues of National and Public Life in the Estonian SSR

In accordance with the Constitution of the Estonian SSR, draft legislation and other critically important matters pertaining to the national and public life of the republic may be submitted for public discussion.

Draft legislation and other important issues of national and public life are submitted for public discussion by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet or by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Article 2. Public Discussion of Important Issues of Local Significance

Decisions with respect to important matters of local significance, which affect the interests of the resident population of the territory concerned, shall be made by the local Soviets of People's Deputies and their executive committees after preliminary discussion of these matters by the public.

Matters of local significance are to be submitted for public discussion by rayon, city, city rayon, settlement and rural Soviets of People's Deputies or their executive committees.

Article 3. Legislation of the Estonian SSR Regarding Discussion of Important Issues of National and Public Life in the Republic

The procedure for public discussion of important issues of national and public life in the Estonian SSR, as well as for public discussion of important issues of local significance, is determined by the present law on the basis of the USSR law entitled "On Public Discussion of Major Issues of National Life."

Article 4. Participation by Citizens of the Estonian SSR in Discussion

Citizens of the Estonian SSR are guaranteed free participation in discussion of important issues of national and public life.

In discussing issues of republic and local significance, citizens have a right to participate directly as well as through social organizations, labor collectives, meetings at their places of residence, independent social bodies, military unit meetings of servicemen, and the mass media.

Any limitations of the right of citizens to participate in discussions, direct or indirect, pertaining to place of origin, social position or property, racial or national affiliation, sex, education, language, attitude towards religion, length of residence in a given locality, family or kind of employment are prohibited.

Article 5. Role of Social Organizations and Labor Collectives in Preparing for and Holding Discussions

Organizations of the CPSU, the trade unions, the all-Union Komsomol, the cooperatives, women's groups, war and labor veterans, and other social organizations and labor collectives shall participate in preparing for and holding discussions of important issues of national and social life.

Article 6. Providing for Holding Discussions

The holding of discussions regarding important issues of republic or local significance is provided for by the Soviets of People's Deputies.

Article 7. Glasnost in Holding Discussions

Discussions are to be conducted on a broad basis of glasnost. Draft legislation and other important issues of national and public life in the Estonian SSR that are submitted for discussion shall be published in the press, announced by television or radio, or brought to the attention of the people by other means.

The mass media shall thoroughly report the progress of public discussion, disclosing proposals and comments of citizens, state organs, social organizations and labor collectives, as well as analytical surveys of proposals and comments submitted, and make public the results of discussion.

Article 8. Expenditures Incidental to Discussion

Expenditures incidental to discussion of draft legislation and other important issues of national and public life in the Estonian SSR, as well as public discussion of draft resolutions by local Soviets of People's Deputies or their executive committees, shall be borne by the state.

Article 9. Liability for Violations of Law With Respect to Discussions

Officials of state and social organizations who permit infractions of the present law, as well as persons who interfere with the free exercise of the right of citizens to participate in discussions, shall be held responsible as established by law.

II. Procedures for Public Discussion of Important Issues of Significance for the Republic

Article 10. Submission of Issues for Public Discussion

Draft legislation and resolutions affecting fundamental aspects of political, economic, and social development of the Estonian SSR are to be submitted for public discussion, as well as large-scale problems of science, technology, and ecology, the resolution of which requires utilization of considerable resources of the national economy; the implementation of rights, liberties or obligations of citizens of the Estonian SSR; and other major issues of national and public life.

Article 11. Procedure for Submission of Issues for Public Discussion

The submission of draft legislation and other matters for public discussion is by decision of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet or the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, taken at its own initiative. Permanent commissions of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers, rayon and city (subordinate to the republic) Soviets of People's Deputies, and republic organs of social organizations may also make recommendations regarding the desirability of draft legislation and other matters for public discussion by submitting them, in accordance with the law, to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet or Presidium.

Draft legislation and proceedings pertaining to other matters are to be published in the newspapers RAKHVA KHYAZL and SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, as well as in other republic newspapers, and in case of need in other local newspapers, no later than ten days following the

adoption of a decision to submit them for public discussion. They may also be made public in special periodical publications or by other means.

When submitting issues for public discussion, the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet or its Presidium shall at the same time establish the period and procedure for organizing activities pertaining to reviewing proposals and comments made in the course of public discussion, and issue instructions to the appropriate permanent commissions of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet to have this work carried out or create a special commission for this purpose.

Article 12. Organizing Discussion of Draft Legislation or Other Issues

Republic and local Soviets, and other government organs, as well as managers of enterprises, institutions, and organizations, together with social organizations, shall ensure broad discussion of draft legislation and other issues, creating the conditions necessary for this purpose.

Citizens may address proposals and comments on draft legislation and other issues submitted for public discussion directly to the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, or to the executive committee of the local Soviet of People's Deputies, or to other state and social organs, or to their own deputies.

Draft legislation or other issues submitted for public discussion may be taken up at sessions of the Soviets of People's Deputies, or at meetings of their organs, of groups of deputies, of social organizations, of labor collectives, of citizens at their places of residence, of independent social organizations, or of military service units, as well as in the press or on radio and television broadcasts.

Article 13. Summing up Proposals and Comments

Proposals and comments occurring in the course of public discussion are to be summed up by the appropriate executive committees of the local Soviets of People's Deputies as well as by other state and public bodies and the mass media. For the purpose of summing up the proposals and comments made, these bodies may form commissions and working groups. The proposals and comments in summary form are to be directed to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Article 14. Summing up Results of Public Discussion

The proposals and comments of citizens, labor collectives, and state and public bodies on draft legislation or other issues which have been referred to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium are to be reviewed and given consideration by the appropriate permanent com-

missions of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet or special commission, or by the body that has submitted the issue to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet or its Presidium. Preparatory commissions or working groups, including among their members people's deputies, appropriate specialists, spokesmen for science and culture, and representatives of national and public bodies and scientific institutions, may be formed by them for the purpose of providing a preliminary review of the proposals and comments.

The mass media shall keep the people regularly informed of proposals and comments made and the progress of their review, and shall undertake to elucidate the provisions of the draft resolution or other matter that is submitted for discussion.

The results of the public discussion of a draft resolution or other issue are to be reviewed and given consideration in deciding the issue by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet or the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the public is to be informed of the decision reached within a period of 15 days.

Citizens, labor collectives, and state and public organizations whose proposals have not been taken into consideration in amending the draft, are to be informed of the reasons for their having been set aside.

Proposals and comments that are not relevant to the draft legislation or other issue under discussion are to be referred to the appropriate state or public bodies, which will review them in the manner prescribed.

III. Public Discussion of Important Issues of Local Significance

Article 15. Important Issues Submitted for Public Discussion

Draft resolutions of local Soviets of People's Deputies or their executive committees regarding plans for integrated economic and social development or the budget, maintenance of socialist law, environmental protection, the protection of cultural and historical monuments, the protection of law and order and the rights of citizens, the operation of enterprises, institutions, and organizations related to consumer services, or any other issues of national, economic, and social or cultural importance in development locally shall be submitted for public discussion.

Decisions by the local Soviets of People's Deputies regarding the efficient use of local resources, the use of land, housing construction, the development of public health services, public education, transport, trade, public catering services, or carrying out plan measures in fulfillment of the voters' mandate are to be implemented, as a rule, following public discussion.

Article 16. Procedure for Submission of Issues for Public Discussion

The submission of draft resolutions by the local Soviets of People's Deputies and their executive committees, or other important matters, is to be undertaken by the local Soviet and its executive committee at their own initiative, and also upon the recommendation of the Soviet's permanent commissions, groups of deputies, individual deputies, agencies of public organizations, labor collectives, citizen gatherings at their places of residence, or other agencies and organizations, as provided for by the laws of the Estonian SSR.

When submitting issues for public discussion, the local Soviet or its executive committee shall at the same time establish the period of time and procedure for undertaking a review of proposals and comments made in the course of public discussion, and shall instruct the appropriate permanent commission of the local Soviet of People's Deputies to conduct the review or shall create a special commission for this purpose.

The draft resolutions of the local Soviets and their executive committees, as well as the proceedings for other issues submitted for public discussion, shall be published in the local press or brought to the attention of the people by local radio or by other means no later than ten days following the decision to submit them for public discussion.

17. Organizations for the Discussion of Draft Resolutions and other Issues

Local soviet and other state agencies, managers of enterprises, institutions, and other organizations, together with public organizations, shall ensure broad discussion of the draft resolutions of rayon, city rayon, settlement, and rural Soviets of People's Deputies and their executive committees, as well as other issues, and create the conditions required for this purpose.

Citizens may direct their proposals and comments regarding draft resolutions and other issues of local significance to the appropriate Soviet of People's Deputies, or to its executive committee, or to other state and public bodies.

Draft resolutions and other issues submitted for public discussion may undergo preliminary review at meetings of the lower-ranking Soviets of People's Deputies; at meetings of their executive or staff organizations, permanent commissions, or groups of deputies; at meetings of public organizations, labor collectives, or citizens at their places of residence; at meetings of independent social organizations and military service units; and they shall be discussed on the radio and in the local press.

Article 18. Summing up and Review of Proposals and Comments

Proposals and comments made in the course of the discussion shall be summed up by the appropriate executive committees of the lower-standing Soviets of People's Deputies, by other state and public bodies, and by the mass media. For the purpose of summarizing the proposals and comments that have been made, these bodies may form commissions and working groups. The proposals and comments in summary form shall be sent to the executive committee of the appropriate Soviet of People's Deputies.

The proposals and comments received by the executive committee of the Soviet of People's Deputies shall be reviewed and taken into consideration in the completion of the draft resolution by the permanent committees of the local Soviet, or by the special commission created for this purpose, and also in their routine activity.

The local press and radio shall keep the public regularly informed with regard to the proposals and comments and the review process, and shall undertake to elucidate the provisions of the draft resolution and other issues submitted for discussion.

Proposals and comments that are relevant to the operations of the higher-ranking bodies shall be sent to them for review.

Proposals and comments that are not relevant to the subject of the draft resolution or other matter under discussion shall be reviewed by the executive committee of the Soviet of People's Deputies and sent to the

appropriate state and public bodies. State and public bodies receiving such proposals and comments shall review them in the manner prescribed and inform the executive committee of the Soviet of People's Deputies, as well as the citizens, labor collectives, and organizations that have made the proposals or comments, with respect to the results.

Article 19. Information Regarding Results of Discussing Draft Resolutions and Other Issues

The results of discussing draft resolutions and other issues subject to review by the Soviet of People's Deputies shall be announced by the executive committee or appropriate permanent commission or other commission at a session of the Soviet of People's Deputies and brought to the attention of the public.

The results of discussing draft resolutions and other matters subject to review by the executive committee of the Soviet shall be announced at a meeting of the executive committee and brought to the attention of the public.

[Signed]

A. Ryuytel, Chairman, ESSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

V. Vakht, Secretary, ESSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Tallinn, 8 April 1988

12889

**Armenian Student Protesters Air NKAO Views,
Score Dearth of Media Coverage**
18300281 Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
7 Jun 88 pp 1-2

[Article compiled by Special KOMSOMOLETS Correspondents Z. Arevshatyan, S. Arutyunyan and G. Rubinyan "In and Around Theater Square"]

[Text] Last week the telephone rang in the editors' offices (incidentally, this was one of many such calls recently). A woman introduced herself as a co-worker at the Yerevan State University and shared with us her concern for those students who for several days now had been spending all their time on the square in front of the opera house. "I am the mother of one of these students," said the woman. "I am very concerned for my son. How can it be that you, the representatives of the mass information media and those whose words are awaited by the students, don't share my concern? Don't you realize what this indifference can entail?"

But just what are the demands of the students? Is such a form of expressing these demands valid? Is such an "outburst of emotions" helpful in an effective and just resolution to the problem of the NKAO? In order to reply to this, in order to get an idea of the actual picture and to hear different opinions, we set off for the "hottest" points in the city, Theater Square and the Yerevan State University. We spoke with scores of people, including students and instructors. A majority wanted to talk about everything all at once. Many said essentially the same thing. And they still asked: "Will this be published? Won't you distort my words?" No, we have not edited out and softened down the opinions collected here (although we were unable to quote all of them completely). Of course, it must be realized that each person has the right to his own opinion.

2 June. Theater Square

Here then are the views of those assembled on the square.

Vache Kalashyan, student on the Radiophysics Faculty at Yerevan State University:

"We have assembled here because we are concerned by the course of reviewing the question raised by the session of the oblast soviet on the reunification of the NKAO with Armenia. We, in the first place, are demanding official information on: has the question been removed from the agenda or not. I feel that our party bodies through the press and television must provide clear explanations for this issue, thereby alleviating the concern of the people for the fate of our compatriots in the neighboring republic."

Samson Avetisyan, student on the Physics-Mathematics Faculty of the Armenian State Polytechnical Institute imeni Kh. Abonyan:

"Secondly, we demand that the next session of the Republic Supreme Soviet examine the decision of the NKAO Soviet in accord with the principles of the Leninist nationality policy concerning the right of nations to self-determination. We want very much to believe that democracy which is gaining strength every day will not make it possible to repeat the mistakes of Stalinism. We are told that the session of our republic does not have the power to resolve this question, that such are the provisions of the USSR Constitution, but if these provisions lead into a stalemate, consequently they are invalid and require revision."

Mger Kamalyan, student on the Economic Planning Faculty of the Yerevan National Economic Institute:

"The tragic events in Sumgait caused pain in our hearts. People died. But up to the present no political assessment of these events has been provided. Moreover, we know that only our republic is providing actual aid to the families and other victims. Or, possibly, we do not have accurate information? Throughout the nation the young people have helped restore and return to normal the life of persons who were the victims of the accident at the Chernobyl AES. But what about Sumgait? Certainly this is a tragedy for all of us."

"I feel that the mood of the youth and all of us would not be so anxious if every day we received official information and thus not the sort leaving room for rumors concerning the state of affairs in Nagorno-Karabakh and around it," said the housewife Zina Asatryan, joining in the conversation. "The exam session has started at the institutes, the students must take their exams, but here they are spending all their time..."

"Involvement in a meeting is not a reason for poor grades on exams," said the student from the Radiophysics Faculty of the Yerevan State University, Ovsep Oganesyanyan. "I have already taken all the exams and while sitting here am studying the outlines and textbooks. Feelings of patriotism and civil duty cannot contradict one another and we realize this well enough."

These were the opinions and positions we heard that evening on Theater Square.

**3 June. The Auditorium of the Yerevan State University
Legal Faculty**

The working, calm situation which prevailed here was in no way like what we had seen the day before on Theater Square. There was an unusual quiet in the corridors of the university as exams were under way. Groups of students preparing for the exam session were in the auditoriums. We glanced into one of them with the hope of hearing a reply to the question of what was the attitude of those in the auditorium toward the students on Theater Square. These were first-year students of the Legal Faculty.

Aram Arutyunyan: "We completely share the demands of the people voiced back in February. In this sense we completely understand the fellows. At that time, 3 months ago, the students of the Legal Faculty were in the front ranks of the demonstrators. Our voice was heard and understood. Now, and this is my personal conviction, we must avoid emotions and endeavor to turn the problem into the correct, reasonable channel. Our new leadership should take control of the situation and find an alternative solution because the question of the NKAO has not been settled. It is being examined on the highest level. And for this we must have a calm, sober and business-like situation."

Tigran Ayrapetyan: "The main thing is this—the leadership of our republic should speak to the people, hear their demands and voice its opinion on the 'Karabakh question.' This must be told to everyone and above all the fellows on the square. Democracy and glasnost have finally given us an opportunity to speak out on unresolved nationality problems which for so long have been completely played down and suppressed. The most insulting is that they continue to do this now. We have virtually no information about the trial for the persons involved in the Sumgait crime which long ago should have been given a political assessment and not merely described as a manifestation of hooliganism. Certainly this is an unjust blow to internationalism, the most valuable victory of Soviet society. Over the 70 years of its existence, this society has worked out its own, permanent spiritual values such as friendship and fraternity which have been given legal status in the Constitution and which, incidentally, were in no way put in doubt during the meetings and demonstrations. The same Soviet Constitution gives us the right to resolve our own urgent problems in a strictly constitutional and democratic manner under the conditions of the commenced struggle for restructuring."

Ayvaz Tomoyan: "Yes, but at times the constitution doesn't work as its individual provisions are contradictory and from this viewpoint, the students on the steps in front of the opera house are right. Certainly the essence of restructuring consists in a policy of changes. Much that for years was considered fixed, even the Criminal Code, is changing and being subjected to revision. Why not revise certain provisions of the Basic Law [Constitution] of our society? Without a just solution to the nationality question it is impossible, in my opinion, to build a truly socialist society on the basis of democracy."

Tigran Bisharyan: "We have generally collected a lot of unresolved questions which, judging from the Theses, will be examined at the 19th Party Conference, including the question of nationality policy. Alas, we do not know the program which the delegates from Armenia will take to the conference, and we do not know in what stage is the examination of the question of the NKAO. All this reticence and silence on important questions—both in the direct contacts of the government with the people and in the mass information media—are unacceptable.

It turns out that we know much more about events in South Korea than what is going on in our own country. Glasnost should be complete or it does not have the right to be called such.

"I feel that at the given stage the meetings are the most correct and sole form of expressing our demands until the question is given the just resolution which our people demand."

On the Same Day at the Alma Mater

These are the opinions of the students. We asked the instructors of the Yerevan State University to comment on them.

Khosrov Agasiyevich Torosyan, head of the Chair of the Theory and History of State and Law:

"Initially on the question as a whole. The demand to review and resolve justly the question of Nagornyy Karabakh does not contradict but rather completely conforms to the Leninist principles of nationality policy and self-determination of nations. These were flagrantly violated at the beginning of the 1920s by Stalin. Precisely then a political and historical mistake was made and which is now being felt in the events concerning all of us. And today, when the nation is struggling to restore Leninist principles in all spheres of social and political life—including in the sphere of internationality relations—it must be realized that the 'Karabakh question' is not a question of revising frontiers but rather the question of eliminating an historical mistake and injustice.

"Now about the students on Theater Square. It must be said that not only the students but many of us have grounds to be dissatisfied. First of all, due to the lack of information. And chiefly over what is the state of review in the superior levels? There is a different question of what forms the dissatisfaction takes. We must not give way to emotions. We must adhere to the legal and hence morally justified forms of voicing our demands. I do not doubt the sincerity of the patriotic feelings of the most enormous majority of young people, but, in the first place, exams are under way. For this reason I urge the students to return to the classrooms. Secondly, let us look at things realistically: what do the people want, what have they achieved—this is a question which has been posed with all seriousness. No one has abrogated the decisions of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee which clearly state that the Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee is assigned to study the question. But still there are rumors, someone has said something somewhere.... And these rumors grow out of the lack of information and ignorance which at times become grounds for speculation and the inflaming of passions. This plays into the hands of persons who desire to 'ride' the general wave. A vivid example is the telegram to Reagan. In this situation it is essential to honestly tell the students on the highest level that the question has not

been closed and that the excellent program for the socioeconomic development of the autonomous oblast does not remove from the agenda a solution to the nationality question in this region.

"The nationality question and precisely the question of the reunification of the NKAO with Armenia cannot be reduced merely to the carrying out of socioeconomic changes which are undoubtedly essential for the development of the area but which do not resolve the main demand of its people."

Aramais Azizbekovich Ovsepyan, head of the Chair of Historical Materialism, Ethics and Aesthetics:

"I have two theses on this question. If one approaches the student movement externally and formally, then actually, in recent days it has assumed unreasonable forms which do not take into account the actual conditions. But this is not their fault but rather their misfortune! This is an expression of desperation and impotence, as for a long time there was no dialogue with them and no clear approach of the government or community to their demands was expressed. There was none and still is none. At the same time, no alternative was pointed out and this exists. This is the constitutional path of resolving the 'Karabakh problem' and where the primary question should be not the question of revising the frontiers of the Union republics, but rather the question of the right of nations to self-determination, as the main principle of Leninist nationality policy. What happened at the beginning of the 1920s was a flagrant distortion of this principle. From precisely that time, the giving of orders and applying pressure prevailed in the area of nationality relations. At present we must have the strength and courage to recognize the historical mistake but also rectify it. It is essential to be guided solely by constitutional provisions without looking at transitory aspects which consist in the fact that in the 'Karabakh question' there is a clash of numerous contradictory factors—ideological or economic—as well as a multiplicity of factors—national and local. The principals of these interests are different but certainly truth and justice exist. The elucidation of this truth in an honest and open discussion will also help to develop the culture of inter-nationality relations and will bring into action constitutional mechanisms which up to now have remained idle. We must find the correct forms for positing complex problems and these forms must be sought out primarily by our government, proceeding from the aspirations and demands of its people. Otherwise, all sorts of excesses are possible. Moreover, a difficulty of our times is that we have learned to speak correctly, but at times not to act correctly. Why up to now has the local press been silent on events in the NKAO and in Yerevan? Why, for example, has a political assessment not been given to the events in Sumgait and why has official sympathy not been expressed for the families of the victims? These questions await a reply."

Georgiy Arshakovich Kasabov, head of the Chair of Civil Law:

"The restructuring which has awakened Soviet society and which has provided an opportunity to freely and openly express one's opinion has also posed many unsolved problems. Why did the question of the NKAO not arise previously? Not because this did not exist, but because nothing could be said about it. At present, our people have the opportunity to voice their concern and pain and this is an enormous victory for restructuring. However, events must not be forced. Certainly the restructuring has not gone on smoothly and there is a great number of obstacles on its way. We should in every possible manner contribute to its inexorable forward movement and not obstruct it. In this sense, the 19th Party Conference, the Theses of which have also raised the nationality question, should give new life to the policy of fundamental changes in Soviet society and take up arms against all that is stagnant and bigoted. The solution of the 'Karabakh question' also depends upon the success of restructuring. Excesses merely play into the hands of the opponents of restructuring and cast doubt on the sense and goal of the mass actions by the people. For this reason, it is essential to show wisdom and patience. The question has been raised on the highest level. It is being reviewed."

On 6 June, we returned to Theater Square and met here with the First Secretary of the Yerevan Komsomol Gorkom, G. Israyelyan, who was talking with a group of students.

"In the complicated and tense situation which presently exists, there is in fact a lack of reliable, competent information on what is going on," was his opinion. "At the same time, the problems concerning the people should become a matter of discussion in the highest state body in the republic. In this regard the demands of the students are just. I would like to point out that we have turned to the appropriate levels for the taking of decisions on these questions.

"However, one can be concerned by the form of expressing one's feelings which the students have resorted to, particularly over the last 2 days. Such actions can raise a question but cannot resolve it. For this reason, at present, these actions are more of a hinderance than a help. The workers of the Komsomol gorkom and raykoms at present are conducting such explanatory work with the youth. There must be a clear and principled position on the given question, relying for now on the specific document of the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

"One other thing. It is pleasing to note that the mass information media in recent days have begun to more closely follow events in Yerevan. But it would be a good thing if this timeliness was not achieved at the expense of

reliability. It is a question of the criticism directed at the Komsomol organizations and heard in one of the Saturday broadcasts of the Armenian Television. Clearly, the blame lies primarily with us, the Komsomol workers and the youth propaganda media who did not sufficiently treat the activities of the Komsomol organizations during these days. This can be rectified and we can make up for the lost. But we must not draw broad generalizations based on the opinion of just one person without having verified its reliability."

When the issue was going to press, we learned that the group of students on Theater Square had declared a hunger strike. We got back in touch with the university and asked Doctor of Legal Sciences Khosrov Agasiyevich Torosyan to comment on the developing situation:

"In actuality, the situation is grave. I realize that the fellows are motivated by patriotic feelings the sincerity of which I do not doubt. But I will repeat what I said earlier: We must not give way to emotions, the question has been raised and is being reviewed on the highest level. For this reason, I would advise the students to refrain from extreme forms of voicing their demands and they should wait for a final solution to the question."

10272

More on Student Hunger Strikers in Yerevan
18300289 Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian 9 Jun 88 p 2

[Article by G. Rubinyan entitled "Theater Square"; this report is a follow-up to a 7 June KOMSOMOLETS article.]

[Text] Since KOMSOMOLETS published the article entitled "In and Around Theater Square," the editors' phones haven't stopped ringing. Readers have been expressing their worry and alarm over the health of the laborers and professionals who declared a hunger strike. The majority rightly believes that such an extreme manner of making their demands known cannot effect a speedier resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast (NKAO) problem, and that such an act is foolish, since the issue has been raised and is being reviewed at a high level.

We returned to Theater Square and spoke with hunger strikers Shant Arutyunyan, Leonid Kocharyan, Andranik Arutyunyan and others. They are demanding that the upcoming session of the Supreme Soviet examine the petition of the session of the oblast NKAO Soviet of People's Deputies about reunification with Armenia and make the corresponding decision. They maintain that

their hunger strike is not a demonstration of self-sacrifice, but rather a way to draw the deputies' attention to the demands of the people, a step of desperation by people who have lost faith in any other means to solve the problem.

Many of the people who have gathered this evening on Theater Square, including students seated on the steps of the Opera, shared their patriotic feelings and aspirations, but nonetheless felt that a hunger strike was too extreme a form of expressing their demands and that it should be avoided.

We cite a couple of these views:

Vilen Vagarshakovich Manasaryan, member of the Armenian SSR Lawyers Collegium said this: "I believe that our deputies are obligated to respond to the demands of the people and act on their behalf. In this regard, I hope that the session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet will make a certain decision. But as far as a hunger strike is concerned, I believe that this is too serious a measure, and that it can and must be avoided."

Natasha Sarkisyan, a laboratory assistant at the Institute of Public Hygiene and Occupational Diseases, had this to say: "Although I'm in complete agreement with the demands of the people who sincerely want to help in reaching a solution of the problem, I cannot agree with the form of their expression. Indeed, no one has rescinded the decision of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo to entrust an examination of the issue to the Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee. Naturally, this requires time. I am sincerely and humanly worried about these people."

Status of Armenian Refugees From Sumgait Updated

18300282a Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 7 Jun 88 p 1

[Armenpress report: "In the Commission for Examining Questions Concerning Citizens Arriving From Sumgait"]

[Text] As already reported, as of 1 June there were 702 families (2780 citizens) from Sumgait in the republic. They are temporarily living in various boarding houses in the republic as well as with friends and relatives.

As of 6 June, the question of permanent residence of 239 families or 955 citizens in various population centers in the republic has been decided.

Thirty-seven families have announced their desire to settle in a new residential building belonging to the "Armpromgaz" Production Association in the Nagorny Karabakh city of Stepanakert.

Twenty-eight families will take up permanent residence in the republic's Bagramyanskiy Rayon. Twenty-four families have declared their desire to obtain plots of land on which to build their own houses in the Abovyanskiy and Nairiyskiy rayons. Accordingly, under the established procedure they will be given long-term loans, the necessary construction materials, and will be rendered the necessary paid services.

Fifteen families have now filed the necessary documents to exchange their apartments in Sumgait for state apartments and private houses of citizens who have expressed the desire to move from the Masisskiy Rayon to the Azerbaijan SSR.

Many families have taken up permanent residence in Leninakan, Kirovakan, Ararat, Sevan, Artashat, Spitak, and other towns and rayon centers in the republic.

Work is continuing on finding accommodations for citizens arriving from Sumgait in the Aparanskiy, Bagramyanskiy, Akhuryanskiy, Gorisskiy, and Megrinskiy rayon centers and in other population centers. Plots of land are being made available for the construction of private housing in the Razdanskiy, Ashtarakskiy, Abovyanskiy, Nairiyskiy, Masisskiy and other republic rayons. The ispolkoms of the respective raysovets and gorsovets are rendering the necessary assistance and are helping to resolve all questions associated with the relocation of families, the acceleration of the exchange of apartments, and the shipment of their personal property from the city of Sumgait. The Commission for Examining Questions Concerning Citizens Arriving from Sumgait is continuing its work.

5013

Armenian Education Minister on Plans to Train NKAO Students in Armenia

*18300282b Yerevan KOMSOMOLETS in Russian
7 Jun 88p 1*

[Interview with Lyudvig Papikovich Garibdzhanyan, ArSSR minister of higher and secondary specialized education]

[Text] More than two months have already passed since the adoption of the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers "On Measures to Strengthen the Socioeconomic Development of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan SSR in 1988-1995" which, among other things, envisages the expanded special training of students from the NKAO in Armenian VUZ's. Today, on the eve of VUZ entrance examinations, our correspondent asked Ludvig Popikovich Garibdzhanyan, ArSSR minister of higher and secondary specialized education, to describe the course of fulfillment of the decree:

[Answer] Strictly speaking, cooperative specialist training within the three Transcaucasian republics has already become traditional. Every year, secondary school graduates go from Armenia to study at VUZ's in fraternal republics and we of course admit boys and girls from Azerbaijan and Georgia. These admissions in large measure resolve the problem of supplying the republics with diplomate specialists in critical areas. Last year, we sent 125 people to study in neighboring republics and admitted 36 secondary school graduates from Georgia and 49 from Azerbaijan. Of the 49 slots for students from the Azerbaijan SSR, 32 were reserved for representatives of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. At the behest of the ArSSR Gosagroprom, another 26 slots are available for Karabakhians at YerZVI and the Armenian Agricultural Institute.

[Question] Many negative aspects in the oblast's socioeconomic development have surfaced in the light of recent events in the NKAO. In particular, much has been said of shortcomings in the sphere of public education and the shortage of skilled cadres. Will there be an increase in the special admission of secondary school graduates from the NKAO this year?

[Answer] Under a recent reciprocal agreement between the ministries of higher education of Armenia and Azerbaijan and with the consent of USSR Gosplan and the USSR State Committee for Education, a plan was approved for the cooperative training of specialists up to the year 1990 and in particular for 69 persons from the indigenous population of the NKAO. In addition to this plan, another 98 persons will be sent from Nagorny Karabakh to Armenia and, at the behest of the ArSSR Gosagroprom, to places additionally indicated by the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers as well as under a plan (that has been in existence for several years but that is still in effect today) for the cooperative training of specialists in 1987-1990.

Boys and girls from Karabakh will be trained in 59 specialties at 11 Armenian VUZ's. It should be noted that the number of students and occupations have been coordinated with the leadership of the Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast in accordance with the area's needs.

Matters are indeed especially unsatisfactory in Karabakh schools where instruction in the native language is not satisfactorily organized and where there are no courses whatsoever in Armenian history and geography. Now as never before, the NKAO needs specialists—especially knowledgeable and competent teachers.

[Question] Lyudvig Papikovich! How will entrance examinations be held for the "special students" from the NKAO?

[Answer] Secondary school graduates from Karabakh will take their entrance examinations in Stepanakert, with the exception of the specialties of art and physical culture, for which the NKAO does not have a corresponding base.

Those who pass all the examinations will come to study here in Armenia. It is also expected that as in years past there will be a large influx of secondary school graduates of the usual type.

[Question] You previously mentioned creative specialties that Karabakh students will study. Will secondary school graduates be sent from the NKAO to study at the YerKhTI? After all, the question of providing creative cadres for the Stepanakert Dramatic Theater is urgent.

[Answer] In past years, YerKhTI did not make it a practice to admit special students at all. But now three slots have been set aside for the NKAO in the specialties "Drama Theater and Cinema Actor," "Decorative Applied Art," and "Industrial Art."

I think that this is only the beginning and that the training of creative cadres for Armenian theaters in Azerbaijan will become a tradition. The Armenian Dramatic Theater, which once had a rich history and was renowned for its famous actors, is now being reborn in Baku. We plan to open in YerKhTI a special course in acting for this theater, which may possibly produce glorious new names for it.

5013

Readers' Letters Offer Advice on NKAO Crisis

Strikes Viewed as Counterproductive

18300283 *KOMMUNIST* in Russian 5 Jun 88 p 2

[Article by Galust Ovsepyan, veteran of the Great Patriotic War and labor: "In the Expectation of Changes"]

[Text] The Nagorno-Karabakh problem is a serious matter. It is disturbing not only to the republic's community but also to very many beyond its borders. For long years, inadmissible phenomena associated with the cultural, social, and economic life of the autonomous oblast were implanted in the NKAO. The just demands of the citizens were not satisfied by the former leadership of the autonomous oblast and the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee.

The Appeal of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stated explicitly and unequivocally that the Nagorno-Karabakh problem must be resolved. "We do not intend to avoid," the Appeal states, "a frank discussion of various ideas and proposals, but this must be done calmly, within the framework of the democratic process and legality without the slightest detriment to the internationalist solidarity of our peoples."

Meetings are being held in Yerevan. On the whole, it must be noted that they are organized and that there are no excesses. This is well. Students have now actively joined the movement. The other day I saw an interview of young Yerevan State University students and their professors on Armenian television. They all expressed

the opinion that the Karabakh problem must absolutely be resolved. It seems to me that we should not hasten events. Time is needed to study and resolve all issues. We want to be certain that problems of interethnic relations are examined and resolved at the 19th All-Union Party Conference. All the same, one would think that meetings are not the most effective means in the given stage. There is now a new leadership in the republic. It must have the possibility of making a serious study of production, economic, ethnic, and social problems. There are more than enough of these problems. This requires the stabilization of the situation.

Unfortunately, let us speak candidly, some appeals and slogans lead directly to incorrect actions. I am thinking of the call for strikes. They would unquestionably hinder the normal restructuring process and the examination of the Nagorny Karabakh problem.

Stalin Blamed for NKAO Problem

18300283 *KOMMUNIST* in Russian 5 Jun 88 p 2

[Article by V. Osipyany, candidate of physicomathematical sciences: "In the Democratic Way"]

[Text] The time demands honest relations from us today. In all things and in all ways. Glasnost specifically means an honest attitude. We traveled a long way before we realized its true urgency for our entire life.

I will also be honest: glasnost has allowed us, albeit belatedly, to address a problem that was considered nonessential to date. The reference, naturally, is to the Nagorny Karabakh problem.

The events of the last 4 months have helped all of us to examine this problem from all sides: socioeconomic and ethnic. To examine and raise it to the very top of our internal political system: the Politburo is now addressing the Nagorny Karabakh problem.

And it is not by chance that the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th All-Union Party Conference note "the need to increase the level of activity of the political system's institutions that must be the basis for eliciting and coordinating ethnic interests."

The interest of the Nagorny Karabakh population is understandable and just. For long years, no one wanted to recall the historic mistake of 1920, the author of which is considered by today's historians to be Stalin.

But every mistake must be corrected lest "it become a festering sore." The words of Lenin's are truly brilliant and reflect the true essence of development of socialist society.

Perestroika permits us or possibly demands of us that we follow just such a path. Its name is known: democracy. And since the party has proclaimed this path of our

society's development as the only true path, the only truly socialist path, it must be hoped that this path will lead us to a just resolution of the Karabakh problem.

We are all on the threshold of the 19th Party Conference. We are waiting for the new word that will be pronounced at the conference. It will be a word about the future avenues of perestroika, about strengthening democratic institutions, and about improving interethnic relations. I hope that the demands of the majority of the Nagorny Karabakh population will be perceived from the correct positions at the conference.

In Yerevan these days there are renewed meetings and demonstrations at which the question of Nagorny Karabakh is raised again. Their participants, including many young people, are again raising the demand for a gradual resolution of the problem.

They take place without any excesses, without the violation of public order. That is, they reflect properties that are characteristic of democratic phenomena: the ascertainment of the truth by means of dialogue.

Without wishing to be categorical in any way, this is what I want to say: meetings are, of course, a form of democratic discussion of the problem. But meetings must not be held for the sake of holding meetings. Today, on the eve of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, we must show wisdom and restraint. The Nagorny Karabakh problem must find its solution. But this takes time.

5013

LiSSR: Language, Culture of Non-Native Nationalities Promoted

*18000399 Vilnius SOBYTIYA I VREMYA in Russian
No 8 Apr 88 pp 2-3*

[Article, unsigned: "At the LiSSR Communist Party's Central Committee," first paragraph a boldface introduction]

[Text] The LiSSR Communist Party's Central Committee has passed a decree On Further Social and Political Development of Nationalities Residing in the LiSSR and Improving Sensitivity to Their Interests and Demands in the Area of Language and Culture.

The decree noted that members of over 70 nationalities and ethnic groups live and work in the LiSSR. The last census showed in 1979 that the largest groups are Poles, who make up 7.3 percent of the population, and Jews who make up 0.4 percent.

The situation that has emerged after the CPSU Central Committee's April 1985 plenum and the 27th party congress, the process of perestroika, the implementation of glasnost and the broadening of socialist democracy have created a favorable climate for every person,

regardless of nationality, to realize his civil rights, liberties and duties, to participate in management of state and social affairs and to partake in the culture of the Soviet people.

The republic's party and soviet organizations are taking steps to ensure that the linguistic and cultural interests of various ethnic groups and members of various nationalities are protected in such areas as education, book publishing, the press, and amateur theater. Currently, 2 percent of students at LiSSR public schools study in Polish. There is one Polish-language republic-wide newspaper and one magazine, as well as three rayon papers. The republic has three amateur Yiddish theaters and a Polish one, there is a Polish song and dance ensembles and a number of other amateur performance groups.

Citizens of Polish, Jewish and other nationalities are represented in elected party, state, trade union and komsomol organizations and state administrative bodies.

Nonetheless, for a long time the questions of protecting national interests of minority groups has not been specially addressed by party committees, soviets of the people's deputies and many party, trade union and komsomol bodies. Party and soviet entities and social organizations sometimes do not pay sufficient attention, do not show enough sensitivity and tact in fulfilling legitimate demands and interests of certain ethnic groups. Little work has been done in ideological, especially atheist, education of the republic's minorities.

In response to recent requests addressed to party and soviet organizations by the republic's Polish and Jewish population, the LiSSR CPSU's Central Committee stressed that departments of the LiSSR CPSU's Central Committee, party gorkoms and raykoms, ministries and organizations must consistently implement the Leninist principles of the CPSU nationalities policy, a policy of equality for all nationalities and ethnic groups in the republic.

In practice, provisions should be made for their equitable representation in party, soviet, trade union, komsomol and economic bodies and in the communist party. All attempts to discriminate against any nationality for national reasons, especially in acquiring education, getting a job or studying native tongues, should be actively discouraged. Attempts to insult the national feelings of the Polish and Jewish population, as well as other ethnic groups, should be combatted. A healthy moral climate should be fostered among members of different nationalities, a climate of intense political, social and labor activity at all working collectives.

The LiSSR CPSU's Central Committee stressed that that party gorkoms and raykoms, executive committees of local soviets of the people's deputies, the Ministry of Culture LiSSR and the Trade Union Council LiSSR should pay close attention to the development of

national cultures of the Polish and Jewish population as well as other ethnic groups in the republic. They should take additional measures to ensure favorable conditions for Poles and Jews to study their native tongues and to create Polish and Jewish language amateur theaters. They must conduct that work taking into account the wishes expressed by citizens of those nationalities.

The Ministry of Culture LiSSR, the gorispolkoms and rayispolkoms of local soviets of the people's deputies should take measures to preserve the memory of active participants of the revolutionary movement and cultural and artistic figures of Polish or Jewish nationality, as well as other ethnic groups, and to mark places of mass execution of Jews during the Hitlerite occupation of the republic.

The State Committee on Television and Radio Broadcasting LiSSR, newspapers and magazines should increase their coverage of the historical past, the national culture and the traditions of the Polish, Jewish, Tatar and Karaim population of the republic, their contribution to Lithuanian culture, their participation, alongside the Lithuanian people and representatives of other nationalities, in the struggle for social and national liberation, building of socialism and its further improvement.

The LiSSR State Committee on Television and Radio Broadcasting should consider introducing a weekly news program in Polish on the republic's television.

In the Museum of Friendship of the People, the LiSSR Ministry of Culture should make sure to create exhibits highlighting the culture of the Polish and Jewish population and other nationalities of the republic, and their participation in building socialism.

It is considered expedient to turn the Vilnius public library imeni A.Mitskevich, after repairs are completed, into a Friendship of the People library, stocked exclusively with books in the Russian, Polish and Belorussian languages, in Yiddish and in the languages of other nationalities residing in the republic.

In cooperation with the LiSSR Artists' Union, the Ministry should regularly organize exhibitions of Polish and Jewish artists from the collections of various museums of the republic.

The LiSSR CPSU Central Committee's decree directed the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade LiSSR to consider before June 1, 1988, the question of increasing the number of literary works published in Polish.

The LiSSR Writers' Union was directed to explore the possibilities of creating sections for writers who write in Polish. In cooperation with the Ministry of Culture

LiSSR it should organize readings of Polish and Yiddish literature in towns, rayons and working collectives, featuring writers and poets working in Lithuanian, Russian and Polish.

The State Committee for Cinema LiSSR should consider showing films produced in the Polish People's Republic, in Polish, at a Vilnius theater.

Copyright: "Sobytiya i vremya," 1988.

12892

NKAO Well Supplied With Foodstuffs During Strikes

*18300295 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
11 Jun 88 p 3*

[Azerinform commentary following an article by special PRAVDA correspondent N. Demidov titled "Today in Nagorno-Karabakh" appearing in the 10 June PRAVDA and reprinted in BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY; for a translation of the Demidov article see the FBIS Soviet Union Daily Report, FBIS-SOV-88-112, 10 June 1988, page 44]

[Text] After having read N. Demidov's article "Today in Nagorno-Karabakh" in PRAVDA, our Azerinform correspondent contacted the deputy chief of the Azerbaijan CP Central Committee's Trade and Consumer Services Department, M.I. Zubkov, who oversees the supplying of foodstuffs to the oblast population. He informed us that there have been no complaints from the NKAO regarding the food supply, which was confirmed in a recent conversation with M.I. Zubkov by the acting chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh Oblast Executive Committee, Sh.M. Petrosyan, and also by a number of NKAO rayon executive committee chairmen, including Gadrutskiy Rayon Chairman E.V. Navasardyan and Mardakertskiy Rayon Chairman V.S. Dzhavadyan.

In all, over the first 5 months of this year the oblast has received greater amounts of foodstuffs and more regular deliveries than it did during the same period in 1987. Thus, over the first 5 months of 1988 809.8 tons of meat and poultry were delivered, as compared to 769.9 tons over the first 5 months of 1987; 244.3 tons of cheese in 1988, as compared to 192.1 tons in 1987; 8395.9 tons of flour as opposed to 7447.2 tons; and 2326.0 tons of sugar as opposed to 2057.3 tons. The stockpiles of other basic food products were increased as well. It is true that the stockpiling of animal fats and eggs was somewhat curtailed, but this is due to the shortfall in delivery of these products on the part of the Stepanakert Municipal Dairy and the NKAO Oblast Consumers Union.

Yet the inhabitants of the city, as PRAVDA correctly points out, are experiencing difficulty in obtaining food products. This is an artificially-created situation: the trade network is not using stockpiles, stores are closed, and trucks carrying foodstuffs frequently remain unloaded or are sent back to Baku.

In light of this, the motives guiding the actions of some individuals from Armenia who are attempting to provide aid in the form of foodstuffs to NKAO residents remain unclear, since the figures given above show that there is no need for such aid.

It is clear that this situation can in no way facilitate an improvement in the situation in the oblast.

Azerbaijan Official on NKAO Water Supply Initiatives

*18300287 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian
5 Jun 88 p 3*

[Interview by BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY correspondent G. Pogosov with Yu.V. Borisenko, first deputy chief of the Azerbaijan SSR Main Administration for Water Resources Construction: "The Man-Made Rivers of Karabakh" under the rubric "Out of the Resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers"; first three paragraphs are BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY introduction]

[Text] It appears that nature, in lavishing its abundant lands throughout the mountainous terrain of Nagorno-Karabakh, forgot the most important thing for this soil—water. Without water nothing can breathe life into the fruitful mountain mass.

It is up to our republic land reclamation specialists to compensate for this oversight. Due to their efforts, one in 3 hectares of NKAO agricultural land has now been made arable.

Yu.V. Borisenko, first deputy chief of the Azerbaijan SSR Main Administration for Water Resources Construction, discussed future prospects for this area of endeavor in an interview for BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY.

[Borisenko] The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution "On Measures To Accelerate the Socioeconomic Development of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast in the Azerbaijan SSR From 1988 to 1995" clearly defines the tasks set before the Main Administration for Water Resources Construction with respect to improving the supply of water to the population and to develop irrigated farming in the NKAO.

Our main project is the construction of a reservoir on the Badarachay River in Askeranskiy Rayon which, incidentally, would solve the problem of supplying Stepanakert with water. The reservoir basin will hold 30 million cubic meters of water, and a high-rise dam will be used to block the river. The main channels on the left and right banks of the reservoir, which will cover a combined distance of 23 kilometers, will have their source in the artificial man-made lake; the water distribution network will be linked up to these channels. The cost of this facility, whose design has been undertaken by Azgiprovdokh specialists, will be 48 million rubles. Planning

and surveying operations are already under way for the construction of the reservoir, the first phase of which will be put into operation in 1993. This will allow water to be supplied to 5000 hectares of land, including more than 3000 hectares of new land assets.

The second most important new construction project is the Karkarchay reservoir, which will have a capacity of 20 million cubic meters. Successful completion of this effort will enable us to irrigate no less than 3000 hectares of land.

[Pogosov] What is the cost of one hectare of irrigated land in Nagorno-Karabakh?

[Borisenko] Whereas on average this figure hovers around 3500 rubles for the republic as a whole, it is approximately 2.5 times higher in the autonomous republic as a result of the specific prevailing conditions and the mountainous terrain. Capital investments are made taking this indicator into account as well.

Our subdivisions in Mardakertskiy Rayon are doing a great deal of work. These projects, with future prospects taken into account, carry a price-tag of approximately 12 million rubles. Space is being leveled on small plowed fields, covering a combined area of 2000 hectares, that are earmarked for exploitation on the basis of family and collective contracts and leasing arrangements. Agricultural equipment will be able to operate on these fields. We are engaged in a construction project, which has exceeded its original cost ceiling, to supply this zone with a shared water pipeline for nine villages, the source of which will be the Terterchay River.

Work is also being expanded on providing irrigated lands in Mardakertskiy Rayon, and is now ongoing on a number of large farms. This will allow an additional 800 hectares to be put into crop rotation, primarily on grape-producing plantations. This land will receive water from the Terterchay River.

Our specialists are engaged in modernizing the irrigation of pasture land in Zhdanovskiy and Fizulinskiy Rayons in Azerbaijan, which entails replacing pipes and creating new watering sites. Flocks of sheep from Mardakertskiy Rayon graze on this pasture land. And there's more. Next year work will begin on irrigating winter pasture land on approximately 1000 hectares in the small town of Beyuk-Gerami. With these objectives in mind a pumping station is being relocated along the S. Ordzhonikidze Main Canal.

[Pogosov] This program seems to involve new approaches to water resources construction and an acceleration of the work pace.

[Borisenko] Quite true. The USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources allocated us 12 powerful excavators, pipe layers, bulldozers, and other pieces of earthmoving equipment for this work, and our main committee came up with another 14 machines out of its own reserves. All of the work has an element of innova-

tion about it. In the NKAO an efficient overhead irrigation system is being introduced, canals are being faced with concrete, and a closed distribution system is keeping water losses to a minimum. Automated water delivery and distribution equipment is being extensively introduced, and very strict account is being kept of the water.

The high degree of understanding of their tasks exhibited by specialists from Azgiprovodkhoz, Azselkhozvodoprovodstroy, and our Karabakhmelivodstroy and Milkanalvodstroy trusts with regard to this comprehensive program inspires complete confidence that all of the facilities I have mentioned will be put into operation at a high performance level and ahead of schedule.